

INSTRUCTIONS / NOTES

FOR 2015-16 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT (“APPR”)

1. Text Highlighted in Grey = explanation or guidance for an entry in the Progress Report. As guidance, schools should remove the existing text entirely and replace it with the appropriate information to complete the report.
2. Text Highlighted in Green = a sample entry that may be modified. As a sample entry, schools will edit sections highlighted in green or leave the text intact in alignment with the measures and goals included in the school’s Accountability Plan.
3. The template for **high school measures** is in Appendix A, beginning on page 26.
4. The template for reporting for each K-2 school with a norm-referenced test growth measure in the Accountability Plan appears on page 66. The corresponding template for a high school with a norm-referenced test growth measure appears on page 66. Present the respective results at the end of the English language arts and math goals.
5. **Annual adjustments to the Accountability Plan Progress 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 (PLI) meeting the AMO) in ELA and math. The 2014-15 school year will mark the final year of reporting PLIs with the state’s forthcoming implementation of a new accountability system under the Every Student Succeeds Act.
 - b) For the 3-8 Growth Measure in ELA and math, report 2014-15 results using the state’s 3-8 Growth Model. (The 2015-16 results are not yet available.)
 - College Preparatory High Schools**
 - a) Due to the introduction of college and career readiness standards, schools renewed after 2011-12 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 these new measures into account when making renewal decisions. Therefore, the Institute encourages all high schools to include the college and career readiness standard in their Accountability Plan 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	1
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL GOALS.....	3
NCLB GOAL.....	25
HIGH SCHOOL COHORTS	26
HIGH SCHOOL GOALS.....	28
OPTIONAL GOALS	61
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES	
ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS.....	64
HIGH SCHOOLS.....	67

The Accountability Plan Progress Report Template Is Below.

84Q298
MIDDLEVILLAGE PREPARATORY
CHARTER SCHOOL

2015-16 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 1, 2016

By Mr. Ronald E. Rivera

6802 Metropolitan Avenue,
Middle Village, New York 1137984

718-869-2933



INTRODUCTION

Mr. Ronald Rivera, Principal, prepared this 2015-16 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Josephine Lume	Chairperson
Serphin R. Maltese	Vice-Chairman
Rosemary DeGennaro	Secretary
Maureen Campbell	Trustee
Kaiko Hayes	Trustee
Michael Michel	Advisor
Margaret Ognibene	Treasurer
Deborah Kueber	Trustee
Monica Konopka	Trustee
Name	Office, Committees

Ms. Josephine Lume has served as the Chairperson since 2013.

INTRODUCTION

Middle Village Preparatory Charter School opened in September of 2013 as a middle school servicing grades 6 through 8. The students number approximately 400 in number at the present time. Students are drawn from the middle class homes of minority families living in District 24 Queens New York. Approximately 65% of the students are Hispanic, 15% East European, 8 % African American, with the rest of them a mix of Asian, Middle Eastern and White. Our mission is to prepare our students for the academic and social rigors of high school and to guide them in choosing the best high school for their individual needs.

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							120
2014-15							120	110						230
2015-16							150	120	110					380

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Write the school's English language arts goal here.

BACKGROUND

The ELA curriculum included the following elements. It was:

- Based on McGraw Hill classroom text grade appropriate programs
- Included a daily Journal Writing component for all students
- Included the 100 Book Challenge program for student Literacy.
- An Inclusion Class model for literacy, with a Co-Teacher servicing all At-Risk ELA learners.
- Access to Professional Development literacy services for teachers, both in and out of the school building with outside PD providers.
- Rigorous, year-long teaching and practice of the NYS Core Standards in the classroom by the ELA teachers.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above 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 ("ELA") assessment to students in 6th through 8th grade in April 2016. 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).

2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3						
4						
5						

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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

6	146				4	150
7	110				1	111
8	108					108
All	364				5	359

RESULTS

The chart below highlights the ELA PERFORMANCE of both our total student body, which includes grades 6 – 8. Student performance for all tested 364 children yielded a school average proficiency of 45.06% at or above level. Note however, that for students enrolled for at least two years, the proficiency level increases to 50.49%, 5.43% higher than the total school population

Performance on 2015-16 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	34.20 %	146	NA	NA
7	44.50 %	110	44.6 %	110
8	56.48 %	108	56.5 %	108
All	45.06 %	364	50.5 %	218

EVALUATION

As will be shown in this report, the school did not meet its' measure of 75% at proficiency after students' second year of enrollment, falling short by approximately 31% at grade level 7 and 19% at grade 8. Grade 6, which has been enrolled for only a year, arrived at the school with only an approximate proficiency of 30% had an increase of approximately 4 % at the end of its first year.

Despite the fact that the 75 % target was not met, the results on the chart above does indicate that something positive is happening instructionally. It is to be noted that grade 6 although at a lower percent of proficiency compared to grades 7 and 8 had an increase from its grade 5 performance. Grade 7 had approximately a 14% jump in proficiency level from its previous year and grade 8 had an approximate 26% jump in proficiency from its first year at the school. These numerical increases strongly suggest that strong instruction is happening.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period². This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The

² A school's Accountability Period includes the final year of the previous charter term through the penultimate year of the current charter term. For schools in their initial charter, the Accountability Period includes the first year of operation through the fourth year of the charter term.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

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 64 in the Appendix.

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

The year to year trends in ELA progress strongly suggest that instruction is having a strong positive effect on student progress. Take, for example, the progress made by grade 8 on the chart below. Two years ago, this same population performed at only 29.3 % at proficiency; in their following year, their proficiency rose to 46 % and then rose to their present level of 56.5 %. Also, take the grade 7 progress made in the same two years, from their initial 30.3 % at proficiency to their current 44.6 % level.

Several reliable assessments during the school year in the form of Mock ELA examinations revealed these upward trend before actual State Testing in May.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6	29.3	116	30.3 %	119	NA	NA
7			44.5 %	108	44.6 %	110
8					56.5%	108
All	29.3 %	116	37.4 %	227	50.5 %	218

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 PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 English language arts AMO of **104**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.³

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

RESULTS

The school results on the table below indicate that the school made adequate progress towards the goal of ELA proficiency, achieving a PLI of 131 this year.

English Language Arts 2015-16 Performance Level Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
364	13 %	43 %	33 %	11 %

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PI} &= 43 + 33 + 11 = 87 \\ &+ 33 + 11 = 44 \\ \text{PLI} &= 131 \end{aligned}$$

EVALUATION

The school met the measure of progress, exceeding the goal of 104 by 27 points. There was notable performance on grades 7 and 8, where students made a quantum leaps from their previous school year. Effective practices that provided this jump included the use of Writing Journals on a daily basis and time on task spent reading good literature.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

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

RESULTS

The aggregate school performance of Middle Village Prep for students enrolled at least two years, when compared to the aggregate district performance in the same testing grades, indicate that Middle Village Prep outperformed the local school District 24.

2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

⁴ 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](#).

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	44.6 %	119	38.5 %	4096
8	56.5 %	108	44.3 %	3965
All	50.1 %	227	41.4 %	8061

EVALUATION

The school exceeded the aggregate district performance by almost 10 % above the district 24 level. The grade 8 performance was especially notable because of the large jump that the students achieved. Grade 7 took a similar jump, solidifying the gains over District 24.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The chart below clearly indicates that MVP Charter School outperformed the Local District 24 schools each year since its' inception in 2013 to the present day. The only lapse in this trend occurred this year on MVP grade 6's ELA score, which under-performed the District.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3						
4						
5						
6	29.3 %	25.9 %	30.5 %	26.6 %	34.2 %	36.8 %
7			45.0 %	30.5%	44.6 %	38.5 %
8					56.5%	41.4 %
All	29.3 %	25.9 %	37.8 %	25.4 %	45.1 %	38.9 %

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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

METHOD

The SUNY Charter Schools Institute (“Institute”) conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school’s 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

2014-15 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	60.0 %	118	30.5 %	25.46 %	5.04 %	.36
7	61.6 %	109	45.0 %	25.92 %	18.98 %	1.23
8						
All	60.8 %	227	37.72 %			.80

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:

Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here

EVALUATION

The school met the measure, exceeding the .3 Effective Size by a substantial margin.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
-------------	--------	----------------------	---------------	--------	-----------	-------------

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

		Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged				
2012-13						
2013-14		60.0 %				
2014-15		61.5 %				

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁵

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 2014-15 and also have a state exam score from 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 score are ranked by their 2014-15 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁶

RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2014-15 results, shown in the data table below, that directly addresses the critical data: the school's mean growth percentile. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective percentiles.

2014-15 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4		50.0
5		50.0
6	48 %	50.0
7	69 %	50.0
8		50.0
All	58.5 %	50.0

⁵ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

⁶ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

EVALUATION

The school met the measure, exceeding the measure by 8.5 %

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Statewide Median
4				50.0
5				50.0
6	NA	NA	NA	50.0
7			48 %	50.0
8			69 %	50.0
All			58.5 %	50.0

<p>Goal 1: 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 ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

The school achieved all of its' ELA goals except for the 75% of students at proficiency level.

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	Achieved

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

	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.	
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
	Write in optional measure here	Choose an item.

ACTION PLAN

Although the school achieved each of its areas of ELA growth, it has not yet achieved its goal of 75% at Proficiency. For grade 6, it will be necessary to continue monitoring its' ongoing data when students enter grade 7 in order to drive this grade's instruction. As a result, we would hope for a commensurate leap in performance as was seen in this year's grade 7 leap in performance.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Write the school's mathematics goal here.

BACKGROUND

The school Board of Trustees chose to institute the Algebra Regents 1 exam instead of the State Grade 8 exam this year. To prepare the students for the Regents, an additional teacher was hired to help the regular grade 8 math teacher get the students ready. The results were good, with 82 % of the students tested receiving a passing Regents grade. The grades 6 and 7 grade students also received additional assistance through the use of an Inclusion Model which had an extra teacher in the math classes for purposes of Co-Teaching.

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 through 7th grade in April 2016. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. **Grade 8 did not take this test, but instead took the Algebra I Regents instead.**

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.

2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁷				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3						
4						
5						
6	145				5	150
7	109				2	111
8						
All	254				7	261

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.

MATHEMATICS

RESULTS

The chart below indicates that for ALL students, the proficiency % is 46.75, but for those students enrolled for at least two years, the proficiency % goes up to 63.95. Note that the grade 8 students took the Algebra Regents I exam instead, with a pass rate of 82 %. This Algebra % is being used as the measure instead of the regular State Math exam which they did not take.

Performance on 2015-16 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	47.6 %	145	NA	NA
7	45.9 %	109	45.9 %	109
8	82 % Alg Reg.	104	82%	104
All	46.75 %	254	63.95 %	213

EVALUATION

The school fell short of its' goal of 75% of the students performing at proficiency by 30 %. In this case, the number of students needed to attain this goal is an additional 32 students, or approximately one classroom of students that need to be moved upwards.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

For our two year performers, the school has achieved a higher performance level than the State, City or District averages in mathematics. Note however that the first group (the entering class of 2013) at the school for two years or more has done consistently better with high proficiency levels, than the second group of students(the entering 2014 class) who have not matched the performance of the first group. This difference in the consistently high performance of the current grade 8 class and the lower performance of the grade 7 class was likely due to the structural dismantling of the 2013 math team of teachers that was replaced by less experienced teachers. Entering grade 6 students received the best pedagogy from our best math teachers, with the result that high performance followed them for the next two years.

A strategy to "ignite" higher performance in MVP's grade 6 entering class would be to reassemble the grade 6 math team of 2013 and have that team set the standard of performance for the entering class for the following two years after.

MATHEMATICS

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6	NA	NA				
7			68 %	108	45.9%	109
8					82%	104
All					63.95 %	213

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 PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 101. 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

Mathematics 2015-16 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level
-----------	---

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

MATHEMATICS

Cohort	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	11 %	42%	30%	17%

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 42 & + & 30 & + & 17 & = & 89 \\
 & & & & 30 & + & 17 & = & 47 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 136
 \end{array}$$

EVALUATION

The school exceeded the measure of 101 by 35 points.

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

RESULTS

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

2015-16 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	45.9 %	109	39.6 %	4182
8				
All	45.09 %	109	39.6 %	4182

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

EVALUATION

MVP Charter School exceeded the measure of the District Schools by more than 5 % when comparing our grade 7 students who have been with us for 2 years.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

In the previous years, that is 2013 -2015, MVP Charter has surpassed the District performance in Mathematics each and every year. This cannot be explained due to demographic or socio-economic differences, since the MVP enrollment has been picked each year by a random lottery from District 24 itself.

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					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3						
4						
5						
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	68.8 %	37.3 %	45.9 %	41.2 %
8	NA	NA	-	-	82 % Reg.	NA
All	NA	NA	68.8 %	37.3 %	45.9 %	41.2%

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

MATHEMATICS

disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2014-15 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: overall Effect Size. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective Effect Sizes.

2014-15 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						
7						
8						
All						

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here

EVALUATION

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

The school met the Effective Size requirement, exceeding the 0.3 goal set.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance on this comparative measure, including trends over time.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size

MATHEMATICS

		Economically Disadvantaged				
2012-13						
2013-14						
2014-15		60 %	227	37.72	25.69 %	.80

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 2014-15 and also have a state exam score in 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 scores are ranked by their 2014-15 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.¹¹

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2014-15 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: the school's mean growth percentile. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective percentiles.

2014-15 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

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

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.

MATHEMATICS

EVALUATION

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

The school met the measure of the State Wide Median on all grades in mathematics.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Median
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

Goal 2: Optional Measure

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

METHOD

RESULTS

EVALUATION

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

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

Type	Measure	Outcome
------	---------	---------

MATHEMATICS

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
	Write in optional measure here	Choose an item.

ACTION PLAN

An action that should be instituted is the reconstitution of the 2013 year math grade 6 team. This team was responsible for taking students from 36 different elementary schools and successfully got this new group to function at a high level of performance. This level continued in terms of student results into their 7th and 8th

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.

The school did not have our grade 8 students take the State Science test. Instead, our students took the Regents State Earth Science Exam.

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 2015-16 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				
All				

EVALUATION

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

SCIENCE

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					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	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.

2015-16 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				
All				

SCIENCE

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					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4						
8						
All						

Goal 3: Optional Measure

Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

METHOD

RESULTS

EVALUATION

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

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

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Choose an item.
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Choose an item.
	Write in optional measure here	Choose an item.

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
2013-14	Choose an item.
2014-15	Choose an item.
2015-16	Choose an item.

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 2012 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9th grade in the 2012-13 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state’s annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2015-16 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
2013-14	2010-11	2010	??	??	??
2014-15	2011-12	2011	??	??	??
2015-16	2012-13	2012	??	??	??

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 ¹² (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2013-14	2010-11	2010	??	??	??
2014-15	2011-12	2011	??	??	??
2015-16	2013-14	2012	??	??	??

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 ¹³ (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2013-14	2009-10	2009	??	??	??
2014-15	2010-11	2010	??	??	??
2015-16	2011-12	2011	??	??	??

¹² 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.

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

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 Choose an item. 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.¹⁴ 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 2012 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 Cohort¹⁵

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

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. 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	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2012						
2013						
2014						
2015						

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

(S) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will meet the college and career 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 ¹⁶

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of <u>65</u> / <u>75</u>
2010		
2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

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

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

¹⁶ Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 English language arts AMO of 174.

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

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.¹⁷

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
2010				
2011				
2012			N/A	N/A

OR

English Regents Accountability Performance Level (APL)¹⁸
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2010				
2011				
2012			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.

¹⁷ The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65.

¹⁸ 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.

Goal 1: Optional Measure
Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.
METHOD
RESULTS
EVALUATION
ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL ¹⁹

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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.)	Choose an item.

¹⁹ If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	Outcome
Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.)	Choose an item.

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.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: MATHEMATICS

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan mathematics goal.

GOAL 2: 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

(S) 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 Algebra I (Common Core), Geometry, Geometry (Common Core), Algebra 2/Trigonometry, and/or Algebra II (Common Core) 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 or fully meeting Common Core expectations to meet the college and career readiness standard.**²⁰ 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 Cohort²¹

²⁰ 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.

²¹ Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: MATHEMATICS

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 80
2010		
2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance 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	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2012						
2013						
2014						
2015						

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: MATHEMATICS

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 2012 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 ²²

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 80
2010		
2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

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

²² Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: MATHEMATICS

meeting college and career readiness standards. See page 72 of SED’s ESEA waiver application for the high school AMOs:

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

The AMO continues to be SED’s basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 159.

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: MATHEMATICS

(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.²³

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
2010				
2011				
2012			N/A	N/A

OR

Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL)
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District²⁴

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2010				
2011				
2012			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

²³ The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65.

²⁴ See page 39 above for an explanation of the APL.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: MATHEMATICS

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

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

Goal 1: Optional Measure
Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.
METHOD
RESULTS
EVALUATION
ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS GOAL ²⁵

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

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

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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	Choose an item.

²⁵ If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: MATHEMATICS

	local school district. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	
Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	Outcome
Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.)	Choose an item.

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.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: SCIENCE

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan science goal.

GOAL 3: 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 schools administer multiple high school science assessments; current Regent exams are Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. The school administered Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. It scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100; students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass any one of the Regents science exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents science exam multiple times or have taken multiple science exams. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a science exam.

RESULTS

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2012 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 Cohort²⁶

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2010		
2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

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

²⁶ Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: SCIENCE

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

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

Cohort Designation	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2012						
2013						
2014						
2015						

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
2010				
2011				
2012				

EVALUATION

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: SOCIAL STUDIES

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

GOAL 4: 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 2012 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 Cohort²⁷

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2010		
2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

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

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: SOCIAL STUDIES

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	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2012						
2013						
2014						
2015						

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
2010				
2011				
2012				

EVALUATION

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: SOCIAL STUDIES

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 Cohort²⁸

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2010		
2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

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

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

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

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: SOCIAL STUDIES

Cohort Designation	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2012						
2013						
2014						
2015						

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
2010				
2011				
2012				

EVALUATION

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

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

GOAL 5: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

GOAL 5: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Write the school's graduation goal here.

Goal 5: 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

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

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 2015-16

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2012		
2013		
2014		
2015		

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

OR

Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2015-16

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2014		
2015		

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 5: 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
2012		
2013		
2014		

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

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 5: 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
2010		
2011		
2012		

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2009		
2010		
2011		

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

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 5: 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 district²⁹. 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
2010				
2011				
2012				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.

²⁹ 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](#).

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

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	Choose an item.
	(§) 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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.

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.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: COLLEGE PREPARATION

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

GOAL 6: COLLEGE PREPARATION

GOAL 6: COLLEGE PREPARATION

Write the school's college preparation goal here.

Goal 6: 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
2013-14						
2014-15						
2015-16						

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: COLLEGE PREPARATION

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
2013-14						
2014-15						
2015-16						

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

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: COLLEGE PREPARATION

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 Measure³⁰

³⁰ 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](#).

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: COLLEGE PREPARATION

Cohort	Charter School	Statewide ³¹
2010		38.1
2011		40.0
2012		N/A

EVALUATION

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

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

METHOD

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

RESULTS

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

Percent of Graduates with a Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation³²

Cohort	Charter School	School District ³³
2010		
2011		
2012		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.

³¹ Statewide results for the 2011 cohort are not yet available.

³² 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](#).

³³ District results for the 2011 cohort are not yet available.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: COLLEGE PREPARATION

(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 ³⁴
2010		
2011		
2012		

EVALUATION

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

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.

³⁴ Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam, or a college level course

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: COLLEGE PREPARATION

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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
College Preparation	Each Year, the school will demonstrate the preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design.	Choose an item.
College Attainment	Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design.	Choose an item.
	Write in optional measure here	Choose an item.

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.	Choose an item.
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.	Choose an item.
	(§) 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.	Choose an item.
	(§) 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.	Choose an item.

HIGH SCHOOL GOALS: COLLEGE PREPARATION

	(§) Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation.	Choose an item.
	(§) Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation.	Choose an item.
	Write in optional measure here	Choose an item.

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

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.

2015-16 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

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

2015-16 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.

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

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.

2015-16 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
2013-14	%
2014-15	%
2015-16	%

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.

2015-16 Attendance

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

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

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
2013-14	%
2014-15	%
2015-16	%

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 2015-16, 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.

2015-16 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 2015-16; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

2015-16 English Language Arts Performance of

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY TABLES

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
2013-14									
2014-15									
2015-16									

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 2014-15 and 2015-16. 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.

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY TABLES

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
		2014-15	Target	2015-16	
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?
2013-14	
2014-15	
2015-16	

Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2012-13	?-?		
2013-14	?-?		
2014-15	?-?		
2015-16	?-?		

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

2015-16 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	
2011					YES/NO
2012					YES/NO
2013					YES/NO
2014					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.

APPENDIX C: SUMMARY TABLES

HIGH SCHOOLS: SUBJECT AREA MEASURES

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
Integrated Algebra				
Geometry				
Algebra 2				

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2009	2010	2011	2012
Living Environment				
Earth Science				
Chemistry				
Physics				