



CONEY ISLAND PREP

The courage to dream. The commitment to succeed.

Coney Island Prep

2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 11, 2018

By Amanda Warco

315 Avenue U
Brooklyn, NY 11218

929-441-3370

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Jacob Mnookin, Executive Director, Eric Green, Chief Academic Officer, and Amanda Warco, Director of Data, prepared this 2017-18 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Josh Wolfe	Chair
Anu Malipatil	Academic Chair
Jennifer Philbrick-McArdle	Board Member
Joseph Talia	Board Member
Joan Davidson	Board Member
Joe Herrera	Board Member
Shona Pinnock	Board Member

Jacob Mnookin has served as the Executive Director since 2009.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Coney Island Prep opened in the Coney Island neighborhood of Community School District 21 in August 2009 with 90 fifth grade scholars. The initial plan was to grow up from there, adding a grade every year. In this way, we opened our high school in 2013 - 2014. That same year, however, we decided to grow down as well, and in 2014 – 2015, we opened an elementary school, starting with kindergarten and first grade. Our initial cohort of scholars graduated from high school two years ago. Last year, the 2017 – 2018 school year marked the first year we were a fully-grown, K – 12 school. And this 2018 - 2019 school year is the first year that we have students in our middle school that started at our elementary school. This year we are serving approximately 1,000 students.

This mission of Coney Island Prep is to prepare student to succeed in the college and career of their choice, and we can confidently say that, while there is much hard work to be done to ultimately fulfill that lofty mission, we are on track. We drastically outperform comparable schools on both New York State ELA and math assessments. We outperform the city and state on New York State Regents exams, and our scholars have an average SAT score above that of the city, state and country. As previously mentioned, 2016 – 2017 marked the first year that we had a graduating class, and 100% of our first two classes of seniors graduated from high school, and 100% were accepted into college. In fact, our graduating seniors have, on average, earned almost 7 college acceptances each, and earned over \$5,000,000 in scholarships and grants.

Coney Island Prep is in an incredibly diverse part of the city, and that diversity is reflected in our student body. 43% of our students identify as Black, 29 identify as Hispanic, 17% identify as white, and 10% identify as Asian. 24% of our students are classified as Special Education students, and over 85% of our students qualify for free- or reduced-price lunch.

Below, we detail 8 key design elements, as well as our general instructional philosophy and approach.

High Expectations for Academics and Behavior

We believe that all students can learn and achieve at high levels and behave well. At Coney Island Prep, student expectations are at the core of our educational philosophy. All graduates will earn the opportunity to attend selective colleges and universities, and go on to be successful in the career of their choice.

Gradual Release of Structures

We believe that in order for Coney Island Prep to be a learning environment where every moment of classroom time is maximized, the school needs to be structured and systematized. We also recognize that as students get older and mature, they need to be afforded increasing independence, and be given more room to make their own decisions. We believe that there is no silver bullet for helping students reach a place where they are able to excel independently as is required in many high schools and all colleges. We do believe, however, in being intentional about what systems and structures are in place in different grades and scaffolding those appropriately, releasing more structure and building in more responsibility for decisions and independence so that as students graduate from one grade to the next, they will be better equipped to make good choices on their own. How we structure these systems and the gradual release of those systems were an ongoing discussion throughout startup, and have continued to be refined as the school grew and added a grade each year.

Great Teachers and Meaningful, Strategic Professional Development

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

High quality teachers are the most important determinant of academic achievement. Without strong teachers delivering exceptional lessons, students cannot make significant academic gains, regardless of how well-behaved they are or how disciplined the learning environment is.

We invest significantly in recruiting and hiring exceptional teachers. We also invest heavily in internal professional development so all teachers increase their effectiveness over time. Professional development at Coney Island Prep begins with a three-week summer orientation. In addition, during the year, all teachers have a coach, who observes them teach at least weekly, provides intensive support including Real Time Coaching, and meets with them separately to discuss things that are going well, and identify and agree upon areas for improvement and concrete action steps. In addition, all teachers have three hours of weekly in-house professional development. We also provide dedicated professional development days during the year.

K – 12, College Preparatory Curriculum

A seamless elementary, middle, and high school education affords the opportunity to craft a strategic curriculum, while creating a strong and lasting sense of community. A seamless K-12 education fully supports our college preparatory mission because it provides continuity to curriculum as students move from one grade to the next. The five elementary school years serve as a foundation for the four middle school years at Coney Island Prep, which continue to build a strong sense of college purpose among students, while strengthening foundational skills and developing the work habits and personal characteristics that lead to school success. By continuing seamlessly into high school, students do not need to adjust to a new environment with different expectations. The high school differs in some ways to meet the varied academic and developmental needs of maturing students, but the mission and core beliefs of the school remain constant. This minimizes any adjustment period and allows students to focus on preparation for and acceptance into a competitive college or university.

Assessments and Data to Drive Instruction and Inform Professional Development

We believe in scaffolding instruction to ensure students have the skills and knowledge necessary for school success. To monitor student progress, we use assessments throughout the year to gather frequent data points regarding students' academic levels. Teachers discern which standards need to be re-taught to the entire class, and which students need individual remediation and tutoring on particular skills and concepts. Assessment data guides professional development and the support and growth of individual teachers.

We administer a variety of tests, including the STEP assessment to diagnose students' reading levels and deficiencies as soon as they enter kindergarten. We also administer a nationally-normed assessment, called the Northeast Evaluation Association (NWEA) Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) assessment. This tool is used to quantify the progress of each individual student during the school year and assess the effectiveness of the school's educational program overall.

At the end of each unit, students take a teacher-created assessment. In addition, students take interim assessments, which are designed to mimic the state assessments, approximately four times per year.

All of these various assessments allow teachers, students, administrators and parents to know precisely which standards students have mastered, so that no academic deficiency will ever come as a surprise and so that timely supports can be put in place.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

More Time to Learn

We provide an approximately 182-day school year and a longer school day, from approximately 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Combined with frequent assessments and the strategic use of results, extended time allows us to ensure that students are achieving at the high levels we expect, and that they are on the path to college success.

Character Development and Advisories

It is every adult's job to enforce the ideals of the community and teach young people how to behave and make good decisions. We recognize that "[c]hildren first develop values, attitudes, and skills as a result of their experience in the families that raised them. But those values, attitudes, and skills continue to be shaped by children's interaction with their peers, teachers, neighbors, and other aspects of their environment."¹ In order to have teachers and other school staff positively affect students' values, attitudes and skills, character development will continue to be an integral part of our academic program. Our core values are represented by the acronym PRIDE - Professionalism, Respect, Integrity, Determination and Excellence. We explicitly teach and reinforce these core values in advisories and whole-school gatherings.

Family Involvement

Parents and schools need to be partners in a child's education. The two need to be aligned philosophically and reinforce each other's messages, so that the child is surrounded by a coherent, consistent and collective voice, which nurtures, encourages and demands academic success. We foster a successful partnership with the parents of our children through a variety of steps listed, which could include the following.

- Information Sessions
- Home Visits
- Commitments to Excellence
- Workshops
- Family Surveys
- Parent-Teacher Conferences
- Parent Orientations
- Volunteers
- Family Newsletters

Instructional Methods: Whereas some schools identify themselves as primarily a project-based school model, and other schools identify themselves as an experiential learning model, we are firmly committed to implementing varied instructional methods and techniques as appropriate and to best fit the needs of our students.

While we have shied away from purchasing pre-packaged curricula in the past, in the era of the Common Core Standards (CCSS), we have moved to using Open Educational Resource (OER) curriculums that are fully CCSS-aligned. Specifically, we use the EngageNY math curriculum and Wheatley ELA curriculum. We recently made this shift to ensure that the materials we put in front of our students are focused on grade level standards, coherent across grade levels, and emphasize the correct component of rigor for each standard.

¹ Thernstrom, Abigail, and Stephan Thernstrom. No Excuses: Closing the Racial Gap in Learning. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2003. Page 66.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

The use of these curriculums also changes the way teachers prepare for class. Rather than creating their own scopes and sequences, unit plans, and lessons, teachers are provided with these materials and build their content knowledge by shifting their time to internalizing curriculum through protocols that help them study the standards, assessments, and progression of learning across a unit. Teachers are then able to use that knowledge to help emphasize and modify the material within a lesson so that it meets the needs of all of their students.

Study, Teach, Assess, Analyze, Remediate

Our instructional model is built on a five-step process: study, teach, assess, analyze, and remediate. Once teachers have studied the material of a unit and lesson, they teach the lesson and assess student understanding with a daily exit ticket, which is based on the lesson's learning objective. The exit tickets are graded quickly and teachers analyze the student work to determine any misconceptions the students may have. Teachers then create the most effective and least invasive remediation plan they can, based on the data. This may range from opening the next day's class by analyzing student work with the whole class, to tutoring a small group of students, to re-teaching the material to the entire class. Teachers continually used daily formative assessments and student work to determine mastery, and work to correct any student misconceptions. Larger summative assessments are administered at the end of each unit to assess standard mastery.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2013-14	-	-	-	-	-	88	90	90	90	90	-	-	-	447
2014-15	64	57	-	-	-	57	89	86	91	81	88	83	-	640
2015-16	62	64	60	-	-	88	84	85	92	88	84	77	-	784
2016-17	64	60	61	59	-	92	87	91	85	90	83	78	71	941
2017-18	62	62	62	63	60	90	87	89	88	90	84	76	73	986

HIGH SCHOOL COHORTS

ACCOUNTABILITY COHORT

The state's Accountability Cohort consists specifically of students who are in their fourth year of high school after entering the 9th grade. For example, the 2014 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9th grade anywhere in the 2014-15 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state's annual enrollment-determination day (i.e., BEDS day) in the 2017-18 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 SIRS Manual for more details about cohort eligibility: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/ht>)

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

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Fourth-Year High School Accountability Cohorts

Fourth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 th Grade Anywhere	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on BEDS Day in October of the Cohort's Fourth Year	Number Leaving During the School Year	Number in Accountability Cohort as of June 30th
2015-16	2012-13	2012	-	-	-
2016-17	2013-14	2013	79	6	73
2017-18	2014-15	2014	81	1	80

TOTAL COHORT FOR GRADUATION

Students are also included in the Total Cohort for Graduation (referred to as the Graduation Cohort, Total Graduation Cohort, or Total Cohort interchangeably throughout this report) based on the year they first enter the 9th grade. Students enrolled for at least one day in the school after entering the 9th grade are part of the school's Graduation Cohort. The school may remove students from the Graduation Cohort if the school has discharged those students for an acceptable reason listed in the SIRS manual, including the following: 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 are deceased.

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)	Number of Students No Longer at the School Who Had Been Enrolled for at Least One Day Prior to Leaving the School and Who Were <u>Not</u> Discharged for an Acceptable Reason (b)	Total Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2015-16	2012-13	2012	-	-	-
2016-17	2013-14	2013	75	0	76
2017-18	2014-15	2014	80	2	82

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)	Number of Students No Longer at the School Who Had Been Enrolled for at Least One Day Prior to Leaving the School and Who Were <u>Not</u> Discharged for an Acceptable Reason (b)	Total Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2015-16	2011-12	2011	-	-	-
2016-17	2012-13	2012	-	-	-
2017-18	2013-14	2013	2	0	2

GOAL 1: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

GOAL 1: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Goal 1: Leading Indicator

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

METHOD

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of the high school cohort and examines students’ progress toward graduation based on annual credit accumulation. The measure requires that, based on the school’s promotion requirements, 75 percent of the first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn the required number of credits.

Promotion Policies

To deliver on our mission, students must be fully prepared for the rigors of each following grade. Students will not automatically be passed from one grade to the next—we do not believe in social promotion. Only students who have demonstrated mastery of essential knowledge and skills for a given grade will be promoted.

Grade Level	Coursework/Exams	Minimum Credits
9	Successful completion of standards in academic subject areas	8 credits
10	Successful completion of standards in academic subject areas	20 credits (Including 4 in English and/or ESL and 4 in social studies)
11	Successful completion of standards in academic subject areas	30 credits
12	Successful completion of standards in academic subject areas	44 credits in required subject areas

Coney Island Prep High School defines scholars who are at risk for not graduating high school in four years as scholars who enter their 10th grade year with a 4 or more credit deficit, scholars who enter their 11th and 12th grade years with a 2 or more credit deficit, and scholars who have been previously retained at CIPHS or at another school. If a scholar is identified as a “high risk” student, the school’s administration will employ any methods possible to ensure a 4-year graduation rate. These possibilities include, but are not limited to:

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

1. Scholar enrollment in extra core classes in lieu of elective classes.
2. Scholar enrollment in after school classes from 4:00 – 5:00pm to earn credits.
3. Scholar enrollment in courses that will yield the best opportunity for credit recovery or passed Regents exams.
4. Scholar enrollment in after school tutoring for Regents preparation.

Scholars will be closely monitored throughout the academic year. If a scholar fails to fulfill the requirements to get back on the four-year graduation track and is no longer qualified for a College and Career Readiness Diploma Designation, or she will be jeopardy of retention or a change in diploma track. Counselors and school administrators will create the best path forward that could include pursuing another diploma option and/or repeating a full grade. Scholars who are retained at a grade level will still keep the credits they have accumulated. At Coney Island Prep High School, the close of the 4th quarter marks the official end of the school year and Regents examination re-take opportunities are in mid-August. As such, the school makes final promotion decisions each year by August 20th.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the 2016 and 2017 cohorts, 94% of the students earned the required number of credits, exceeding the measure by 24%. We attribute this success to the strength of our curriculum and close tracking and communication of student progress.

Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts
Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2017-18

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2016	86	94%
2017	89	94%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 1: Leading Indicator

Each year, 75 percent of students in the second year high school Total Graduation Cohort will score at or above proficient 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 Graduation Cohort have passed at least three Regents exams by their second year in the cohort. In August of 2018, the 2016 cohort will have completed its second year.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In our 2014, 2015, and 2016 cohorts, 91%, 88%, and 88% of students scored at or above proficient on three or more Regents exams, exceeding the goal by 23 – 26%. We attribute this success to our strong curriculum, measuring of student’s progress, and response to data.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2014	82	91%
2015	76	88%
2016	88	88%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 1: Absolute Measures

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 2014 cohort and graduated four years later and those who entered as members of the 2013 cohort and graduated five years later. These data reflect August graduation rates. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams required for high school graduation in ELA, mathematics, science, U.S. History, and Global History or met the requirements for the 4+1 pathway to graduation.²

The school’s graduation requirements appear in this document below the graduation goal’s first measure pertaining to annual grade-by-grade promotion or credit accumulation.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Ninety-seven percent of the students in our 2013 cohort graduated CIPHS within five years of entering, exceeding the goal by 22%. So far, 86% of the students in our 2014 cohort have graduated within five years of entering CIPHS, exceeding the goal by 11%. We expect that number will climb after this year, which is the fifth year for that cohort.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2012	-	-
2013	73	97%
2014	80	86%

² The state’s guidance for the 4+1 graduation pathway can be found here:

<http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/multiple-pathways/>.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2011	-	-
2012	-	-
2013	73	100%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 1: 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 school district of comparison.

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 school district of comparison.³ 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 AND EVALUATION

Our 2013 cohort, the only cohort with available data, outperformed the Total Graduation Cohort from our comparable school district by 27%, exceeding the goal. We attribute this success to our strong curriculum and communication of progress with students.

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

Cohort Designation	Charter School		School District	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2012	-	-	1,883	69%
2013	73	97%	1,897	70%
2014	80	86%	Not yet available	

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Cohort pursuing an alternative graduation pathway (commonly referred to as the 4+1 pathway) will achieve a Regents equivalency score and pass an approved pathway assessment required for graduation by the end of their fourth year in the cohort.

³ 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](#).

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

METHOD

The New York State Board of Regents approved regulations establishing alternative pathways to graduation for all students. Students may replace one of the required Social Studies Regents exams with an approved alternative assessment. For more information about requirements and approved assessments refer to the NYSED resource online: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/multiple-pathways/>. The school will document the names of the alternative assessments administered and success rate for students in the templates below.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Coney Island Prep has not had any students pursue an alternative graduation pathway.

Percentage of the 2014 Graduation Cohort Pathway Students Demonstrating Success by Exam Type

Exam	Number of Graduation Cohort Members Tested (a)	Number Passing or Achieving Regents Equivalency (b)	Percentage Passing = $[(b)/(a)]*100$
N/A			

Pathway Exam Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing a Pathway Exam
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

N/A

SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION GOAL

Type	Measure	Outcome
Leading Indicator	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.	94%
Leading Indicator	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.	88%
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the fourth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate.	86%

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Absolute	Each year, 95 percent of students in the fifth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate.	100%
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 school district of comparison.	86% vs. 70% (district number is from 2016)
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Cohort pursuing an alternative graduation pathway will achieve a Regents equivalency score and pass an approved pathway assessment required for graduation by the end of their fourth year.	N/A

ACTION PLAN

GOAL 2: COLLEGE PREPARATION

GOAL 2: COLLEGE PREPARATION

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by at least one or some combination of the following indicators:

- Passing an Advanced Placement (“AP”) exam with a score of 3 or higher;
- Earning a score of 4 or higher on an International Baccalaureate (“IB”) exam;
- Passing a College Level Examination Program (“CLEP”) exam;
- Passing a college level course offered at a college or university or through a school partnership with a college or university;
- Achieving the college and career readiness benchmark on the SAT; or,
- Earning a Regents diploma with advanced designation; or,

METHOD

Schools use any method listed here, or any combination thereof, to demonstrate that at least 75 percent of graduates are prepared to engage in rigorous college level coursework. The school should select only those methods listed here that it uses to demonstrate the college readiness of its students and eliminate those that it will not. For instance, high schools that do not deliver an IB Program as part of their high school design do not report on the IB option. The school reports on the number of students who attempted to achieve each indicator, the number who succeeded, and the corresponding percentage. Additionally, the school should report on the overall number of students who graduated after four years, the number of those graduates who achieved any of the

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

relevant measures, and the overall percentage achieving the measure.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Overall, 77% of our students met at least one of the criteria listed above, exceeding the indicator by 2%. This year we have reframed our goals for students graduating with and Advanced Regents diploma and we're working on a new approach to AP classes, so we expect this percentage to climb in the coming years.

Percentage of the 2014 Total Cohort Graduates Demonstrating College Preparation by Indicator

Indicator	Number of Graduates who Attempted the Indicator	Number who Achieved Indicator	Percentage of Graduates who Achieved Indicator
Passing an Advanced Placement ("AP") exam with a score of 3 or higher	40	20	58%
Achieving the college and career readiness benchmark on the SAT	69	53	77%
Earning a Regents diploma with advanced designation	69	23	33%
Passing a college level course offered at a college or university or through a school partnership with a college or university	3	3	4%
Overall	69 ⁴	53	77%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the College, Career, and Civic Readiness Index ("CCCRI") for the school's Total Cohort will exceed the Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

⁴ This number should match the number of graduates reported under the high school graduation goal.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

METHOD

The state’s recently finalized ESSA plan includes a College, Career, and Civic Readiness Index that measures the rate of completion among the Total Cohort of a variety of indicators of readiness for the next step after high school. Indicators that are more rigorous and that are therefore more difficult to attain receive greater weight in the new CCCRI (e.g., attaining a Regents diploma and a score of 4 or higher on an IB exam). Conversely, some less rigorous indicators that were not included in the College and Career Readiness Index under the state’s NCLB accountability system are included in the CCCRI (e.g., completion of a high school equivalency program).⁵

To achieve this measure, the school must have a CCCRI value that equals or exceeds the 2017-18 CCCRI MIP for all students. The state will calculate and disseminate the MIP in the summer of 2018. The CCCRI is calculated by multiplying the number of students in the cohort demonstrating college and career readiness by the weighting for the method by which the student demonstrated college and career readiness, divided by the number of students in the cohort. The highest possible CCCRI is 200.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The state has not yet released this data.

CCCRI Performance by Cohort Year

Graduation Year	Cohort	Number of Students in Cohort	MIP	School CCCRI
2015-16	2012		N/A	
2016-17	2013		N/A	
2017-18	2014		Not yet released	Not yet released

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The state has not yet released this data.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school’s CCCRI for the Total Cohort will exceed that of the district of comparison’s Total Cohort.

METHOD

The school compares the CCCRI of students from the fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the school district of comparison.

⁵ For more detail about the weighting of college readiness methods for calculation of the CCCRI, see page 64 of the state’s finalized ESSA plan here: www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/essa/documents/nys-essa-plan-final-1-16-2018.pdf

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The state has not yet released this data.

CCRI of Fourth-Year Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School	School District
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A
2014	Not yet released	Not yet released

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The ultimate measure of whether a college prep high school has lived up to its mission is whether students actually enroll and succeed in college. Schools track and report the percentage of fourth-year Total Cohort graduates who matriculate into a two or four-year college program in the fall following graduation.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Ninety-three percent of the students in our 2013 cohort and 83% of the students in our 2014 cohort matriculated to college, with both cohorts exceeding the goal. We attribute this success to our College Team, who work with students to choose the best fit schools based on their academics and finances, draft their applications, and apply for financial aid.

Matriculation Rate of Graduates by Year

Cohort	Number of Graduates (a)	Number Enrolled in 2 or 4-year Program in Fall (b)	Matriculation Rate = $[(b)/(a)]*100$
2012	-	-	-
2013	71	66	93
2014	69	57	83

SUMMARY OF THE COLLEGE PREPARATION GOAL

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate	77%

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

	their preparation for college by one or more possible indicators of college readiness.	
Absolute	Each year, the CCCRI for the school's Total Cohort will exceed that year's state MIP set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Not yet released
Comparative	Each year, the school's CCCRI for the Total Cohort will exceed that of the district's Total Cohort.	Not yet released
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate into a college or university in the year after graduation.	83%

ACTION PLAN

GOAL 3: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 3: English Language Arts

BACKGROUND

For our K-8 ELA curriculum we use KIPP Wheatley. KIPP Wheatley is a comprehensive reading and writing curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core State Standards for ELA. Each grade level consists of four modules (one per quarter) that each focus on a grade level novel with supporting texts. Each module has two check-point assessment and one end of module assessment. Teachers and coaches receive training on the curriculum prior to the school year and professional development sessions as needed.

Our high school uses EngageNY's 9-12 ELA curriculum, which is aligned to the Common Core State Standards. Each grade level completes three modules per year, which each consist of three units. Within each unit students complete a mid-unit and end of unit assessment.

Goal 3: 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 3rd through 8th grade in April 2018. 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).

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

2017-18 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁶				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	62				1	63
4	59				1	60
5	90					90
6	88					88
7	89					89
8	87				1	88
All	475				3	478

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Overall, 59% of students in their second year at Coney Island Prep performed at or above proficiency on the NYS ELA exam. While this percent falls below the goal, we have seen this number increase by 26% over the past two years and we expect it to continue to rise. It is worth noting that our 3rd grade students, who have been with us since Kindergarten, saw 70% of the cohort passing the exam.

Performance on 2017-18 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	68%	62	70%	57
4	53%	59	57%	47
5	44%	90		0
6	60%	88	60%	81
7	47%	89	49%	80
8	62%	87	63%	83
All	55%	475	59%	348

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

ELA Performance by Grade Level and Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	0	63%	51	70%	57

⁶ 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.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

4	N/A	0	N/A	0	57%	47
5	0%	5	0%	1	N/A	0
6	17%	63	30%	73	60%	81
7	31%	71	47%	75	49%	80
8	18%	84	58%	79	63%	83
All	22%	223	48%	279	59%	348

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the State English language arts exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2017-18 English language arts MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our PI was 150. The state has not yet released the MIP, so we are unable to evaluate our results.

English Language Arts 2017-18 Performance Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
475	14%	31%	37%	18%

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 31 & + & 37 & + & 18 & = & 86 \\
 & & & & 37 & + & 18 & = & 55 \\
 & & & & & + & (.5)*18 & = & 9 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{150}
 \end{array}$$

Goal 3: 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 school district of comparison.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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.⁷

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

This year 59% of students in their second year at CIP were proficient on the ELA exam. This mark is 2% higher than our comparable district, which meets the goal. Our third grade cohort outperformed the comparable district by 18%.

2017-18 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	70%	57	52%	2172
4	57%	47	55%	2130
5	N/A	0	43%	2141
6	60%	81	63%	2762
7	49%	80	57%	2819
8	63%	83	66%	2694
All	59%	348	57%	14718

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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 District Students					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	N/A	N/A	63%	45%	70%	52%
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	57%	55%
5	0%	34%	0%	38%	N/A	43%
6	17%	45%	30%	51%	60%	63%
7	31%	46%	47%	49%	49%	57%
8	18%	51%	58%	57%	63%	66%
All	22%	42%	48%	48%	59%	57%

⁷ 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](#).

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

The 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 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our average effect size is a 0.88, which exceeds our goal of an effect size of 0.3. Our highest effect sizes are 1.51 in 3rd grade, and 1.25 in 8th grade, which make sense because most of those students have been with us for at least three years. Our lowest effect size was a 0.38 in 5th grade. This is in line with expectations because those students have just entered Coney Island Prep.

2016-17 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	80.6	61	61	33.1	22.9	1.51
4	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	82.6	92	30	24.4	5.6	.38
6	90.2	88	27	17.9	9.1	.71
7	83.1	91	44	29.3	14.7	.80
8	81.4	86	59	35	24	1.25
All	83.8	418	42.9	27.5	15.4	.88

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a large degree

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15	5-8	80.9	347	26.2	19.2	.43
2015-16	5-8	86.8	340	29.4	22.9	.40
2016-17	3, 5-8	83.8	41	43.1	27.5	.88

Goal 3: Growth Measure⁸

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 target of 50.

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 2016-17 and also have a state exam score from 2015-16 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2015-16 score are ranked by their 2016-17 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 target for this measure, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁹

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our overall mean growth percentile for all grades was 61%, exceeding the goal by 11%.

2016-17 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	N/A	50.0
5	53	50.0
6	65	50.0
7	65	50.0
8	63	50.0
All	61	50.0

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

⁸ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

⁹ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0
5	45	41	53	50.0
6	66	63	65	50.0
7	56	55	65	50.0
8	73	62	63	50.0
All	60	55	61	50.0

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	59%
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	150
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	59% -CIP 57% - 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 2016-17 results.)	.91
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 target of 50. (Using 2016-17 results.)	61

ACTION PLAN

HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

METHOD

The school administered a Regents English exam that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

college and career readiness standard as scoring at or above Performance Level 4 (meeting Common Core expectations) on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core).¹⁰ This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 4 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Seventy-seven percent of our 2013 cohort and 74% of our 2014 cohort scored at least a Level 4 on the ELA Common Core Regents exam, exceeding the goal by 10%.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on Regents English Common Core Exam
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort¹¹

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on Common Core exam (or Percent Scoring at Least 75 if student took the Regents Comprehensive English Exam)
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	75	77%
2014	76	74%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Percent Achieving at Least Level 4 by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Level 4	Number in Cohort	Percent Level 4	Number in Cohort	Percent Level 4
2014	76	0%	76	74%	76	74%
2015	77	1%	77	6%	77	68%
2016			88	2%	88	41%
2017					92	0%

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

¹⁰ Students in the 2014 and 2015 high school Accountability Cohorts may have taken the Regents Comprehensive English exam. As such, for 2017-18 and 2018-19, the Institute will continue to count any student who achieved at least a scale score of 75 (the previous target for college and career readiness) on that exam as having met the target for this measure.

¹¹ Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

METHOD

The school administered a Regents English exam that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the cut off for passing and meeting the requirement for graduation as scoring at or above Performance Level 3 (partially meeting Common Core expectations) on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core). This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 3 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Ninety-nine percent of our 2013 cohort and 95% of our 2014 cohort score at least a Level 3 on the ELA Common Core Regents exam, exceeding the goal by 30%.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on Regents English Common Core Exam
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort¹²

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on the Regents English Exam
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	75	99%
2014	76	95%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Percent Achieving at Least Level 3 by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2014	76	0%	76	93%	76	95%
2015	77	1%	77	83%	77	94%
2016			88	2%	88	73%
2017					92	0%

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state’s Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.

METHOD

The state’s finalized and approved ESSA plan in 2018 includes a revised calculation of the high school Performance Index. In it, schools now receive additional credit for students scoring at

¹² Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Accountability Level 4.¹³ To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have a PI that equals or exceeds the state’s 2017-18 English language arts MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018.

The Performance Index is calculated as such: (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 2) + 2*(percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 3) + 2.5 * (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 4). Thus, the highest possible PI is 250. The basis for the percent of students is the school’s fourth year Total Cohort for Graduation. The Regents Examination in English Language Arts (Common Core) is scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Accountability Level 1, 65 to 78 is Accountability Level 2; 79 to 84 is Accountability Level 3, and 85 to 100 is Accountability Level 4.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our PI was 151. We have not received the state’s MIP as of yet.

English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)
For the 2014 High School Accountability Cohort

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Accountability Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
2014	3	16	16	40

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 16 & + & 16 & + & 40 & = & 75 \\
 & & & & 16 & + & 40 & = & 56 \\
 & & & & & + & (.5)*40 & = & \underline{20} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & 151
 \end{array}$$

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations.

METHOD

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. In order to meet or exceed Common Core expectations, a student must achieve Performance Level 4 or 5. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

¹³ For more details on the score ranges used to determine Accountability Levels as distinguished from Performance Levels, see

www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Seventy-seven percent of our 2013 cohort and 74% of our 2014 cohort scored a Level 4 or 5, exceeding the district by 25% and meeting our stated goal.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 4 or Higher on English Regents
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Level 4 or 5	Number in Cohort	Percent Level 4 or 5	Number in Cohort
2012	N/A	N/A	52%	1,670
2013	77%	75	49%	1,590
2014	74%	76	49% using 16-17	1,590 using 16-17

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort at least partially meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations.

METHOD

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. In order to at least partially meet Common Core expectations, a student would need to pass the exam and score at Performance Level 3 or higher (i.e. scoring at least 65). Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Each year 99% of our students earned a Level 3 or higher on the ELA Regents exam, which is about 24% higher than our comparable district. This exceeds the goal.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 3 or Higher on English Regents
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Level 3 or Higher	Number in Cohort	Percent Level 3 or Higher	Number in Cohort
2012	N/A	N/A	78%	2,512
2013	99%	75	75%	2,463

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

2014	95%	76	75%	2,463
------	-----	----	-----	-------

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison.

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 school district of comparison. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The state has not yet released these results.

English Regents Performance Index (PI)¹⁴
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	PI	Cohort Size	PI	Cohort Size
2012	N/A	N/A		
2013	153.5	75		
2014	151	75	Not yet released	Not yet released

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The state has not yet released this data.

Goal 3: Growth Measure

Each year, 50 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 at Performance Level 4 and 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.

¹⁴ For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s PI, see page 28.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

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 the college and career readiness standard.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Seventy percent of our 2013 cohort and 67% of our 2014 cohort who did not score proficient on their 8th grade ELA exam were proficient on the ELA Common Core Regents exam, which exceeds the goal by 17%.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 4 on Common Core exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort ¹⁵

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Achieving Level 4 on Common Core exam (or Scoring at Least 75 on the Regents Comprehensive English Exam)
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	33	70%
2014	45	67%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 3: Growth Measure

Each year, 75 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 at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

METHOD

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its English language arts program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to meet the English requirement for graduation.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Ninety-seven percent of the 2013 cohort and 93% of the 2014 cohort who did not score proficient on their 8th grade ELA exam were proficient on their ELA Common Core Regents exam, which exceeds the goal by 23%.

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

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 3 on Common Core exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort ¹⁶

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Achieving Level 3 on Regents English Exam
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	33	97%
2014	45	93%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL ¹⁷

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	74%
Absolute	Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	95%
Absolute	Each year, the Performance Index (PI) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state Measure of Interim Progress (MIP) set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	151 vs.
Comparative	Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students from the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations.	74% vs. 49%
Comparative	Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort partially meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core) will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations.	65% VS. 75%
Comparative	Each year, the Performance Index (PI) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (Using 2016-17 school district results.)	CIP – 151 District – Not yet released
Growth	Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 th grade English language arts exam will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	67%
Growth	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 th grade English	93%

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

¹⁷ If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

	language arts exam will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at least Performance Level 3 on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	
--	--	--

ACTION PLAN

GOAL 4: MATHEMATICS

Goal 4: Mathematics

BACKGROUND

For our math curriculums we use: EngageNY in K-5th grade, Illustrative Math in 6th-8th grade, and Agile Minds and eMath in 9 – 12th grade. All of our curriculums are aligned to the Common Core Math standards and have been vetted for their reflection of the math shifts and teacher usability.

Students take mid-module and end of module assessments within each unit in their grade, as well as interim assessments twice a year. The data is used to make pacing and remediation decisions.

Teachers receive two full days of training about their curriculums prior to the start of the school year and receive weekly observation and feedback. Before each new unit, teachers complete a module internalization protocol together to study the upcoming material. Other professional development sessions are added as needed.

Goal 4: 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 3rd through 8th grade in April 2018. 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.

2017-18 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total	Not Tested ¹⁸	Total
-------	-------	--------------------------	-------

¹⁸ 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.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

	Tested	IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	Enrolled
3	62					62
4	59				1	60
5	90					90
6	88					88
7	89					89
8	87				1	88
All	475				2	477

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The number of students enrolled in their second year at CIP who were proficient on the mathematics exam ranges from 79% to 47%. Overall, 56% of the students who are enrolled with us in at least their second year score proficient in math, which is below the goal by 19%. Our highest percentage of students passing is in 3rd grade, where most of our students have been with us for at least three years. Our lowest percentage of students passing is in 6th grade, where most of our students are just beginning their second year with us, having entered in 5th grade. The data also shows that the longer students are with us the better they do, so as our elementary school continues to feed into our middle school, we expect to meet this goal.

Performance on 2017-18 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	76%	62	79%	57
4	51%	59	55%	47
5	34%	90	N/A	0
6	47%	88	47%	81
7	47%	89	48%	80
8	56%	87	57%	83
All	51%	475	56%	348

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	0	56%	50	79%	57
4	N/A	0	N/A	0	55%	47

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

5	0%	5	0%	1	N/A	N/A
6	32%	63	44%	71	47%	81
7	46%	71	43%	74	48%	80
8	42%	84	56%	78	57%	83
All	39%	223	49%	274	56%	348

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2017-18 mathematics MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our PI is a 141.5. We do not yet have the state data to be able to make a comparison.

Mathematics 2017-18 Performance Level Index (PI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
475	20%	29%	25%	25%

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= 29\% + 25\% + 25\% = 79 \\
 &+ 25\% = 50 \\
 &+ (.5) * 25\% = 12.5 \\
 \text{PI} &= 141.5
 \end{aligned}$$

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

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 school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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.¹⁹

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Overall, 56% of our students who are enrolled with us in at least their second year are proficient on the state math exam, which is equal to the percent of district students. We do expect to see this percent increase in the coming years as our elementary students feed into our middle school.

2017-18 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	79%	57	58%	2251
4	55%	47	52%	2179
5	N/A	N/A	49%	2189
6	47%	81	57%	2838
7	48%	80	59%	2861
8	57%	83	57%	2471
All	56%	348	56%	14789

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	N/A	46%	56%	51%	79%	58%

¹⁹ 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](#).

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

4	N/A	48%	N/A	45%	55%	52%
5	0%	45%	0%	46%	N/A	49%
6	32%	54%	44%	52%	47%	57%
7	46%	52%	43%	56%	48%	59%
8	42%	49%	56%	47%	57%	57%
All	39%	49%	49%	50%	56%	56%

Goal 4: 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 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 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our overall average effect size is a 1.43, which is higher than expected to a large degree, meeting exceeding the goal.

2016-17 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	80.6	60	55	38.4	16.6	.79
4	-	-	-	-	-	-
5	82.6	92	50	29.6	20.4	1.11
6	90.2	86	45	20.9	24.1	1.40
7	83.1	89	44	21.9	22.1	1.09
8	81.4	85	58	14.1	43.9	2.31
All	83.8	412	50	24.2	25.8	1.43

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
Higher than expected to a large degree

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15	5-8	80.9	345	40.9	22.0	1.0
2015-16	5-8	86.8	337	39.2	19.0	1.05
2016-17	3, 5-8	83.8	412	50.0	24.2	1.37

Goal 4: Growth Measure²⁰

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 target of 50.

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 2016-17 and also have a state exam score in 2015-16 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2015-16 scores are ranked by their 2016-17 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 meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2016-17 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.²¹

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

This data is not yet available.

2016-17 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4		50.0
5	64	50.0

²⁰ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

²¹ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

6	78	50.0
7	80	50.0
8	74	50.0
All	67	50.0

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0
5	53	49	64	50.0
6	76	65	78	50.0
7	54	58	80	50.0
8	74	65	74	50.0
All	64	59	74	50.0

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	56%
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	141.5
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 school district of comparison.	56% - CIP 56% - district
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 2016-17 results.)	1.43
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 target of 50. (Using the 2016-17 results.)	67

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

ACTION PLAN

HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

METHOD

The school administered the Regents mathematics exam(s) that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the college and career readiness standard as scoring at or above Performance Level 4 (meeting Common Core expectations) on any Regents Common Core mathematics exams.²² This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 4 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In our 2013 cohort 60% of the students scored at least a 4 on the Regents, falling 5% short of the goal. In our 2014 cohort, 35% of our students scored at least a 4 on the Regents, falling 40% short of the goal. We have since adopted a new Algebra I curriculum and have aligned all other high school math curriculums to eMath, so we do expect these percentages to increase.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on a Regents Mathematics Common Core Exam
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort²³

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Scoring at Least Level 4
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	75	60%
2014	82	35%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Percent Achieving at Least Level 4 by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent

²² Students in the 2014 and 2015 high school Accountability Cohorts may have taken the non-Common Core mathematics exams. As such, for 2017-18 and 2018-19, the Institute will continue to count any student who achieved at least a scale score of 80 (the previous target for college and career readiness) on that exam as having met the target for this measure.

²³ Based on the highest score for each student on a mathematics Regents exam

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

	in Cohort	Level 4	in Cohort	Level 4	in Cohort	Level 4
2014	82	35%	82	35%	82	35%
2015	76	17%	76	17%	71	18%
2016			91	29%	88	26%
2017					92	27%

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

METHOD

The school administered the Regents mathematics exam(s) that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the cut off for passing and meeting the requirement for graduation as scoring at or above Performance Level 3 (partially meeting Common Core expectations) on the Regents mathematics exams. This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that achieved at least Performance Level 3 by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

One-hundred percent of our 2013 cohort and 96% of our 2014 cohort scored at least a level 3 on the Regents exam, exceed the goal by 20%.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on a Regents Mathematics Common Core Exam by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort²⁴

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on a Regents Mathematics Exam
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	75	100%
2014	82	96%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Percent Achieving at Least Level 3 by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2014	82	78%	82	94%	82	96%
2015	71	83%	71	85%	71	97%
2016			88	75%	88	91%

²⁴ Based on the highest score for each student on a mathematics Regents exam

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

2017					92	68%
------	--	--	--	--	----	-----

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) on the Regents mathematics exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state’s Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”) set forth in the state’s ESSA accountability system.

METHOD

The state’s finalized and approved ESSA plan in 2018 includes a revised calculation of the high school Performance Index. In it, schools now receive additional credit for students scoring at Accountability Level 4.²⁵ To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have a PI that equals or exceeds the state’s 2017-18 mathematics MIP for all students. The state plans to calculate and disseminate the MIP in summer 2018.

The Performance Index is calculated as such: (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 2) + 2*(percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 3) + 2.5 * (percent of students scoring at Accountability Level 4). Thus, the highest possible PI is 250. The basis for the percent of students is the school’s fourth year Total Cohort for Graduation. Regents Common Core mathematics exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Accountability Level 1, 65 to 79 is Accountability Level 2 (65 to 77 for Algebra II); 80 to 84 is Accountability Level 3 (78 to 84 for Algebra II), and 85 to 100 is Accountability Level 4.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our PI for the 2014 cohort is a 176.5. Comparative data from the state is not yet available.

Mathematics Performance Index (PI) For the 2014 High School Accountability Cohort

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Accountability Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
82	0	2	51	29

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 2 & + & 51 & + & 29 & = & 82 \\
 & & & & 51 & + & 29 & = & 80 \\
 & & & & & + & (.5)*29 & = & \underline{14.5} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & 176.5
 \end{array}$$

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

²⁵ For more details on the score ranges used to determine Accountability Levels as distinguished from Performance Levels, see

www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exams will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations.

METHOD

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. In order to meet or exceed Common Core expectations, a student must achieve Performance Level 4 or 5. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Sixty percent of our 2013 cohort and 35% of our 2014 cohort achieved a Level 4 or higher on the Regents exam. We do not have comparative data from the state and are unable to evaluate this goal.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 4 or Higher on a Mathematics Regents of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Level 4 or 5	Number in Cohort	Percent Level 4 or 5	Number in Cohort*
2012	N/A	N/A		
2013	75	60%		
2014	82	35%		

*We are unsure where to find this information for our district.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort at least partially meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exams will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations.

METHOD

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Total Cohort to that of the respective Total Cohort of students in the school district of comparison. In order to at least partially meet Common Core expectations, a student would need to pass the exam and score at Performance Level 3 or higher (i.e. scoring at least 65). Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

One-hundred percent of our 2013 cohort and 96% of our 2014 cohort scored a Level 3 or higher. We do not have the comparative data needed to be able to evaluate this goal.

Percent Achieving Performance Level 3 or Higher on a Mathematics Regents of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Level 3 or Higher	Number in Cohort	Percent Level 3 or Higher	Number in Cohort
2012	N/A	N/A		
2013	100%	75		
2014	96%	82		

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (“PI”) in Regents mathematics of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison.

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 school district of comparison. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our PI for the 2013 cohort was 164.5 and our PI for the 2014 cohort was 176.5. We do not have the numbers from the school district to be able to make the comparison.

Mathematics Regents Performance Index (PI)²⁶
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

²⁶ For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s PI, see page 46.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	PI	Cohort Size	PI	Cohort Size
2012				
2013	164.5	75		
2014	176.5	82		

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 4: Growth Measure

Each year, 50 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 readiness standard (currently scoring at Performance Level 4 and fully meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

METHOD

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its mathematics program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to grow to meeting the mathematics requirement for the college and career readiness standard.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In our 2013 cohort 7% of our students who did not score proficient on their NYS 8th grade math exam earned a Level 4 on the Regents exam, and in our 2014 cohort 3% of our students who did not score proficient on their NYS 8th grade math exam earned a Level 4 on the Regents exam. This measure does not meet our goal of 50%.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 4 on a Mathematics Regents Exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort ²⁷

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Achieving Level 4 on Common Core Exam
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	30	7%
2014	35	3%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 4: Growth Measure

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

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

METHOD

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its mathematics program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to move to meeting the English requirement for graduation.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In our 2013 cohort 100% of our students who did not score proficient on their NYS 8th grade math exam earned a Level 3 on the Regents exam, and in our 2014 cohort 97% of our students who did not score proficient on their NYS 8th grade math exam earned a Level 3 on the Regents exam. This exceeds our goal by 25%.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 3 on a Mathematics Regents Exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8th Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort ²⁸

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Achieving Level 3
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	30	100%
2014	35	97%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL ²⁹

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	35%
Absolute	Each year, 80 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	96%
Absolute	Each year, the Performance Index (PI) in mathematics of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the state	176.5

²⁸ Based on the highest score for each student on the mathematics Regents exam

²⁹ If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

	Measure of Interim Progress (MIP) set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	
Comparative	Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exam will exceed the percentage of comparable students from the district meeting or exceeding Common Core expectations.	35% vs. not available
Comparative	Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort partially meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents mathematics exam will exceed the percentage of comparable students in the district at least partially meeting Common Core expectations.	96%
Comparative	Each year, the Performance Index (PI) in Regents mathematics of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed that of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (Using 2016-17 school district results.)	164.5 not available
Growth	Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 th grade mathematics exam will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at or above Performance Level 4 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	3%
Growth	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 th grade mathematics exam will at least partially meet Common Core expectations (currently scoring at least Performance Level 3 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	97%

ACTION PLAN

GOAL 5: SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

BACKGROUND

This school year we've transitioned to the NGSS and adopted Amplify Science for our K-8 science curriculum. Teachers received two days of training on this curriculum before the start of the school year and we had in extra professional development days as needed. Within each unit of study students are assessed at two checkpoints, and then take an end of unit assessment.

Our high school science program is aligned to the NYS Regents exams.

Goal 5: 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 science examination.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th grade in spring 2018. 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 AND EVALUATION

Ninety-eight percent of our 4th grade students who have been with us for at least two years were proficient on the NYS science exam. This exceeds our goal by 23%. Our 8th grade students did not take the exam because they took the Living Environments Regents exam.

Charter School Performance on 2017-18 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	98%	43		
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	98%	43
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Goal 5: 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 school district of comparison.

METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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 school district of comparison. Given the timing of the state's release of district

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

science data, the 2017-18 comparative data is not yet available. Schools should report comparison to the district's **2016-17** data.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Ninety-eight percent of our 4th grade students who have been with us for at least two years were proficient on the NYS science exam, outperforming our district students and exceeding the goal by 10%.

2017-18 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 ³⁰	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	98%	43	88%	2,258
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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					
	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	98%	88%
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State examination.	98%
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 school district of comparison.	98% vs. 88%

³⁰ This table uses the prior year's results as 2017-18 district science scores are not yet available.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

ACTION PLAN

HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE

Goal 5: 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 AND EVALUATION

100% of our students scored at least a 65 on a NYS Regents science exam, exceeding our goal by 25%.

Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort³¹

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	75	100%
2014	82	99%

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

Cohort Designation	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2014	82	93%	82	94%	82	99%
2015	71	79%	71	85%	71	93%
2016			88	68%	88	98%
2017					92	84%

³¹ Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Goal 5: Comparative Measure

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

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 school district of comparison. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available district results.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

100% of our students scored at least a 65 on a NYS Regents science exam. We do not have comparative data for our school district.

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
2012	N/A	N/A		
2013	75	100%		
2014	82	99%		

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

GOAL 6: SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 6: Social Studies

Goal 6: 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

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

Ninety-six percent of our 2013 cohort and 89% of our 2014 cohort passed the NYS Regents US History exam, exceeding our goal by at least 14%.

U.S. History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort³²

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	75	96%
2014	82	89%

EVALUATION

Ninety-six percent of our 2013 cohort and 89% of our 2014 cohort scored at least a 65 on the NYS Regents US History exam, exceeding our goal by 14%.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

Cohort Designation	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2013	82	0%	82	0%	82	89%
2014	71	0%	71	1%	71	86%
2015			88	1%	88	1%
2016					92	0%

Goal 6: 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 school district of comparison.

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 school district of comparison. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, school presents the most recently available district results.

³² Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

RESULTS

Ninety-six percent of our 2013 cohort and 89% percent of our 2014 cohort scored a 75% or higher on the NYS Regents US History exam, which is at least 15% higher than our school district of comparison, and exceeds our goal

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
2012	N/A	N/A	71%	3187
2013	96%	75	69%	2655
2014	89%	82	74%	2549

EVALUATION

Both the 2013 and 2014 cohorts exceeded the goal of outperforming our district of comparison.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 6: 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

Seventy-five percent of our 2013 cohort and 82% of our 2014 cohort scored at least a 65 on the NYS Global History exam, exceeding our goal.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	75	83%

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

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

2014	82	94%
------	----	-----

EVALUATION

Eighty-three percent of our 2013 cohort and 94% of our 2014 cohort scored at least a 65 on the NYS Regents Global History exam, exceeding our goal by 18% and 29% respectively.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

Cohort Designation	2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2014	82	82%	82	90%	82	94%
2015	71	4%	71	86%	71	90%
2016			88	1%	88	82%
2017					92	0%

Goal 6: 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 school district of comparison.

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 school district of comparison. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available district results.

RESULTS

Eighty-three percent of our 2013 cohort and 94% of our 2014 cohort passed the Regents Global History exam with a score of 65 or higher. On average this is 25% higher than our comparable school district and exceeds our goal.

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
2012	N/A	N/A	58%	3,652
2013	83%	75	58%	3,728
2014	94%	82	58%	3,728

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

EVALUATION

Both of our 2013 and 2014 cohorts outperformed the comparable school district on the NYS Regents Global History exam, exceeding our goal.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

GOAL 7: ESSA

Goal 7: ESSA

Goal 7: Absolute Measure

Under the state's ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school's status under the state accountability system.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The ESSA status for 2017 – 18 has not yet been released but in 2016 – 17 we were in Good Standing and we expect that to continue.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2015-16	Targeted Assistance
2016-17	Good Standing
2017-18	Not Yet Released



APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

We have not set any optional goals at this time.