

## INSTRUCTIONS / NOTES FOR 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT (“APPR”)

1. Text Highlighted in Grey = explanation or guidance for an entry in the Progress Report. As guidance, schools should remove the existing text entirely and replace it with the appropriate information to complete the report.
2. Text Highlighted in Green = a sample entry that may be modified. Schools should leave the text intact or edit appropriately so that the text aligns with the program’s offerings and the measures and goals included in the school’s Accountability Plan.
3. The template for reporting a norm-referenced test growth measure for elementary/middle school grades in the Accountability Plan appears in Appendix B. Present the respective results at the end of the English language arts (“ELA”) and mathematics goals.
4. **Annual adjustments to the Accountability Plan Progress Report**
  - a) During the 2017-18 school year, the state finalized and approved its Every Student Succeeds Act (“ESSA”) plan. As such, the Institute established changes to required goals and measures in order to align with the new accountability system. The Institute now requires schools to report a Performance Index (“PI”) with the target of meeting or exceeding the state’s Measure of Interim Progress (“MIP”). This supplants the previous measure of Annual Measureable Objective (“AMO”) attainment. Additionally, the Institute has replaced the No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) goal with the functionally equivalent ESSA goal.
  - b) For the elementary grades growth measure and comparative effect size measure in ELA and mathematics, report 2016-17 results. (The 2017-18 results are not yet available.)
5. Please do not include these instructions or the reference guide below in a submitted report.

## REFERENCE GUIDE TO TEMPLATE SECTIONS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE AND HIGH SCHOOL GOALS.....	5
ESSA GOAL.....	25
OPTIONAL GOALS .....	26
SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES.....	28

***The Accountability Plan Progress Report Template Is Below. Delete all information above before submitting.***

---



**Rochester Preparatory Charter  
School 3**

**2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 12, 2018

By Amy Sponsler, Director of Operations

85 St. Jacob Street, Rochester, NY 14621

585-368-5111

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

The Director of Operations prepared this 2017-2018 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Geoffrey Rosenberger	Chair
Jean Howard	Trustee
Jim Ryan	Trustee
Ronald Zarella	Trustee
Rebecca Sumner	Trustee
Joshua Phillips	Trustee
James Barger	Trustee
James Costanza	Trustee
Ebony Miller-Wesley	Trustee

**Christopher Shaffer has served as the Principal of the Elementary School since 2016.**

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Narrative description of the school, e.g. mission, when it opened, what grades served, number of students, demographic characteristics of students, etc. In addition, the description may also include key design elements or other unique aspects of the school program. In the table below, provide the school's enrollment as of June 30, 2018.

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														
2014-15														
2015-16														
2016-17	90													
2017-18	90	90												180

### GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

#### Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at the school will become proficient in reading and writing of the English language.

#### BACKGROUND

Rochester Prep's curriculum is developed with the goal of maximizing student academic achievement through intentional standards-driven teaching and the systematic use of objective performance data to continually inform decision making. To this end, Rochester Prep middle school created a scope and sequence for reading and writing and divided the year into units, each culminating in a formal assessment. During the 2013-2014 school year, Rochester Prep began to develop its scopes, sequences, and assessments in alignment with the Common Core Learning Standards. Rochester Prep continued to refine this process during the past three school years.

Each academic year, Rochester Prep uses three formative assessments in ELA, each aligned to state standards and to the school's scope and sequence. Starting in August, teachers and administrators develop curricular strategy, unit plans and daily lessons based upon the scope and sequence. At the close of each unit, an assessment is administered, graded and data produced so that teachers and administrators develop action plans based upon objective, standards-driven data. The principal and leadership team work closely with teachers at every step of this process, giving feedback on daily lesson plans, curriculum, action plans and the implementation of these plans.

Rochester Prep's ELA program emphasizes both strong reading and strong writing. In reading the program emphasizes four key aspects of literacy: decoding, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. In the elementary school grades (K-4) there are 3 literacy blocks of 50 minutes each day and students are broken up into groups based on STEP (Strategic Teaching and Evaluation

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

of Progress) levels. In the literacy blocks, students focus on reading mastery, guided reading, and reading comprehension. Students spend 45 minutes writing daily, in addition to the 3 literacy blocks.

In the middle school grades (5-8), in 2014-2015 we moved away from separate Reading and Writing classes. Instead, students had a 2 hour English class. This was done again this year as it aligns more accurately to the Common Core Learning Standards, whereby students' written work must be based on a text they have read.

Every year Rochester Prep provides teachers with an intense training program where we instruct teaching and student behavior management techniques and strategies to employ in their classrooms and throughout the school. We achieve complete consistency throughout the school with regard to behavior and academic standards.

Additionally, all staff meets one day each week to review the past week's progress and to finalize preparations for the coming week. Teachers are regularly observed teaching by the school leadership and receive constant feedback for improvement.

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts ("ELA") assessment to students in [X] through [Y] 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).

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>1</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						

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

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

All						
-----	--	--	--	--	--	--

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Not applicable.

#### 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				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

#### 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						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

#### Goal 1: 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.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 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

Not applicable.

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							
	[?]	[?]	[?]	[?]							
	PI	=	[?]	+	[?]	+	[?]	+	[?]	=	[?]
									[?]		[?]
									(.5)*[?]		[?]
									PI		[?]

### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

## 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.<sup>2</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Not applicable.

<sup>2</sup> 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](#).

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 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 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

## 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						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

### METHOD

The 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

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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

Not applicable.

#### 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						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

#### School's Overall Comparative Performance:

*Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here*

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

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

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15						
2015-16						
2016-17						

#### Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>3</sup>

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.

<sup>3</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## 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.<sup>4</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Not applicable.

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

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

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

## SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Not applicable.

---

<sup>4</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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.	
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.	
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.	
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.)	
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.)	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

### ACTION PLAN

Not applicable.

## GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will achieve mastery of skills in Mathematics.

### BACKGROUND

Rochester Prep's Mathematics program emphasizes both strong computational procedures and problem solving skills. The math program at Rochester Prep takes arithmetic concepts and breaks them down to concrete, step-by-step approaches toward solving problems. At Rochester Prep, math instruction incorporates a rigorous balance between mechanics and problem solving.

In the elementary school, there is one 65-minute block of math a day that focuses on number sense, number systems, and problem-solving. During this block, students chant, act out, and model math with activities and math manipulatives.

#### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in [X] through [Y] 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 Tested	Not Tested <sup>5</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Not applicable.

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				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

<sup>5</sup> Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

### 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						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

### Goal 2: 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

Not applicable.

### 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

# 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

	[?]	[?]	[?]	[?]					
	PI	=	[?]	+	[?]	+	[?]	=	[?]
					[?]	+	[?]	=	[?]
							(.5)*[?]	=	[?]
							PI	=	[?]

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the 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.<sup>6</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Not applicable.

### 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 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				

<sup>6</sup> 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](#).

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

### 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						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

### Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

### METHOD

The 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.

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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

Not applicable.

#### 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						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

#### School's Overall Comparative Performance:

*[Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here]*

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

#### Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15						
2015-16						
2016-17						

#### Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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.<sup>8</sup>

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Not applicable.

2016-17 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	Target
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0

<sup>8</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

8				50.0
All				50.0

### SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Not applicable.

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.	
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.	
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.	
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.)	
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.)	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

### ACTION PLAN

Not applicable.

## GOAL 3: SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Science

Students will demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge in Science.

### BACKGROUND

Rochester Prep's Science curriculum takes a comprehensive instructional look at Science standards over the course of five grades, 4 through 8. The Science program has expanded in scope and depth as the school has grown over the past eight years.

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

### 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 science examination.

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> 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

Not applicable.

#### 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 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8				
All				

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

#### 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						
8						
All						

### Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

### 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 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

Not applicable.

#### 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 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students <sup>9</sup>	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8				
All				

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

#### 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						
8						
All						

### SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Not applicable.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at	

<sup>9</sup> This table uses the prior year's results as 2017-18 district science scores are not yet available.

## 2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

	least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State examination.	
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.	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

### ACTION PLAN

Not applicable.

### GOAL 4: ESSA

#### Goal 4: ESSA

The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

#### Goal 4: 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

Rochester Prep was deemed to be in "Good Standing."

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Rochester Prep was deemed to be in "Good Standing."

#### Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2015-16	
2016-17	Good Standing
2017-18	Good Standing