



## **University Preparatory Charter School For Young Men**

*1290 Lake Avenue  
Rochester, NY 14613  
Phone - 585.672.1280  
Fax - 585.458.2732*

# **2017-18 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:  
September 16, 2018

Resubmitted October 12, 2018 & November 8, 2018

By University Preparatory Charter School  
For Young Men

1290 Lake Avenue  
Rochester, NY 14613

(585) 672 – 1280



Edward Cavalier (Interim President), William Geraci (interim Principal) and Tracy DelGrego prepared this 2017-18 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school’s board of trustees:

Trustee’s Name	Board Position
Dr. Edward Yansen	Board President, Executive Board Committee Chair
Maria Scalise	Board Vice President
Sharon Delly	Board Secretary
Dr. Josh Fegley	Board Vice President
Joe Bertola	Board Treasurer
Dr. Marie Cianca	Board Member
Najmah Abdulmateen	Board Member
Dr. George Bovenzi	Board Member
Dr. Rachel Santiago	Board Member

Edward Cavalier has served as the Interim President of the University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men since July 10, 2018.

William Geraci has served as Interim Principal of Instruction of the University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men from August 1, 2018 until November 1, 2018

Tracy DelGrego has Served as Principal of Instruction of University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men since November 1, 2018.

The mission of the University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men is to establish a culture that celebrates diversity and where all boys thrive academically and holistically. University Prep develops this culture through small classes, student empowerment, personalized attention from teachers and school staff, and a consistent focus on successful instructional outcomes. University Prep provides opportunities and experiences that balance the academic, social, physical, and creative development of young men. Consistent emphasis is placed on preparation for life after high school, a 100% graduation rate and all students being college or work place ready.

University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men first became an educational option in the Rochester community when it opened its doors in 2010. Since its inception, University Prep has made it its goal to graduate young men with the disposition and skills to be successful in college, career and as citizens of their communities. In order to meet this goal, University Prep understands the necessity of doing whatever it takes to advance its middle school students at their entry point in order to expedite the development of their social, emotional and academic skills in preparation for the rigor of high school and the requirements of a Regents diploma.

University Prep's program is reflected in the ten Key Design Elements, which summarize the school's model and serve as the cornerstones of its quality instructional program. These components distinguish the school's model, and embody the spirit of the charter movement in providing Rochester families with an innovative and viable educational option that improves student achievement for our young men. These core tenets have been carefully established to provide an educational program relevant to the New York State Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and the diverse student population it serves.

### **Key Design Elements**

1. All-male student environment
2. Curricular content, instructional resources, and pedagogical strategies designed specifically to engage and address the learning styles and needs of male learners
3. College and career preparatory focus
4. Daily Advisory through grade level managers, counselors, social workers and academic support staff
5. Inquiry- and self-discovery based instruction to promote higher-order and critical thinking skills
6. Student-centered, data-driven, individualized instruction grounded in Constructivist Theories and principles of inquiry-based learning
7. Safe, disciplined, and nurturing school culture focused on high expectations, personal responsibility for learning, and respect for all
8. Continuous fostering of reflection, positive relationships, and productive work habits

9. Summer programs for incoming student orientation, academic remediation, and high school credit recovery
10. Ongoing professional development for teachers beginning with pre-service training, and continuing throughout the year with weekly meetings and daily coaching.

The instructional model employed across all grade levels and subjects is standards-based, student-centered, and rigorous. It is a workshop model which includes essential questions and summary and closure activities which require students to demonstrate and apply learning. All instruction is planned and implemented using one consistent curriculum mapping and unit planning process. Lesson plans are constructed using one research-based instructional framework (Wiggins and McTighe, 2005) across all grades and subject areas. In the summer prior to each school year, newly hired teachers participate in a week-long training session which focuses on lesson planning and instructional preparations in alignment with the Danielson Rubric (2013). Throughout the week, new teachers participate in the identification and application of research-based aspects of the Danielson Rubric which have been proven to promote student learning in the areas of Planning and Preparation, Learning Environment, Instruction and Professionalism.

Each teacher is required to submit weekly lesson plans prior to the start of each week. Supervisors review the lessons and provide feedback which may include suggestions for improvement, revision, or corrections. Supervisors' ongoing informal classroom observations are instrumental in determining the quality of instructional delivery of lesson plans. Further support is provided when instructional delivery minimizes the learning potential of students or when instructional modalities do not meet the intended objectives for the lesson. Whenever necessary, a meeting is held with the teacher and his or her supervisor to address pacing, teacher questioning techniques, or classroom management issues.

University Prep values parent support and acknowledges that communication with families is a key factor in the success of its students. Prior to the start of each school year, University Prep invites parents to a grade-level orientation. At each of these meetings, teachers and administrators address the specific components for success for the year ahead and introduce parents to grade level staff, administration, operations and academics. Parents are also made aware of the avenues of communication that are available to them and the open-door policy of the school to meet with them at any time, including any morning before school without need for an appointment. These impromptu meetings occur often with anywhere from 3 to 12 parent-teacher meetings held each week. Student improvement is at the core of each of these meetings and students are always present. As parents and the school work together, student progress is most often the result. However, in the event that progress is not evident, follow-up meetings are held to determine additional actions that may be required.

Academic progress is reported to parents regularly. Students receive progress reports and report cards at 5-week intervals. Teachers are required to notify parents in advance of these reports when a student is struggling along the way. Many teachers send weekly reports to increase

communication. Parent-teacher meetings are held to determine how the school and family can work together on behalf of students in need of additional support. Interventions are put into place when necessary and have included daily school-home progress forms, student behavior contracts, identification of additional classroom supports, and referrals to counseling. There are also several celebratory events that parents are invited to attend to acknowledge student achievement. Some of these include quarterly honor roll celebrations, community art shows featuring student artists, school band performances, sports events and banquets, and speeches made by students in our public speaking class.

Technology is an integral part of instruction. Each classroom is equipped with technological resources to support learning that is research-based, relevant and interesting. Resources include Smartboards and internet access in each classroom. In addition, the school is equipped with 5 classroom laptop carts with student access to technology for online research and for the creation of learning products. Students also engage in computer tech classes and become experienced in Microsoft Office, Computer Applications, and Web Design.

University Prep staff members are committed to the success of all students and believe in a “whatever it takes” approach, regardless of position or school responsibility. Teachers are available after school on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays to provide additional instruction or tutoring time. In addition, they are always willing to work beyond their regular schedules to minimize or eliminate barriers to the success of their students. Administration supports all efforts of teachers as they work to advance student achievement and provides assistance when called upon to implement action items.

Each grade level is assigned a Grade Level Student Manager who supports learning by working closely with each student and his family as intensively as required to address issues that may be having a negative impact on academic success. To maximize students’ learning time, teachers are supported by Grade Level Managers whose primary responsibility is to build strong, mutually respectful relationships with students and families and support teachers to do the same. At University Prep the managers support student character development and cultivate success in students, specifically focusing on the areas of whole child outside of academics. These men serve as positive role models, sports coaches and personal home-school contacts as they work with each of their students to promote academic, social, emotional development.

As an all-male school, University Prep acknowledges the importance of sports and extra-curricular activities in the lives of young men. University Prep offers many opportunities to enrich and develop its students in positive ways. The following list includes some of the opportunities available to University Prep students:

- Modified, Junior Varsity, and Varsity Football,
  - Basketball, Baseball, Lacrosse, Soccer, Track and Field
- Arts/Performing Art programs

- Music/Band
- Chess Club
- Masterminds
- Math Club
- Public Speaking and Poetry Slam Events
- After-school tutoring sessions
- College Campus Visits
- College Club facilitated by St. John Fisher College
- Field studies linked to instructional learning targets

University Prep is committed to transforming the educational experiences and outcomes that have been the norm for male minority students in the City of Rochester. This has been achieved in the passing rates of University Prep high school students on Regents exams and on the graduation rate University Prep has achieved in its first three years of graduating classes (94%, 94% and 98%). In order to achieve these results, tremendous effort and resources have been required at the middle school level where the majority of students enter University Prep in the 7<sup>th</sup> grade with serious academic deficiencies and behavior issues. Knowing the urgency of this work, University Prep engages its new students in an August Summer Institute prior to each school year to get an early start on identifying students' needs and acclimating them to the culture of University Prep. The institute includes character-development, team building exercises, rules, policies and expectation workshop and literacy/math assessments which provided early diagnosis of reading and math skills and needs. These first two years have posed serious concerns for University Prep in terms of student academic performance. However, in the past two years, data has shown that growth begins to occur after the completion of the first year in middle school. Middle school not only allows for the development of reading, writing and math skills but provides the school with the time needed to create the culture, climate, relationships and academic attention that has proven to be transformational for our students as they begin and move through the next 4 years of their education at University Prep.

### **Professional Development**

Professional Development is driven by teacher and student needs and focused on supporting students in meeting content area learning standards. All professional development sessions are aligned to the criteria for high effective teacher practice as articulated in each of the four domains of the Danielson Teacher Evaluation Rubric. Professional development has also been designed to offer ongoing grade-level meetings as well as individual coaching sessions that address students' specific needs and issues in order to determine and implement individualized action steps to improve student performance.

Professional development begins in August for new and veteran teachers. During the third week of August, all newly hired teachers are required to attend professional development sessions. These sessions train new teachers in the cultural and instructional areas required to begin their work on the same footing as their returning colleagues. During the 6-hours required each day for new teachers, University Prep's instructional leaders provide training in the following areas:

- University Prep mission, vision, and instructional philosophies
- Instructional Framework for Lesson Planning
- Analysis of Content Learning Standards/Common Core Standards
- Review and analysis of NYS Assessments for their core areas
- Curriculum Mapping, Unit Planning and lesson planning
- Learning Environment

During their second week of professional development newly hired teachers join all staff members in another 5 days of training, workshops, and informational sessions from 8:30 a.m. – 3:30 pm. All sessions and activities are aligned to the criteria outlined in the Danielson Framework for Teacher Evaluation.

Staff professional development, continues throughout the school year during teachers' PD Wednesdays, and provides training and support in the development and delivery of effective lessons that engage students and yield results. The focus of ongoing professional development sessions is based on observation in accordance with identified needs. Each Wednesday is devoted to a specific focus. One Wednesday per month is scheduled for content area teams with an instructional focus. A second Wednesday focuses on grade-level teams which worked together to determine needs for specific students or groups of students. A third Wednesday is facilitated by Grade-Level Student Managers who share operational information and discussed matters related to school safety, culture, climate, and learning environment. The final Wednesday is determined by staff and student needs and may include additional time in content area teams, addressing upcoming assessments and review of assessment results/data, or working with smaller groups of teachers who will benefit from coaching with instructional leaders. Following the SUNY Re-chartering process in the Fall of 2017, the leadership team targeted professional development to enhance the understanding of rigor and engage the teachers in learning opportunities to increase their repertoire of skills in this area.

In addition to Wednesday professional development, 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade math and ELA teachers continued their work on data teams which met weekly to analyze student performance data which included NWEA reading and math reports and student writing products. Instructional decisions were made and strategies were put in place based on findings. Each content area began the discussions regarding a new initiative involving vertical data teams but some of the sessions were postponed due to the increased focus and attention to the topic of rigor.

During the summer 2018, professional development for new teachers focused on similar topics from past years. During the whole staff week, the first three days of professional development were devoted to Proactive Classroom Systems training. The last two days were dedicated to implementing new strategies into planning and classroom structure. A session was held to review the SUNY Charter Report and to focus teachers on the Rigor and Relevance Framework. Teachers completed the week prepared to begin the school year equipped with everything needed to engage students in a positive, productive, rigorous and engaging learning environment from the very first

day of school. Teachers were encouraged to include activities to “wow” their students following the advice of Steve Barkley.

Professional development during the 2018-19 school year will take on a new format aimed at increasing teacher ownership for their leaning and collaboration among colleagues. Following a survey of veteran staff and considering the needs of the new staff we have developed professional development that will build community, ensure implementation and accountability and identify the individual needs of teachers. Two topics of study will be the focus of the Professional Learning Communities (PLC). In the fall the PLC’s will focus their work around enhancing their planning, delivery and assessment of lessons to embed rigorous outcomes. PLC groups will study a new strategy together, implement that strategy, observe each other and debrief regarding their observations. There will be three cycles of PLC work which included debrief sessions with the entire faculty. In the spring the topic will change to enhancing instructional effectiveness through embedded technology.

To individualize professional development, teachers will also set one instructional goal for each semester based in Domain Three of the Danielson Rubric and address that goal through their participation in an ASCD on line course. Again, teacher implementation of the strategies, ideas or principles will be included in the annual observation and evaluation process.

In 2017-18, 372 students were enrolled at University Prep. The chart below provides enrollment numbers for each of the years University Prep has been in existence.

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								68	75	106	92	52		393
2014-15								75	73	74	85	82	52	441
2015-16								71	77	71	65	78	70	432
2016-17								66	69	63	64	52	73	387
2017-18								36	70	82	68	59	57	372

## 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 9<sup>th</sup> grade. For example, the 2014 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9<sup>th</sup> 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 30<sup>th</sup> of that year.

#### Fourth-Year High School Accountability Cohorts

Fourth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Anywhere	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on BEDS Day in October of the Cohort’s Fourth Year	Number Leaving During the School Year	Number in Accountability Cohort as of June 30 <sup>th</sup>
2015-16	2012-13	2012	79	8	71
2016-17	2013-14	2013	82	9	73
2017-18	2014-15	2014	53	4	48

#### 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 9<sup>th</sup> grade. Students enrolled for at least one day in the school after entering the 9<sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>th</sup> Grade Anywhere	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 <sup>th</sup> 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	70	1	71
2016-17	2013-14	2013	73	0	73
2017-18	2014-15	2014	50	0	48

#### Fifth Year Total Cohort for Graduation

Fifth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Anywhere	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 <sup>th</sup> 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	Total Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
-------------------	---	--------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------

				an Acceptable Reason (b)	
2015-16	2011-12	2011	50	1	51
2016-17	2012-13	2012	66	1	67
2017-18	2013-14	2013	71	1	70

## GOAL 1: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

### GOAL 1: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Students will meet New York standards for graduation and successfully complete the academic requirements of the School within four to five years after entering the ninth grade.

#### 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.

University Preparatory School for Young Men  
 Student - 3  
 Board of Trustees Policy Manual  
 Policy Title: **Grade Promotion Policy**  
 Adopted: July 15, 2014  
 Revised: July 24, 2017

#### **Purpose of Policy**

This Policy describes the requirements for student Grade 8 Designation, Grade 9 Designation, Grade 10 Designation, Grade 11 Designation, and Grade 12 Designation.

#### **Target Population**

The target populations for this policy are students, parents, administrators, and school leadership.

## **Policy Description**

**Grade 7 to 8/Grade 8 to 9 Promotion:** Includes the following:

At the end of Grade 7 and/or Grade 8 school year, a promotional meeting is held for each student and attended by:

- Principal, Meeting Chair
- Grade level core subject teacher(s)
- Instructional/grade level administrator
- RTI staff/Special Education Teacher

One of the following is the decision for each student at that grade level:

- Student will be promoted to the next grade
- Student must attend a four-week summer program focusing on literacy and math
- Student must demonstrate some growth at the end of the program to be promoted to the next grade level
- Student and parent will attend a pre-summer school meeting to go over expectations and possible outcomes

If that growth is not evident, grade retention will be a serious option for that student. Final decision will be made by the President and Principal.

## **Grade 10 Designation**

A student must have earned 6 ½ credits (minimum) toward graduation. Credits must include:

(1 Credit) Integrated Algebra	(Regents)		
(1 Credit) Living Environment	(Regents)		
(2 Credits) Global I/II	(Regents)	<b>or</b>	(1 Credit) Global (Local)
(1 Credit) English I	(Local)		
(.5 Credit) Physical Education	(Local)		
(1 Credit) Spanish I or II	(As applicable)		

Summer School is mandatory for credit recovery in all of the above core subjects.

## **Grade 11 Designation**

A student must have earned 13 credits (minimum) toward graduation. Credits must include:

(1 Credit) Geometry	(Regents)
(1 Credit) Earth Science	(Regents)
(2 Credits) Global II – <i>If applicable</i>	(Regents)
(1 Credit) English II	(Local)
(1 Credit) U.S. History – <i>If applicable</i>	(Regents)
(.5 Credit) Physical Education	(Local)

(1 Credit) Elective Credit(s) (Local)

Summer School is mandatory for credit recovery in all of the above core subjects.

### **Grade 12 Designation**

A student must have earned 18 credits (minimum) toward graduation and must have a class schedule that will allow him to graduate in June of that school year. Grade 12 course offerings include the following options:

1. Physics/Chemistry as the third science course needed for graduation (Regents or Local)
2. Algebra 2/Trigonometry as the third math course needed for graduation (Regents or Local)
3. English III – with Regents (if applicable)
4. Participation in Government/Economics
5. .5 Physical Education Credit
6. Course recovery needed from previous years' Regents courses
7. College courses(s) offered on campus(es)
8. Elective credit(s)

### **Instruments of Implementation**

This policy shall be posted on the School's website and distributed to students, parents, and employees.

### **Policy Review**

The Board of Trustees shall annually review the Policy in conjunction with school leadership. The annual review of policies will take place at the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees. Recommended changes to the Policy will be presented to and approved by the Board of Trustees.

## **RESULTS AND EVALUATION**

100% of students in Cohorts 2015, 2016 and 2017 were promoted. While 15% of the students in Cohort 2015 and 20% of the students in Cohort 2016 did not earn the required number of credits, they were promoted. University Prep does not retain students by grade level. Rather, we promote students to the next grade and provide credit recovery classes within their elective schedule to better prepare them for the retaking of failed exams as soon as possible. This approach has proven to be less discouraging to students and promotes higher percentages of students passing Regents exams within shorter periods of time.

University Prep does consistently have 75% of its first and second year students earn at least 5 credits. Three and five-year trends support this conclusion. Credit recovery programs and proactive intervention programs have proven to be successful.

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	59	100%
2017	68	100%

## 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.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Of the past three cohorts one of the cohorts exceeded the absolute measure while two fell slightly below it. University Prep students in Cohort 2014 exceeded the Absolute Measure, passing at least three NYS Regents exams required for graduation by their second year in the cohort with a score of at least 65%. Cohort 2015 and 2016 fell short with absolute measures of 73% and 72 percent respectively.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2014	53	77
2015	64	73
2016	59/58-BEDS	72

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

University Prep's graduation rate has been consistently well over 90%. Students have to minimally pass regents examination in Global History and Geography, Unites States History and Government, English Language Arts, a math regent and either Living Environment or one exam in the physical sciences. This means that very nearly 100% of our students eventually pass not only 3 exams but 5.

### 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 9<sup>th</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

As of 2018, University Prep has had four graduating cohorts. The first graduating class, Cohort 2011, graduated at a rate of 92% within 4 years and 92% after 5 years. Again, 92% of Cohort 2012 graduated after 4 years and remained at 92% after 5 years. Cohort 2013 graduated at a rate of 95%\*after 4 years. The discrepancy between the actual (95%) and reported 4-year graduation rate (93\*) for Cohort 2013 has been found to be an error reported in the school's operating system, Power School. Two Cohort 2013 students were not reflected as graduates and the data in Power School has been corrected to reflect that 70 of the 73 students in Cohort 2013 graduated in 4 years. And the graduation rates for Cohort 2013 was increased to 97% when one additional student in Cohort 2013 graduated in August of 2017. The June 2018 graduation rate of Cohort 2014 was 96%.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2012	71	92
2013	73	93
2014	50	96

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

<sup>1</sup> The state's guidance for the 4+1 graduation pathway can be found here: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/ciai/multiple-pathways/>.

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2011	52	92
2012	67	97
2013	73	96

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

University Prep has far exceeded the Absolute Measure of 75% graduation rate for both 4 years and 5 years for four consecutive cohorts. Each cohort has exceeded the measure at a rate of 18 to 22 percentage points. These results are attributed to University Prep’s adherence to its Key Design Elements and the strategies implemented to ensure that these elements will consistently contribute to each student’s success.

### 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

University Prep is proud of the graduation rate achieved for its three cohorts of students. Cohort 2011 graduated at 92%, Cohort 2012 graduated at 92% and Cohort 2013 graduated at 93%. In addition, University Prep will exceed the 93% for Cohort 2014.

Each of University Prep’s cohort graduation rates has exceed the District of Residence. The 2014 RCSD cohort had a graduation rate of 52% compared to University Prep’s graduation rate of 96%, a margin of 44 percentage points. In addition to exceeding the overall graduation rate, University Prep also exceeds the percent of students achieving a Regents Diploma with distinction. University Prep proudly graduated 17.3% percent with this honor as compared to 5% of the Rochester City School District.

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

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

Cohort Designation	Charter School		School District	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2012	71	92	2235	51
2013	73	93	2097	53
2014	50	96	2187	52

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

University Prep serves an urban population from Rochester, NY. The population at University Prep is over 90% minority and is an all-male school. Most are eligible for free or reduced breakfast and lunch. The poverty and crime rate in Rochester are both in the top 5% nationally. A graduation rate that is consistently over 90% is a source of pride for our community.

### 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.

## 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

Although University Prep does not have many students that pursue the 4+1 option, the data shows that this has been a positive choice for students. University Prep is the only charter school in the state that offers a CTE program and this offers our students a unique opportunity given the 4+1 option. Every student is counseled as to what path will best meet his needs and lead to on-time graduation. The five students who used the Pathway Program to attain graduation requirements passed the exam needed to complete the requirements for graduation.

### 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 = $[(b)/(a)]*100$
Algebra 2 Trig	1	1	100%

Geometry	1	1	100%
Earth Science	3	3	100%
Overall	5	5	100%

**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	5	100%

**ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

**SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION GOAL**

University Prep prides itself on its perseverance toward high school graduation for every student. This starts early with 91.3% of the 2017 cohort achieving 5 credits in their first year and 84% of the second-year students earned 10 credits or more.

Students continue to show growth passing Regents exams, however they often need repeated trials to achieve proficiency.

For four consecutive years University Prep boasts a graduation rate well over 90%, outperforming the RCSD each year by margins ranging from 39-44 percent. University Prep outperforms many of the suburban school districts, as well. The 2014 cohort graduated 96% of its students meeting the August goal of 95% graduation rate. Five students from this cohort pursued the Alternative Pathways program and earned their Regents diploma doing so.

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.	Achieved
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.	Not Achieved
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the fourth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate.	Achieved

Absolute	Each year, 95 percent of students in the fifth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate.	Achieved
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.	Achieved
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.	Achieved

## ACTION PLAN

University Prep will focus on our 7th and 8th graders so that they are better prepared for high school when course credit starts to accumulate. We will begin to use the reading program *Fast Forward* with students in middle and high school to facilitate vocabulary development and reading comprehension. Learning labs will also be utilized as a math and ELA intervention strategy across the academic program at the middle school level. Professional development will focus on research-based instructional strategies that require analysis and critical thinking. We have purchased the professional development materials from The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. We will also look to upgrade our use of educational technology - flat panel interactive screens or similar technology, 1:1 student devices, the Google platform, etc.

## GOAL 2: COLLEGE PREPARATION

### GOAL 2: COLLEGE PREPARATION

Students will graduate from the School with the disposition to enter college or military service and will demonstrate the necessary skills to be successful.

#### 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,

- A different school-created indicator approved by the Institute.

## 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 relevant measures, and the overall percentage achieving the measure.

University Prep used the following as measures of college preparedness:

- Passing a college-level course offered at a college or university through a school partnership with a college or university. (We have a partnership with Monroe Community College).
- Earning a Regents diploma with advanced designation.
- College Acceptance

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our graduation rate for June 2018 was 96% of the 2014 cohort.

Six students took and passed English I at Monroe Community College. One student passed a Machining Course at MCC.

Nine students received the Regents diploma with Advanced distinction. In addition, we had six other students pass the Algebra 2 Regents exam, a course and exam that demonstrates college readiness. Algebra II Trig is often a gateway course to four-year college admission.

100 % of our students are accepted to college. Every University Prep student applies to our community college in addition to colleges of their choice. We had 12 students accepted at four-year colleges. Two of these students are currently enrolled at Rochester Institute of Technology.

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 a college level course offered	7	7	13.4%
Earning a Regents diploma with	9	9	17.3

advanced designation;			
College Acceptance	52	52	100
Overall	52	68	130

## 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.

## 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).<sup>3</sup>

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 baseline MIP for the 2016-17 school year was 117.8. The MIP for the 2017-18 school year was 120.1. Our students exceeded that with an MIP of 130. While we continue to struggle with the students meeting the higher level expectations we do have 100% college acceptance.

CCCRI Performance by Cohort Year

Graduation Year	Cohort	Number of Students in Cohort	MIP	School CCCRI
2015-16	2012		N/A	
2016-17	2013		117.8	
2017-18	2014	51	120.1	130

<sup>3</sup> 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](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/essa/documents/nys-essa-plan-final-1-16-2018.pdf)

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

### 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.

### RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The local school district has not published their CCCRI. Based on published data, however University Prep has exceeded the local school district on graduation rates each year. We also proportionally graduate more students with Regents diplomas with distinction.

University Prep now houses a state of the art Career and Technical Education Center and is moving toward advanced course sequences through CTE programming led by a CTE Director who has come to University Prep with decades of experience.

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	130	

### 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

Information submitted to NYS indicates that 13 students from the 2014 Cohort will matriculate into a 4-year college and 29 will matriculate into a 2 year college. Based on late-spring student survey data for the 51 students in Cohort 2014, the students expressed the following plans:

- 7 students to a 4 year college
- 20 students to a 2-year college
- 0 students indicated interest in the military
- 1 student to vocational training
- 23 students expressed interest in a gap year, working or remain undecided

The data from the information submitted to the state indicates that University Prep has met the matriculation measure while the initial survey data from the spring of 2018 indicates that the University Prep has not met the matriculation measure with only 39% of the students matriculated in a two or four-year college. In the past, through follow up phone calls and emails to students in the 2015, 2016 and 2017 graduates, the reality regarding college matriculation is somewhere between the two measures. Our follow-up information reveals that students make changes or find focus once they are not enrolled in mandatory school.

While matriculation data for the 2014 cohort is unavailable at this time, 100% of the cohort was accepted into 2 year college and 9 were accepted into 4 year colleges.

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	65/67	51	78/76
2013	72/71	56	78/79
2014	51	20/50	39/98

## 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 their preparation for college by one or more possible indicators of college readiness.	Achieved for college acceptance
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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school's CCCRI for the Total Cohort will exceed that of the district's Total Cohort.	NA
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate into a college or university in the year after graduation.	NA

## ACTION PLAN

University Prep is advancing its college preparation agenda. The following actions are established:

- Two new experienced counselors have been added to the counseling staff who are following up on graduates;
- the CTE program is established and growing to afford more students more opportunities; rigor has become a major focus of all high school instructional programs in alignment with Common Core Standards;
- instructional time has been devoted to meeting the higher-level thinking reflected on the PSAT and SAT exams; and
- Students are encouraged to retake Regents courses and exams to earn higher scores and meet aspirational performance measures.

## GOAL 3: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 3: English Language Arts

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

### BACKGROUND

The English Language Arts curriculum at University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men is designed to ensure that students become fully literate and able to read, write, and speak well in accordance the NYS Common Core Standards. The school's English Language Arts curriculum is closely aligned to the New York State English Language Arts Standards and the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). New York State ELA Curriculum Modules are used as a resource for lesson planning and instruction.

The ELA curriculum also considers the CCSS and the principles of constructivism as a guide to the planning and implementation of instruction. Through the use of project-based learning, inquiry projects, and extended learning opportunities, students are provided access to multiple experiences that allow students to rehearse these skills across all core content areas. These experiences are embedded into daily lessons during the workshop periods where students are working in a variety of groupings to ask questions, explore, investigate and construct knowledge and share discoveries. Also, daily lessons include closure and extended learning activities where students apply learning. Teachers are also invited to offer students opportunities beyond the classroom. In the past, some of these events engaged students in field studies to local museums (Rochester Science Museum), involved students in Rochester history and geography projects, took students to evening performances at local theaters to see plays of books read in class (To Kill a Mockingbird), and allowed them to experience special presentations by experts in a field of study (example: birds of prey exhibit and presentation followed by owl pellet science experiment), or the Vietnam Memorial at Highland Park after reading, The Things They Carried. Guest speakers from the community have presented experiential anecdotes: Vietnam veterans, Holocaust survivors and local entrepreneurs.

In addition to motivating students to think and learn, these educational experiences are expected to increase literacy proficiency through integrated tasks which require reading and/or writing practice.

Past student performance outcomes on the New York State English Language Arts Common Core Assessments for grades 7 and 8 have demanded the highest degree of commitment for improving literacy proficiency rates, especially with the challenge of testing that occurs within a few months to one year of entry into University Prep. With this in mind, University Prep continues to seek methods for accelerating middle school performance. With an intense focus on implementing strategies to increase the achievement rate of middle school students, University Prep administrators and teachers worked as a team to review and monitor existing practices and to determine informed means for improvement. The collaboration resulted in several actions which were implemented during the 2015-16 school year that are continued during the current school year.

- Reduced Class Size
- After school tutoring 3 days per week
- Strategic Assignment of Staff in Key Areas
- Intensive Support through Ongoing Feedback and Coaching for All Teachers
- Diagnostic Reading Assessments
- Benchmark/Interim Assessments
- Data Analysis and Use to Inform Instruction
- Portfolio Assessment
- Literacy-based Professional Development
- Extended Learning Opportunities for Students on Saturdays

As a result, improvements in proficiency levels were evident on the 2016-2017 NYS English Language Arts Assessment for 7 and 8 but additional strategies were recommended for the 2017-18 school year. From the 2017-18 Action Plan, the following strategies were implemented:

- **Reassigned Literacy Specialist to Exclusively Support Grades 8 and 9 ELA Classrooms.** The Literacy Specialist provided daily coteaching to the 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA classroom. She also co taught Grade 9 ELA where there was a first-year teacher. She provided delivery and follow-up coaching to teachers. They will also work with the ELA team and participate in professional learning communities (PLCs) as a model and coach for integrating literacy strategies and best practices into all classrooms. The Literacy Specialist also provided direct instruction to four intervention groups for a ten-week period prior to the NYS ELA 8 assessment.
- **Recruited and Selected a Middle School Academic Leader.** In October, a Middle School Academic Leader was selected. She was responsible for providing grade 7 and 8 instructional leadership including setting team and individual academic vision and goals that align with organization vision, mission, values, and goals; supporting instructional improvement by observing, coaching, modeling for, and teaching staff; overseeing the administration of multiple forms of assessments, to measure and improve teaching and

learning; supporting the team in using student and staff performance data to drive improved teaching and learning; and overseeing and implementing systems that reinforce positive character, behavior, and organizational values. She co-taught math classes and lead four eighth grade intervention groups in Algebra prior to the NYS Regents Exam.

**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 7<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> 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>4</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3						
4						
5						
6						
7	38	0	0	1	0	36
8	63	0	4	0	4	70
All	101	0	4	1	4	106

**RESULTS AND EVALUATION**

The state-wide refusal rate for the 2018 administration of the ELA Exam was 18%. Students at University Prep had a 0% refusal rate at seventh grade and a 6% refusal rate at 8<sup>th</sup> grade, both significantly lower than the state rate.

**Performance on 2017-18 State English Language Arts Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

<sup>4</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.

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	11	38	0	2
8	38	63	43	37
All	28	101	41	36

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Students entering University Prep in seventh grade maintained the 11% proficient rate of the previous year’s cohort. The eighth graders, however, demonstrated improved evident by their 38% proficiency on this NYS assessment. Eighth graders improved their proficiency rate from the year prior and the students who attended University Prep for the second year outperformed the larger cohort performing at 43% proficient. This supports the trend that the longer a student remains at University Prep the stronger their skills become.

In grades 9 - 12, University Prep continues to offer small class sizes with experienced English teachers who proactively investigate and are trained in best practices for language arts instruction. Trainings are provided often and occur regularly in full department meetings, coach with teacher or teachers visiting each other’s classrooms to observe techniques with discussions following. The practices students engage in are embedded in higher level thinking and include questioning techniques such as Socratic seminars, reciprocal teaching, and interactive reading and writing response journals. English teachers select appropriately leveled grade text and embed up to 60% informational texts. Students are gradually introduced to the rigor and structure of the NYS Regents as teachers mimic replications of the Regents tasks in lesson development. Teachers also provide opportunity for performance, debate and public speaking. Professional development has included these types of models of student centered instruction in literacy development.

Writing portfolios are transferred from one grade level to the next and act as a body of work representing growth over time. To encourage the development of writing, English teachers in grades 9 – 12 administer a bi-annual school-wide baseline and are trained to score this Regents task using the NYS Common Core English Regents rubric. Successes and challenges in reading and writing are graphed across grade levels. Special education teachers and social studies teachers are actively included in this process so that writing, the standards and rubrics become a cross course objectives.

English teachers continue to be available after school on Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays. Additionally, Regents prep is offered on Saturdays for several weeks in the winter and preceding the June exams, students go off campus to two local colleges; RIT and St. John Fisher to experience instruction in a university environment.

### 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					0	2
8	16	64	17	54	43	37
All	16	64	17	54	41	39

### 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

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			
	36	37	22	6			
	PI	=	37	+	22	=	65
					22]	+	6
						+	6
						+	(.5)*[6
							PI
						=	[96]

### 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.

## 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>5</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the spring of 2018, the 8<sup>th</sup> graders in their second year and the entire 8<sup>th</sup> grade both outperformed the Rochester City School District. The University Prep second year students performed at 43% and the entire 8<sup>th</sup> grade met proficiency at 38% while the eighth graders in the RCSD had a proficiency rate of 11%.

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		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	0	2	Not available	Not available
8	43	37	11	1083
All	41	39	11	1083

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

University Prep is an all-male charter school. Our young men outperformed the 8<sup>th</sup> grade males in RCSD by an even greater comparison. Our boys met proficiency at 43%, while the males in RCSD only met proficiency at 9%.

The following supplemental chart from the 2016-17 school year shows the proficiency rates of 8<sup>th</sup> graders in schools in the same neighborhoods in which University Prep students live, that have comparable poverty rates and that have the same 7-12 grade school configuration. As indicated in the chart, University Prep's 8<sup>th</sup> graders outperformed each of the similar schools by a margin of 11 to 13 percentage points.

<sup>5</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](#).

2016-17 English Language Arts Performance of  
Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on the State Exam by Grade							
	University Prep Charter School		East Lower Academy		Integrated Arts and Technology		RCSD Leadership Academy for Young Men	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
8	17	54	6	126	6	90	4	69

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					0	
8	16	6	17	9	43	11
All	16	6	17	9	41	11

**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

Results show that when compared to similar demographics for economically disadvantaged in New York State, University Prep’s Comparative Overall Performance was lower than expected with a total difference of -21 for all students tested and a -10.6 for 8<sup>th</sup> graders.

### • 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	55.6	65	2	34.8	-32.8	-2.09
8	92.2	74	14	24.6	-10.6	-0.67
All	75.1	139	8.4	29.3	-21	-1.33

#### School’s Overall Comparative Performance:

Comparative performance was lower than expected in both grade levels.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

### English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15	7-8	73	138	6	NA	NA
2015-16	7-8	75	139	8	29.3	-1.33
2016-17	7-8	25	118	14		
2017-18	7-8	2	101	28		

### Goal 3: Growth Measure<sup>6</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.

## 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>7</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

University Prep exceeded the Statewide Median for Grades 7 and 8 for a combined score of 65 which exceeds the Statewide Median of 50. The 8<sup>th</sup> grade median score of 72 exceeded the Statewide Median by 22 percentage points. The 7<sup>th</sup> grade median score of 59 exceeded the Statewide Median by 9 points.

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	59	50.0
8	72	50.0
All	<b>65</b>	50.0

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The mean score of 72 for grade 8 in 2016-17 exceeds the previous year’s mean score of 61 achieved in 2015-16. University Prep exceeded the Statewide Median for the past two years. Results also show an 11 .point gain from 2015-16 to 2016-17 and a 22 point gain from 2013-14 to 2016-17.

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

<sup>7</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

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	53	26	59	50.0
8	65	61	72	50.0
All	59	43	65	50.0

<b>Goal 3: Optional Measure</b>
[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]
<b>METHOD:</b>
<b>RESULTS AND EVALUATION:</b>
<b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b>

**SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL**

University Prep achieved its accountability goal for its Comparative measure and for the Growth measure. University Prep has made gains each year in its ELA proficiency rates for 8<sup>th</sup> graders in their second year. University Prep has consistently outperformed the Rochester City School District to which it is compared. University Prep has yet to meet the Absolute Measure but is making gains each year.

.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Did not achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate 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.	Did not achieve
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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a	Unable to determine

	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.)	Achieved
	[Write in optional measure here]	

**ACTION PLAN**

University Prep continues to address the challenge of meeting the Absolute Measure for the New York State ELA Assessment for the middle school level. In addition to the steps taken in 2016-17, the following organizational and instructional adjustments have already been put into place for the 2017-18 school year.

1. Continue the reduction of class size in all core content areas. (15-17)
2. Provide Response to Intervention in ELA for students in 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade through a learning lab model with embedded instruction from an ELA or literacy trained teacher
3. Facilitate improved reading instruction through the delivery of *Fast Forward Reading* software to all 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> graders as well as upper classman who demonstrate the need for improved vocabulary and reading comprehension.
4. Continue to focus the Literacy Specialist to Support Grades 7, 8 and 9 ELA Classrooms. The Literacy Specialist will be responsible for provide delivery and follow-up coaching to teachers. She will also work with the ELA team and participate in professional learning communities (PLCs) as a model and coach for integrating literacy strategies and best practices into all classrooms.
5. Continue the development of Vertical Teacher Teams Teachers will meet weekly for 60 minutes to review student performance data and identify effective instructional strategies. Within the structures of a PLC, University Prep teachers will clarify with teachers in the grade levels above what they consider the skills and knowledge students must have as they enter the grade level.
6. Expand the instructional focus of the Middle School Academic Leader to include all content areas for grades 7 & 8.
7. Create a More Student-Centered Learning Environment. At University Prep students are at the center of everything we do, and creating a student-centered learning environment shifts the focus from the teaching to the learning. It encourages active student participation and requires that they monitor their own thinking. Areas of skill development for teachers will include:
  - i. Engagement strategies that include alternative strategies to demonstrate learning.
  - ii. Use open-ended questioning techniques and other methods to deepen thought, understanding and relevance of topics

- iii. Encourage student collaboration and group projects

## 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 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).<sup>8</sup> 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

The following table represents the percent of students in the 2012, 2013 and 2014 cohorts who have passed the English Regents Common Core exam with a score of 75 or better. Note that most students in the 2013 cohort took the Common Core version of the ELA Regents exam rather than the Comprehensive Regents exam, hence adjusting to the standards of a different exam. We have not met the absolute measure of 65 % of the students reaching a performance level of 4 on the Regents exam.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on Regents English Common Core Exam  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>9</sup>

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	71	30
2013	73	52
2014	50	42

<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>9</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The data below supports the belief that the longer students remain at University Prep the stronger their academic skills become. Although a cohort may have a low college readiness rate at the initial assessment the students respond to additional instruction and improve their performance in ELA prior to graduation.

Moving forward, University Prep will provide additional opportunities for students in every cohort to meet the career and college readiness measure by providing additional instructional support leading to the retaking of the English Common Core Regents exam so that all students are better prepared for the rigor of college.

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	63	27	51	31	50	42
2015	68	Not Eligible	65	32	56	34
2016			63	Not Eligible	59	17
2017					68	9.2

### 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.

## 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

The past three cohorts have exceeded this measure, with over 92% of the students in their fourth year at University Prep meeting proficiency of at least a 3 on the NYS ELA Common Core Assessment in ELA.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 3 on Regents English Common Core Exam

by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>10</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Scoring At least Level 3 on the Regents English Exam
2012	71	<b>95</b>
2013	73	94
2014	50	92

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Each cohort has an initial passing rate of at least 44% with two of the cohorts over 58% for their initial pass rate. Each cohort improved their proficiency with each additional administration with the 2014 cohort reaching 92%

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	51	68	51	80	50	92
2015	65	Not eligible	65	58	56	72
2016			59	Not eligible	59	44
2017					63	Not eligible

### 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 Accountability Level 4.<sup>11</sup> 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

<sup>10</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

<sup>11</sup> 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](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf)

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

The students from cohort 2014 had a performance index (PI) of 209 as determined using the formula below. This cohort had strong success at both levels 3 and 4.

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
50	2	2	25	21

  

PI	=	[4]	+	[50]	+	[42]	=	[96]
				[50]	+	[42]	=	[92]
					+	(.5)*[42]	=	<u>21</u>
						PI	=	209

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The school continues to strive for an increase in students performing at a level 4 through continued focus on rigorous and challenging instruction. Higher level thinking is built into instruction to build students independence interacting with text.

### 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.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The students at University Prep achieving a performance level of 4 or 5 exceeds that of the local school district by 19 percent. The University Prep students have achieved 42% at this level, while the RCSD has only reached a 23% mastery.

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	28	71	16	2097
2013	52	73	27	2187
2014	42	50	23	2279

## 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

University Prep outperformed the Rochester City School District in terms of APL for Cohorts 2012, 2013 and 2014.. Each year the University Prep students reach nearly 100% of their students meeting minimal competency on the ELA Regents exam while only half of the students in the RCSD meet competency.

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	96	71	54	2047
2013	95	73	56	2187

2014	92	50	52	2279
------	----	----	----	------

## 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 students in the 2014 cohort had a Performance Index of 209. The District PI was not available to compare, although the

English Regents Performance Index (PI)<sup>12</sup>  
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	PI	Cohort Size	PI	Cohort Size
2012		71		2047
2013		73		2187
2014	209	50	NA	2279

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Although University Prep is achieving its comparative measures, the school continues to address learning gaps of students through improved data collection and analysis, review of student work, and supervision of teachers. The action plan moving forward includes continued attention to classroom instruction, higher level questioning techniques, grading rubrics and learning environments, making adjustments to support students in achieving at college and career readiness levels. This will include attention to the guidelines presented in the NYS ELA instructional modules and adjusting what is considered “good enough” regarding student work products in alignment with ELA common core reading and writing standards and resources. The literacy specialist, an expert in

<sup>12</sup> For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s PI, see page 28.

the ELA common core will continue to coach ELA teachers, evaluate instruction and provide evidence-based professional development.

**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 8<sup>th</sup> 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.

**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**

The 2013 cohort met the goal of 50 of students scoring at the Performance level 4. The most recent cohort, 2014, fell short of the goal with only 42% of the students reaching that mark.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 4 on Common Core exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort <sup>13</sup>

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	71	30
2013	73	52
2014	50	42

**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 8<sup>th</sup> 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.

<sup>13</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

## 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

Based on the information a the 92% of the 2014 cohort met the proficiency level 3 on the NYS ELA Regents, this growth measure is met.

### Historical information

Thirty-seven students in grade 8 remained at University Prep to take the ELA Regents as Cohort 2011. Of these thirty-seven, five students achieved proficiency on the NYS ELA assessment as 8<sup>th</sup> graders. Thirty-two of the fifty students in Cohort 2011 had only achieved a level 1 or 2 on the Grade 8 New York State ELA assessment. The majority of these thirty-two students took the Comprehensive ELA exam. The 19% who achieved a score of 75% or greater took the ELA Comprehensive exam.

Of the fifty-six students who had a score for the NYS ELA Grade 8 assessment, 10 achieved proficiency. Forty-six of the seventy-one students in Cohort 2012 had achieved a level 1 or 2 on the Grade 8 New York State ELA assessment. The majority of these students took the Comprehensive ELA exam. 63% achieved a score of 75% or greater took the ELA Regents.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 3 on Common Core exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort <sup>14</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Achieving Level 3 on Regents English Exam
2012	71	<b>95</b>
2013	73	92
2014	50	92

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Although University Prep is achieving its comparative measures, the school continues to address learning gaps of students through improved data collection and analysis, review of student work, and supervision of teachers. The action plan moving forward includes continued attention to classroom instruction, questioning techniques, grading rubrics and learning environments, making adjustments to support students in achieving at college and career readiness levels. This will include attention to the guidelines presented in the NYS ELA instructional modules and adjusting what is considered “good enough” work products in alignment with ELA common core reading and writing

<sup>14</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

standards and resources. The literacy specialist, an expert in the ELA common core will continue to coach ELA teachers, evaluate instruction and provide evidence-based professional development.

<b>Goal 3: Optional Measure</b>
[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]
<b>METHOD:</b>
<b>RESULTS AND EVALUATION:</b>
<b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b>

## SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL <sup>15</sup>

Students at University Prep have met the graduation requirement of achieving at least a 3 on the ELA Regents exam for three consecutive cohorts with performances well over 90%. There growth from 8<sup>th</sup> grade is significant. In addition, the students exceeded the Measure of Interim Progress with a PI of 209 and an MIP of 167.8. The students are not doing as well reaching the higher-level standards set forth in ESSA. We continue to have a large gap in achievement for students reaching a 4 on the NYS ELA exam.

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.	Did not achieve
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.	Achieved
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.	Achieved
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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percentage of students in the Total Cohort partially meeting	Achieved

<sup>15</sup> If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

	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.	
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.)	Not determined
Growth	Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 <sup>th</sup> 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.	Achieved
Growth	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 <sup>th</sup> grade English 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.	Achieved

**ACTION PLAN**

1. Facilitate improved reading instruction through the delivery of Fast Forward Reading software to upper classman who demonstrate the need for improved vocabulary and reading comprehension. Students who have failed or who are in danger of failing Regents exams will be assessed and plans will be developed for implementation of reading instruction through the Credit Recovery classes or other ELA elective classes.
2. Provide opportunities for juniors and seniors to participate in instruction through the Fast Forward software to prepare for SAT and Accuplacer exams.
3. Continue to focus the Literacy Specialist to Support Grades 7, 8 and 9 ELA Classrooms. The Literacy Specialist will be responsible for provide delivery and follow-up coaching to teachers. She will also work with the ELA team and participate in professional learning communities (PLCs) as a model and coach for integrating literacy strategies and best practices into all classrooms.
4. Continue the development of Vertical Teacher Teams Teachers will meet weekly for 60 minutes to review student performance data and identify effective instructional strategies. Within the structures of a PLC, University Prep teachers will clarify with teachers in the grade levels above what they consider the skills and knowledge students must have as they enter the grade level.
5. Create a More Student-Centered Learning Environment. At University Prep students are at the center of everything we do, and creating a student-centered learning environment shifts the focus from the teaching to the learning. It encourages active student

participation and requires that they monitor their own thinking. Areas of skill development for teachers will include:

- i. Engagement strategies that include alternative strategies to demonstrate learning.
- ii. Use open-ended questioning techniques and other methods to deepen thought, understanding and relevance of topics
- iii. Encourage student collaboration and group projects

## GOAL 4: MATHEMATICS

### Goal 4: Mathematics

**GOAL:** STUDENTS WILL DEMONSTRATE COMPETENCY IN THE UNDERSTANDING AND APPLICATION OF MATHEMATICAL COMPUTATION AND PROBLEM SOLVING.

#### BACKGROUND

University Prep mathematics curriculum and instruction is based on the NYS Common Core Learning Standards. Teachers plan using one instructional framework across all grades and subjects, including mathematics. Math teachers refer to NYS Curriculum modules to guide lesson planning. University Prep has found that as mathematics becomes more challenging in the high school courses, struggling students require greater supports to engage them in the classroom. With this understanding, University Prep has hired a Director of Mathematics, who has worked with University Prep students since its inception and who has proven to be successful at teaching math and at managing classroom behavior.

In addition, University Prep is taking steps to address deficiencies evident in the results of Mathematics assessments in both middle school and high school. The following strategies were employed in 2017-18.

1. Reduce Class Size for Grades 7-9 in all Core Content areas, including Geometry.
2. Support classroom instruction in the most challenging high school math classes with co-teachers.
3. Hire a Director of Mathematics to fully support math instruction as a coach and co-teacher.
4. Increase Math instructional time by an additional 620 minutes per month.
5. Establish Math Data Teams
6. Hire a Middle School Academic Leader, responsible for providing grade 7 and 8 instructional leadership.
7. Identify and Re-purpose Skill Based Interventionists in Math.

#### 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 7<sup>th</sup> grade only 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>16</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3						
4						
5						
6						
7	33					36
8	0	0	0	0	0	70
All	0	0	0	0	0	106

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The eighth-grade students at University Prep enrolled in Algebra and did not participate in NYS testing at Math 8. They demonstrated proficiency in Algebra with a 60% passing rate on the Regents Exam.

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				

<sup>16</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.

6				
7		33		2
8	NA	0	NA	0
All		33		2

## 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						
4						
5						
6						
7	3	66	5	56	0	2
8	6	69	2	60	NA	0
All	8.4	139	7	116	0	2

#### 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

Unable to complete Performance Index due to the fact that the eighth-grade students at University Prep enrolled in Algebra and did not participate in NYS testing at Math 8. They demonstrated proficiency in Algebra with a 60% passing rate on the Regents Exam.

From 2015-16 data, students in at least their second year at University Prep did not meet the Absolute measure for Mathematics in grade 8. Of the 51 students tested, no students performed at proficiency levels. As will be shown later in this report, 8th grade students in their second year demonstrated 49% mean growth, the highest growth University Prep has experienced over the past 3 years and only 1 percentage point below the Statewide growth median.

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					
	[?]	[?]	[?]	[?]					
	PI	=	[?]	+	[?]	+	[?]	=	[?]
									[?]
									[?]
									[?]
									[?]

**Goal 4: 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>17</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The eighth-grade students at University Prep enrolled in Algebra and did not participate in NYS testing at Math 8. They demonstrated proficiency in Algebra with a 60% passing rate on the Regents Exam. Two seventh graders in their second year took the 7<sup>th</sup> grade exam but did not meet proficiency.

Previously, for the 51 students in their second year at University Prep, none achieved proficiency on the NYS Grade 8 Mathematics assessment. For the district of residence, only 1% of 1111 students achieved proficiency.

<sup>17</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 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				
4				
5				
6				
7	3	33	6	1510
8		0		
All	<u>3</u>	33	<u>6</u>	1510

**ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

The seventh-grade students did not exceed the performance of the Rochester City School District. The RCSD outperformed University Prep by 3% overall.

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					2	Not available
8	16	6	17	9	Did not take	1
All	16	7	17	8		1

**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

The eighth-grade students at University Prep enrolled in Algebra and did not participate in NYS testing at Math 8. They demonstrated proficiency in Algebra with a 67% passing rate on the Regents Exam. Therefore, the comparative measure was unable to be evaluated.

Previously, results showed that when compared to similar demographics for economically disadvantaged in New York State, University Prep's Comparative Overall Performance was lower than expected with a total difference of -19 for all students tested and a -7 for 8<sup>th</sup> graders.

### 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	Not reported	Indicates 0 tested of 56				
8	53% / 92.2	32	1	24	-23	
All						

#### School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Comparative performance was lower than expected in seventh and eighth grade.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

### Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2014-15	7-8	73	138	6	NA	NA
2015-16	7-8	75.1	139	8.4	29.3	-1.33
2016-17	7-8	92.2	88			

#### Goal 4: Growth Measure<sup>18</sup>

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

<sup>18</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

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>19</sup>

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Previously, the mean growth percentile charts show that University Prep did not meet the growth measure in 2015-16. However, in 2016-17, University Prep exceeded the Statewide Median by 3 percentage points for all students tested. 2016-17 results show an increase over the previous year.

### 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	0	50.0
All		50.0

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

.

### Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Target
	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7	<b>26</b>	<b>59</b>		50.0
8	61	72		50.0
All	43	65		50.0

<sup>19</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

<b>Goal 4: Optional Measure</b>
[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]
<b>METHOD:</b>
<b>RESULTS AND EVALUATION:</b>
<b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b>

**SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL**

The seventh graders enter University Prep with significant deficits in math. Throughout the year the team works to build their higher-level thinking about math while providing repetitive practice to demonstrate learning. This year identified students will be engage in 30 additional minutes of math instruction in a small group RTI setting.

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

## ACTION PLAN

University Prep is taking steps to address deficiencies evident on the results of Mathematics assessments in both middle school and high school. The following strategies will be employed in 2017-18.

1. Reduce Class Size for Grades 7-8 in all math classes.
2. Continue with enrollment of eighth graders in Algebra.
3. Expand the role of Director of Mathematics to fully support math instruction as a coach and co-teacher.
4. Increase Math instructional time by an additional 360 minutes per month using an RTI model for implementation.
5. Continue to expand the Math Data Teams to analyze data to inform instructional decision-making.
6. Expand role of the Middle School Academic Leader, responsible for providing grade 7 and 8 instructional leadership.
7. Identify and Re-purpose Skill Based Interventionists in Math.
8. Add an instructional inventory tool.
9. Create a More Student-Centered Learning Environment, shifting the focus from teaching to learning and encouraging active student participation and discovery.

## 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.<sup>20</sup> 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.

---

<sup>20</sup> 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.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

The following table represents the percent of students in the 2012, 2013 and 2014 Cohorts who have passed the Math Regents with a score of 80 or better. The students have not met the goal to have 65% performance level 4 on the Math Regents. Cohort 2014 only had a 4% passing rate falling drastically short of the goal.

Percent Scoring at Least Level 4 on a Regents Mathematics Common Core Exam by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>21</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Scoring At least Level 4
2012	71	<b>10</b>
2013	73	9
2014	50	4

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

University Prep is currently reassessing math instruction, implementing interventions and additional supports for students who are struggling in the area of mathematics. These include the expansion of the responsibilities of the Director of Mathematics, additional teacher support in mathematics classrooms, and extended day tutoring. The department also reassesses the credit recovery program. Through on going professional development an action plan will be developed that focuses on improving rigorous instruction.

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	63	0	51	2	50	4
2015	68	4	65	5	56	5
2016			63	5	59	3
2017					68	4

### 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.

<sup>21</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a mathematics Regents exam

## 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

University Prep students meet proficiency of a 3 on a math Regents at a rate of 90-95% the past three Cohorts. This exceeds the expectation of 80%. University Prep students continue to meet minimal competency of a 3 but struggle to gain the higher-level skills to reach a 4.

Percent Scoring At least Level 3 on a Regents Mathematics Common Core Exam  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>22</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Scoring at least Level 3 on a Regents Mathematics Exam
2012	71	95
2013	73	94
2014	50	90

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The data shows that more than half of each cohort meets competency at the first Regents administration and the rest of the cohort meet the expectation at the second or third administration of the exam, demonstrating success of the instruction and intervention for these students.

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	63	76	51	88	50	90
2015	68	46	68	75	56	77
2016			63	61	59	63
2017					68	54

<sup>22</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a mathematics Regents exam

#### 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.<sup>23</sup> 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

Data for the 2014 cohort indicates a Performance index of 196. Cohorts 2011, 2012, and 2013 achieved Mathematics Accountability Performance Levels of 110, 110, and 113 respectively.

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
50	0	6	90	4

$$\begin{aligned} \text{PI} &= 6 + [90] + 4 = 100 \\ &= [90] + 4 = 94 \\ &+ (.5)*4 = \underline{2} \\ \text{PI} &= 196 \end{aligned}$$

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

All students in Cohort 2013 were tested in mathematics with Common Core Regents. As the first cohort under the common core assessments, 94% of these students were able to pass the Regents exams with a score of 65% or better. While this does reflect achievement at the career and college

<sup>23</sup> 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](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/sirs/documents/2017RegentsScoreRangesforAnnualandAccountabilityReporting.pdf)

readiness level of 80%, the 15% difference does not present unsurmountable odds and University Prep will address the gap with an intensive intervention plan as outlined in the Mathematics Action Plan for 2017-18.

**Goal 4: Comparative Measure**

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**

University Prep and the RCSD had similar results of performance level 4 or higher for cohorts 2012 and 2013. Using the previous year’s data of the RCSD, University Prep fell short with only a 4% success rate at this level.

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	10	71	2	2097
2013	10	73	4	2187
2014	4	50	NA	NA

**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.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

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	95	73	57	2097
2013	94	74	57	2187
2014	90	50	NA	NA

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Data not available for comparison for the most recent 2014 cohort.

### 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

Student performance index was a 196 compared to the MIP of 117.8. Comparative data with the local district was not available.

Mathematics Regents Performance Index (PI)<sup>24</sup>  
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	PI	Cohort Size	PI	Cohort Size
2012		71		2097
2013		73		2187
2014	196	50		NA

## 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 8<sup>th</sup> 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

The students have not been successful at meeting the goal of a performance level of 4.

Percent Achieving at Least Performance Level 4 on a Mathematics Regents Exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort <sup>25</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Achieving Level 4 on Common Core Exam
2012	73	51
2013	74	82
2014	50	80

<sup>24</sup> For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school's PI, see page 46.

<sup>25</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Students show considerable growth from 8<sup>th</sup> grade until their last year of high school. The past two years 80 % of the students who were not proficient on the 8<sup>th</sup> grade NYS exam were able to meet criteria on a math Regents, qualifying them for graduation.

### Goal 4: Growth Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8<sup>th</sup> 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 math requirement for graduation.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Percent Achieving At least Performance Level 3 on a Mathematics Regents Exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort <sup>26</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Achieving Level 3
2012	73	<b>51</b>
2013	74	82
2014	50	80

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

---

<sup>26</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the mathematics Regents exam

<b>Goal 4: Optional Measure</b>
[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]
<b>METHOD:</b>
<b>RESULTS AND EVALUATION:</b>
<b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b>

**SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL MATH GOAL <sup>27</sup>**

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

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 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.	Not achieved
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.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the Performance Index (PI) in mathematics 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.	Achieved
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.	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.	Achieved
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.)	Achieved
Growth	Each year, 50 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 <sup>th</sup> grade mathematics exam will meet or exceed Common Core expectations (currently scoring at	Achieved

<sup>27</sup> If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

	or above Performance Level 4 on a Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	
Growth	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8 <sup>th</sup> 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.	Achieved

**ACTION PLAN**

At the high school level math instruction must take on a more rigorous focus with applications of learning to multiple settings. Students must develop critical thinking skills which enable them to exceed mastery on these exams at a higher rate. Teachers will participate in PLC groups focused on rigorous strategies, exposure with the Rigor and Relevance Framework, and coaching from peers and administrators. Teachers will also participate in individually determine professional development through ACSD to engage them in specific skill deficit areas.

**GOAL 5: SCIENCE**

**Goal 3: Science**  
 Goal: Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific ideas, methodologies, and skills.

**BACKGROUND**

Science curriculum, instruction and assessment are aligned to the NYS Learning standards and assessments. In addition to the school’s ongoing professional development and classroom observations and coaching, science teachers meet monthly to address instructional strategies related to science classroom instruction and science labs. Science staff remained constant in grades 7, 9, and 10 over the past three years. Teachers are provided whatever instructional and laboratory supplies needed to ensure optimal learning in the Sciences.

**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.

## 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

33% of University Prep 8th graders in their second year were proficient on the 8th Grade State Science Exam. The year previous the 8<sup>th</sup> graders scored 43%. University Prep did not meet the Absolute Measure for Science 8 and fell short of the goal by 63%. Although the Science 8 performance has shown growth in the past, this year's performance did not follow that trend.

### 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		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8	33	40	13	1115
All	33	40	13	1115

## 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						
8	32	72	46	16	33	40
All	32	72	46	16	33	40

### 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 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

Data from the current year, 2017-18 shows evidence of the 8<sup>th</sup> graders at University prep outperforming the 8<sup>th</sup> graders from the Rochester City School District, with 43% and 13% passing respectively.

### 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>28</sup>	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8	43	67	13	1115
All	43	67	13	1115

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The students have outperformed students from the Rochester City School District in Science 8 during the 2016-17 and 2017-18 school year.

### 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	36	64	43	16	33	13
All	36	64	43	68	33	13

<sup>28</sup> This table uses the prior year’s results as 2017-18 district science scores are not yet available.

<b>Goal 5: Optional Measure</b>
[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]
 <b>METHOD:</b>
 <b>RESULTS AND EVALUATION:</b>
 <b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b>

**SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL**

University Prep has outperformed the RCSD for the past two years.

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.	Not achieved
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.	Achieved
	[Write in optional measure here]	

**ACTION PLAN**

Action Plan for the 2018-19 includes

- Continue Smaller class size,
- Embed vocabulary and reading comprehension goals into daily lesson plans
- Student exposure to Levels of Questioning Training
- Continued assessment of student performance data to determine areas of strength and weakness. Application of identified needs to teaching to prepare students for success in high school science.
- Student exposure to the format of test questions to increase familiarity and confidence.

**HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE**

<b>Goal 5: Absolute Measure</b>
---------------------------------

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

University Prep has exceeded the Absolute Measure for High school science for the past three cohorts with passing scores higher than 65 % at a rate of 94, 95% and 90% respectively.

Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>29</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2012	71	<b>94</b>
2013	73	95
2014	50	90

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

University Prep encourages students to retake Regents exams to achieve higher scores in order to increase attainment of the scores at the college or career readiness levels.

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	63	86	51	84	50	90
2015	68	57	65	63	56	74
2016			63	64	59	68
2017					68	54

## Goal 5: Comparative Measure

<sup>29</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

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

University Prep has met the Comparative measure, performing at a higher rate than the school district of comparison for Cohorts 2011 and 2012. It is not possible to compare the 2013 Cohort to the school district since district data is not yet available.

University Prep is unable to evaluate the Science Regents performance of Cohort 2013 against the Rochester City School District until district scores are made public. However, based on past performance and the current Science Regents passing rate of Cohort 2013 at 95%, it is expected that University Prep will meet or exceed this measure.

University Prep requires students to pass Regents exams in order to pass the course. This ensure students be assigned to retaking courses in order to sit for a failed Regents exam a second time.

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	94	71	50	2097
2013	95	73	51	2187
2014	90	50	NA	NA

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## GOAL 6: SOCIAL STUDIES

### Goal 6: Social Studies

Goal: Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of the recurring themes and skills that organize how social scientists explore, investigate, and construct meaning of and among historical and current themes.

### 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 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

University Prep has met the Absolute measure for Regents U.S. History for Cohort 2014 with a passing rate of 80%. University Prep also met the Absolute measure for its past cohorts.

U.S. History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>30</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2011	52	<b>87</b>
2012	71	89
2013	73	88
2014	50	80

## EVALUATION

The ability to meet the Absolute measure in the high school Regents exams has been consistent and supports University Prep maintains that the longer students remain at University Prep the greater the results.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Historically, University Prep students take the U.S. History Regents exam for the first time as 10th graders. By the time they are in their fourth year, 87% or more have passed the U. S. History. University Prep requires students to pass Regents exams in order to pass the course. This ensure students be assigned to retaking courses in order to sit for a failed Regents exam a second time.

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

Cohort Designation	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing						

<sup>30</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

2013	87	51	80	74	73	88	71	90
2014	68	NA	63	57	51	63	50	80
2015			68	NA	65	34	56	43
2016					63	NA	59	22
2017							68	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.

**RESULTS**

University Prep has outperformed the district of residence for each of its past cohorts, 211,2012, and 2013 by almost double each year.

.

**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
2011	87	52	48	2235
2012	89	71	48	2097
2013	88	73	45	2187
2014	80	50	NA	NA

**EVALUATION**

University Prep exceeded the district of residence by 39 percentage points for the 2011 Cohort, by 46% for the 2012 Cohort and 44% for the 2013 Cohort.

**ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

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

**Goal 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

University Prep has exceeded the Absolute measure for the Global History Regents for Cohort 2014 with a passing rate of 84%. University Prep has exceeded this measure for each of its cohorts.

Global History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>31</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2011	52	87
2012	71	90
2013	73	88
2014	50	84

## EVALUATION

Each of University Prep’s graduating cohorts has met the Absolute measure for Global History 87-90%. Historically University Prep administered the Global History Regents for the first time to 9 th graders. Over 20% of University Prep’s 9th graders pass within the first year of high school. This presents more strategic and differentiated opportunities for those who pass and for those who have not passed. With the changes in the course requirements, the exam will be administered after the 10<sup>th</sup> grade year.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

Cohort Designation	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17		2017-18	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing		
2013	87	61	80	81	73	88	71	89

<sup>31</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

2014	63	21	63	73	51	77	50	84
2015			68	37	65	69	56	57
2016					63	29	59	58
2017							68	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

University Prep has maintained a strong performance on the Global History Regents outperforming the Rochester City School district in each cohort.

### 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
2011	87	52	42	2235
2012	90	71	39	2097
2013	88	73	45	2187
2014	84	50		

### EVALUATION

University Prep has exceeded the Comparative measure for the Global History Regents for its past cohorts. In fact, our first cohort outperformed the district by 45 percentage points and our second cohort outperformed the district by 51 percentage points. District data is not yet available for the 2014 Cohort. However, it is expected that we will be able to once again meet or exceed this measure.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

### OAL 7: ESSA

#### Goal 7: ESSA

The students will make adequate yearly progress on both absolute and comparative measures..

#### 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

Based on the results of the 2016-17 school year the University Prep has made Annual Yearly Progress in the following areas:

- Middle-Level Science
  - all students –Yes,
  - tested 80% - Yes,
  - PI \_ Progress Target – Yes
- Secondary ELA
  - 95% tested – Yes
- Secondary Math
  - 95% tested - Yes
- Graduation Rate
  - All Students – Yes,
  - African American – Yes

Based on the results of the 2016-17 school year University Prep has **not** made Annual Yearly Progress in the following areas:

- Middle-Level ELA
  - All students- No,
  - Tested 95% - No (93%),

- Safe Harbor Target – No
- Middle-Level Math
  - All students – NO,
  - Tested 95% - No,
  - Safe Harbor Target – No
- Middle-Level Science -
  - African American Progress target -NO
- Secondary ELA
  - All students – No,
  - Progress target – No
- Secondary Math
  - All students – No,
  - Progress target - No

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Accountability Status by Year

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

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

### Goal S: Parent Satisfaction

Write the school's goal here.

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

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

### METHOD

A survey was not completed during the 2017-18 school year.

### RESULTS

Provide a narrative of parents' responses.

#### 2017-18 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

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

#### 2017-18 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
[List Item Here]	%

### EVALUATION

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure with a discussion of individual items, changes from previous years, areas of concern, etc.

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

## METHOD

Students are monitored through our Power School System.

## RESULTS

We retained 78% of the students from 2015-6 to 2016-17

### 2017-18 Student Retention Rate

2015-16 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2015-16	Number of Students Who Returned in 2016-17	Retention Rate 2016-17 Re-enrollment ÷ (2015-16 Enrollment – Graduates)
446	66	297	[78%]

## EVALUATION

University Prep retained 78% of their students but did not meet the goal of 90%.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Year	Retention Rate
2015-16	[%]
2016-17	[78%]
2017-18	[%]

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 95 percent.

## METHOD

Provide a narrative explaining how the school tracks student attendance and calculates its daily attendance rate.

## RESULTS

Provide a narrative describing the year's attendance rate.

### 2017-18 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
-------	-------------------------------

1	[%]
2	[%]
3	[%]
4	[%]
5	[%]
6	[%]
7	[%]
8	[%]
Overall	[%]

## EVALUATION

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and how close the attendance rate was to the target.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2015-16	[%]
2016-17	[%]
2017-18	[%]

## APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

The school may wish to use the following supplemental tables in the **Additional Evidence** sections. They are organized by subject and measure. Table titles need to be adapted to reflect the appropriate subject area, i.e. English language arts, mathematics, etc.

## ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

### Absolute Measure

In 2017-18, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.

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

by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7	14	29	0	2				
8	33	24	43	37				
All	23	53	41	39				

**Comparative Measure**

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

While schools are required to compare themselves to the local school district, there may be individual schools that also provide a compelling comparison. These comparisons might be schools in the same neighborhood, with the same demographics, or have similar programs. The first table features a grade level breakdown for 2017-18; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

2017-18 English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on the State Exam by Grade							
	Charter School		School 1		School 2		School 3	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

English Language Arts Performance of School and Comparison Schools by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on State Exam by Year							
		Charter School		School 1		School 2		School 3	
		Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
2015-16									
2016-17									
2017-18									

### Growth Measure (national norm-referenced assessment)

Each year, on a national norm-referenced assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

If the school has administered a norm referenced test, e.g. Terra Nova, ITBS, Stanford 10, it should report cohort growth results in a similar fashion to the growth measure based on state tests.

### METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they made towards the desirable outcome of grade level or an NCE of 50. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the same norm-referenced exam in 2016-17 and 2017-18. It includes students who repeated the grade. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students who took the exam in both years.

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

### RESULTS

#### Cohort Growth on [XXX] Test from Spring 2017 to Spring 2018

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2016-17	Target	2017-18	
A					YES/NO
B					YES/NO
C					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

### EVALUATION

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

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

### Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Reading Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort met target?
2015-16	
2016-17	
2017-18	

### Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2014-15	[?/?]		
2015-16	[?/?]		
2016-17	[?/?]		
2017-18	[?/?]		

## ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

### 2017-18 Science Performance by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 According to Number of Years in School							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4								
8								

## HIGH SCHOOLS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

### Growth Measure

Each year, the group of students in their second year in the school who have taken a norm-referenced reading test for two years will reduce by one-half the difference between the average of

their first year in the school and an NCE of 50. If the cohort already achieved an average NCE of 50 in the first year, it will show an increase in their average NCE.

## METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same cohort of students from their first year to their second year in high school on a norm referenced reading test. Each cohort consists of those students who have norm-referenced reading test results for their first two years in the school. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in the first year and the 50<sup>th</sup> NCE in the second. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year.

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

## RESULTS

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

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		First Year Baseline	Second Year Target	Second Year Result	
2014					YES/NO
2015					YES/NO
2016					YES/NO
2017					YES/NO

## EVALUATION

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

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

## HIGH SCHOOLS: SUBJECT AREA MEASURES

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam

Exam	Cohort
------	--------

	2014	2015	2016	2017
Integrated Algebra				
Geometry				
Algebra 2				

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2014	2015	2016	2017
Living Environment				
Earth Science				
Chemistry				
Physics				