



**Legacy College Preparatory
Charter School**

**2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 23, 2019

By Principal, Summer Schneider

400 E 145th ST. Bronx, NY 10454

347-746-1558

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Principal, Summer Schneider, prepared this 2018-19 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Kathryn Hurley	Board Chair
Nikki Ho-Shing	Vice Chair
Matthew Bliss	Secretary
Hillary Swiggett	Fund Development Committee Chair
Jared Parker	Treasurer
Someera Khokar	Fund Development Committee Member
Yvonne Guillen	Academic Achievement Committee Member
Catherine Prefontaine Hausmann	Academic Achievement Committee Chair
John Sanchez	Fund Development Committee Member
David Camputo	Governance Committee Member

Summer Schneider has served as the Principal since 2016.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Legacy College Preparatory Charter (“Legacy College Prep”) is a college preparatory charter school serving students in grades 6 through 12. We believe that all students regardless of race, background, or socioeconomic status can excel at high levels – achieving mastery of state standards, scoring competitively on college entrance exams, and earning acceptance to four-year universities. Our school incorporates high behavioral and academic expectations to ensure we are developing scholars to have strong character through the formation of successful habits. Our belief is that these habits are vital to a student’s ability to establish a strong foundation in middle school, achieve success within in high school, and gain access to and graduate from the college or university of their choice.

Our school vision is driven by three core beliefs:

1. Rigorous instruction educates students to attend and graduate from college.
2. Values-based character development prepares students for school and life success.
3. Ambitious goals drive college readiness and the pursuit of professional aspirations.

These beliefs directly inform our vision and all elements of our school design.

In our founding years, we have served a population of which 91% are considered economically disadvantaged. We serve a student population where 23% of scholars have disabilities and 17% of scholars are English Language Learners.

We focus heavily on literacy and mathematics in the middle school grades in order to ensure that students are performing on or above grade level before they enter high school. In all grades, Legacy College Prep prepares students for college through rigorous curriculum and instruction aligned to the New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards and New York State Learning Standards. We develop students as insightful and analytical readers of fiction and non-fiction, evidence-based writers who can articulate ideas across multiple texts, and mathematicians who can explain their conceptual reasoning and succeed in advanced high school math study.

In addition to our emphasis on literacy and mathematics, Legacy College Prep prepares students for the larger world as well as for the changing demands of society and the economy. Students take physical education each year to develop healthy nutritional and exercise habits. Students take digital literacy courses each year to provide exposure to and proficiency in computer skills in order to be competitive for many of the jobs that will be available to them in the future.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2014-15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2015-16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2016-17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2017-18	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
2018-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	120	125	0	0	0	0	0	245

GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Scholars will be proficient in English Language Arts.

BACKGROUND

Our English Language Arts classes offer scholars a combination of writing and reading instruction in a 100-minute period, four to five times a week. The curriculum is based around novel study, where five to six novels are selected for our scope and sequence. Scholars read a variety of nonfiction and fiction texts with the goal of being able to read and comprehend literature; including novels, stories, dramas, and poetry, and literary nonfiction at a high level of complexity. The course backwards-plans from the CCSS for 6th grade and 7th grade ELA. The classes focus on the ability to cite textual evidence linking to a claim or analysis, identify the theme or main idea of a text using evidence to support, describe the plot and character development in a story through specific events, determine meaning of figurative language related to text meaning and tone, analysis on the purpose of a specific portion of a text in the context of the overall structure, and the development of the narrator's point of view. As part of the literature portion students compare and contrast difference genres of literature related to how they are written and the experience of reading them, specifically poems, dramas, short stories, and novels. The nonfiction portion of the course will focus on students' ability to analyze the purpose behind the structure of the text, the author's point of view and how it is conveyed in the text, identify the major argument in the text and support with reasons that are factual from the text, and how the author integrates factual information into the text to present an argument. Related to grammar and language students learn how to correct the misuse of pronoun and the use of vague pronouns, spelling errors, punctuation errors with commas and parentheticals. The course aims for students to acquire and use grade appropriate vocabulary. Therefore, students learn to determine unfamiliar word meanings through prefixes, suffixes, and root words, using context clues to determine meaning or check for meaning once the word has been defined, and using the appropriate resources such as dictionaries and thesauruses to determine the meaning of words. Here are some sample anchor texts from our classes: *Number the Stars*; *The Narrative of Frederick Douglass*; *Night*; *Twelve Angry Men*; *The Giver*; *Claudette Colvin: Twice Towards Justice*; and *The Outsiders*. Different classes may read different novels based on the reading levels of scholars in the class.

In the composition portion of the classes, students learn to produce clear and coherent writing that is developed and organized appropriately for the purpose, audience, and task. The course backwards-plans from the CCSS ELA Writing Standards. Students write for various lengths of time, from in class written summaries to long term paper assignments, with a secondary focus on writing from a variety of cultures and perspectives. The course focuses on teaching students to write a short summary, an argument stating a claim, a narrative, an informative/explanatory text, and a research paper. Scholars learn to write arguments to support a claim that is linked to evidence in the text, informative/explanatory texts to convey information and/or concepts, and narratives with a focus on engaging the reader by establishing context, using descriptive details and sensory language to describe the characters, setting, and plot, and organizing the event sequence to show character and plot development. Our teachers use resources from other established charter schools

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

in New York City and adapt the resources to meet the needs of the scholars in their classes. Our curriculum is also modified based on the reading levels of the scholars in the classroom.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts (“ELA”) assessment to students in 6 through 7 grade in April 2019. 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).

2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	120	28	20	0	1	121
7	124	22	9	1	0	125
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
All	244	50	29	1	1	246

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In our second year of operation, 39% of scholars performed at proficient or advanced levels on the State English Language Arts Exam.

Our 6th grade scholars entered our school with only 30 scholars scoring proficient or advanced on their 5th grade State English Language Arts Exam. That number grew to 44 scholars last school year. This is a 14% increase within a single year. This same cohort of scholars entered with 43 scholars earning a 1 on the state exam in the previous year, and finished 6th grade with only 34 scholars receiving a 1. This is a 20% decrease within a single year.

Our 7th grade scholars started the year with 58 scholars scoring proficient or advanced on the prior year’s state exam. That number dropped to 44 scholars last school year. This same cohort of scholars began this year with 28 scholars earning a 1 on the state exam in the previous year, and finished 7th grade with 34 scholars receiving a 1. These results showed that we needed to do more

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

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

in our 7th grade to challenge our scholars in order to continue maintaining the strong results we saw during their 6th grade year.

Our goal for this year was to see at least 60% of scholars score proficient and advanced. We did not meet that goal and have realized that the majority of our scholars earned a 2 on the state exam. This school year we have adjusted our intervention program, our curriculum, and our processes for analyzing data to ensure we achieve higher results in future years. We are also providing additional supports for our scholars who are trending towards earning a 2 on the exam. We have restructured our intervention programs for those specific scholars and are offering after school/Saturday interventions to specific scholars based on their state exam scores and iReady assessment scores throughout the year.

Performance on 2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	37	120	NA	NA
7	40	124	38	110
8	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	39	244	38	110

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school opened in the fall of 2017. We only have one year of results to compare.

ELA Performance by Grade Level and Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	38	110
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	NA	NA	NA	NA	38%	110

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

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 2018-19 English language arts MIP for all students of 105. 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

In the 2018-2019 school year, our PI score for English Language Arts was 166, exceeding the state MIP of 105 by 61 points. Our school has seen a lot of success in the last two years with seeing scholars succeed with earning at least a 2 or higher on the state exam. Coming into 6th grade, 35% of our scholars have earned a 1 on the state exam in the prior year. After a year within our school that percentage drops to less than 25%. Some of the practices that contribute to this success are the amount of time that scholars receive in reading instruction a week, the differentiated interventions we offer scholars, and the curriculum that is designed to expose scholars to a variety of rigorous texts and standards based instruction, Our school provides scholars with 100 minutes a day of English Language Arts instruction, 2-4 days of reading intervention for an additional 50 minutes a day, and 25 minutes of independent reading time daily. Our reading interventions are differentiated for the individual scholars, providing some scholars with guided reading instruction and others with book club style facilitation. Our curriculum includes a variety of fiction and non-fiction texts, ranging from poems to articles from the Washington Post. All lessons are standards aligned and include rigorous questioning that align to the rigor level of the state exams.

English Language Arts 2018-19 Performance Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level								
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4					
	23	39	25	13					
	PI	=	39	+	25	+	13	=	77
					50		26		76
							(.5)*26		13
							PI		166

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.²

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the school year, 2018-2019, our scholars exceeded the district average in terms of scholars performing proficient or advanced on the State English Language Arts Exam. Our scholars, in their second year at the school, had 38% of scholars performing at a Level 3 or 4 and the district average was 22% of 7th grade scholars performing at a level 3 or 4.

2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	NA	NA	28	1131
7	38	110	22	1058
8	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	38	110	25	2,189

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school exceed the district average by 26%. Last year this performance gap was 19%, which shows that we are increasing the difference between our school and our district schools. Our school has only been open since the fall of 2017 so we have no additional years to compare to.

English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District

² 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](#).

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	38	22
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	NA	NA	NA	NA	38	22

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

The SUNY Charter Schools Institute (“Institute”) conducts a comparative performance analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar 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 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the 2017-2018 school year, our school exceed the effect size 0.3, with an effect size 0.9. Our school was predicted to have 32.6% of scholars achieve proficient and advanced, and we had an actual percentage of 45.7% of scholars achieving proficient and advanced.

2017-18 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	94.7	127	45.7	32.6	13.1	0.90
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	94.7	127	45.7	32.6	13.1	0.90

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to large degree

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

This is the first school year where we have been able to measure comparative performance as we opened our school in the fall of 2017.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2015-16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2016-17	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2017-18	6	94.7	127	45.7	32.6	0.90

Goal 1: Growth Measure³

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 2017-18 and also have a state exam score from 2016-17 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2016-17 score are ranked by their 2017-18 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.

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

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁴

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the 2017-2018 school year, our school exceeded the target for mean growth percentile. That year our school only had scholars in 6th grade. Our school had a mean growth percentile of 54.5, exceeding the target by 4.5.

2017-18 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	NA	50.0
5	NA	50.0
6	54.5	50.0
7	NA	50.0
8	NA	50.0
All	54.5	50.0

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school opened in 2017, therefore we only have one year’s worth of data to compare.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Target
4	NA	NA	NA	50.0
5	NA	NA	NA	50.0
6	NA	NA	54.5	50.0
7	NA	NA	NA	50.0
8	NA	NA	NA	50.0
All	NA	NA	54.5	50.0

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

The table below is a summary of our academic goals for English Language Arts. Our school met four of the five Accountability Plan goals. In terms of absolute measures, our school met one of the goals, by exceeding the state’s MIP. We did not meet the absolute goal of having 75 percent of all tested scholars perform at proficiency. Our school met both of the comparative goals by exceeding the predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam, and by having a higher percentage of scholars perform at proficient than students in our school district. Finally, our school met the growth goal by achieving a mean growth percentile that was above the target set by the state.

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

⁴ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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.	Not Met
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.	Met
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.	Met
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 meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2017-18 results.)	Met
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 2017-18 results.)	Met

ACTION PLAN

Based on the results of the 2018-2019 state exam, our school has made several changes to help improve our overall success that involve intervention, curriculum shifts, and data analysis.

Intervention

We have started the year with a rigorous intervention program for Reading that occurs 2 to 4 days a week depending on the scholar's needs. Scholars receive a variety of supports ranging from guided reading four days a week, SETSS services in Reading, close novel study, and differentiated computer instruction through the iReady program. In addition to the above changes, we are also utilizing more advanced curriculum for our scholars who are on or above grade level to make sure that they are being challenged throughout the year. These scholars are reading rigorous non-fiction texts from sources like the Washington Post and the New York Times, and during intervention practicing their multiple-choice test skills utilizing past Regents exams.

Curriculum

In order to ensure that we have stronger results in the absolute goal for the upcoming school year, we have made significant changes to our curriculum and to the way that we analyze student data. We are confident that with these changes, we will see our school achieve stronger results in this area in the next school year. Our curriculum has been modified to include more nonfiction texts and a new unit on short stories that occurs at the beginning of the school year. We use this unit to introduce a lot of skills and establish expectations for the school year. Our teachers have increased the amount of support scholars receive in answering multiple choice questions as that was an area where we performed below the city average in a question by question analysis. We will have a strong focus on point of view, as this was a specific standard that our scholars performed below the city average on. This school year, we also saw our writing scores drop below the city average, which was a change from the prior school year. Our teachers have set up their classes to ensure that writing is happening on a daily basis in the English language arts classes, which was something that was not consistently the case in the prior year.

Data Analysis

To ensure that we are consistently collecting and analyzing data on scholar progress we are also implementing mastery days every month to assess whether or not scholars are mastering the skills involved in the Common Core State Standards. We have standardized this process as a school and are asking that teachers use a common method for collecting and analyzing data. We are confident that this process will help us have a better understanding throughout the year on what scholars' strengths and weaknesses are.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will be proficient in Mathematics.

BACKGROUND

Our mathematics program offers scholars 100 minutes of math each day, split into two classes. One of those classes addresses problem solving skills and the other class addresses procedural, computational skills. Both classes cover the same standards in the same sequence but with different questions and lesson plans. Our teachers use lesson plans and curriculum materials from established charter schools in New York City. The lessons and unit plans are adapted to fit the needs of our scholars, based on the levels of the scholars in each class. Lesson plans are reviewed and given feedback weekly to ensure a high quality. In 6th grade Math students learned content involving ratios and proportions, expressions and functions, geometry, statistics and probability, and the basic number system. The course backwards-planned from the CCSS 6th Grade Math standards. More specifically, the class included the following concepts: compare/order positive/negative fractions/decimals/mixed numbers; solve problems involving fractions, ratios, proportions, percentages; utilize algebraic expressions/equations; apply order of operations; solve, graph, interpret simple linear equations; analyze/use tables, graphs, rules to solve problems; investigate geometric patterns; convert units of measurement, identify properties of angles and two and three-dimensional shapes; determine pi, area, and circumference; analyze data sampling; theoretical and experimental probabilities; problem solve; think critically; compute the perimeter, area, and volume of common geometric objects. In 7th grade math, students learned content involving read, write, compare rational numbers in scientific notation; convert fractions to decimals/percent's; differentiate between rational/irrational numbers; apply exponents, powers, roots/use exponents in working with fractions; understand pre-algebra concepts; use algebraic terminology, expressions, equations, inequalities, graphs; interpret/evaluate expressions involving integer powers/simple roots; graph/interpret linear/nonlinear functions; apply Pythagorean Theorem; use mathematical reasoning; problem solve; solve real-life mathematical problems using algebraic expressions and equations; beginning understanding of algebraic/geometric relationships including angle measurement, area, and formulas; congruence and similarity using physical models; foundational knowledge of volume and formulas for finding the volume of cones, cylinders, and spheres.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

At each grade level, two of our math cohorts received ICT instruction and two of our math cohorts did not. The ICT cohort used a parallel teaching model to ensure appropriate differentiation for the various skill levels in the class.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 6 through 7 grade in April 2019. 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.

2018-19 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁵				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	119	28	20	0	1	120
7	125	23	10	0	0	125
8	0	0	0	0	0	0
All	244	51	30	0	1	245

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In our second year of operation, 41% of scholars performed at proficient or advanced levels on the State English Language Arts Exam.

Our 6th grade scholars entered our school with only 35 scholars scoring proficient or advanced on their 5th grade State English Language Arts Exam. That number grew to 52 scholars last school year. This is a 49% increase within a single year. This same cohort of scholars entered with 46 scholars earning a 1 on the state exam in the previous year, and finished 6th grade with only 26 scholars receiving a 1. This is a 43% decrease within a single year.

Our 7th grade scholars started the year with 63 scholars scoring proficient or advanced on the prior year's state exam. That number dropped to 49 scholars last school year. This same cohort of scholars began the year with 20 scholars earning a 1 on the state exam in the previous year, and finished 7th grade with 39 scholars receiving a 1. These results showed that we needed to do more

⁵ 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.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

in our 7th grade to challenge our scholars in order to continue maintaining the strong results we saw during their 6th grade year.

Our goal for this year was to see at least 71% of scholars score proficient and advanced. We did not meet that goal and have realized that the majority of our scholars earned a 2 on the state exam. This school year we have adjusted our intervention program, our curriculum, and our processes for analyzing data to ensure we achieve higher results in future years. We are also providing additional supports for our scholars who are trending towards earning a 2 on the exam. We have restructured our intervention programs for those specific scholars and are offering after school/Saturday interventions to specific scholars based on their state exam scores and iReady assessment scores throughout the year.

Performance on 2018-19 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	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	44	119	NA	NA
7	39	125	42	110
8	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	41	244	42	110

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school opened in the fall of 2017. We only have one year of results to compare.

Performance on a Regents Mathematics Exam Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

Grade	Year	Regents Exam	Percent Passing with a 65	Number Tested
8	2016-17	NA	NA	NA
8	2017-18	NA	NA	NA
8	2018-19	NA	NA	NA

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

In the 2018-2019 school year, our school did not offer a Regents exam. Our school will be administering the NYS Regents exam to 8th graders starting in the 2019-2020 school year.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	42	110
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	NA	NA	NA	NA	42	110

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2018-19 mathematics MIP for all students of 107. 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

In the 2018-2019 school year, our PI score for Mathematics was 177, exceeding the state MIP of 107 by 70 points. Our school has seen a lot of success in the last two years with seeing scholars succeed with earning at least a 2 or higher on the state exam. Coming into 6th grade, around 35% of our scholars have earned a 1 on the state exam in the prior year. After a year within our school that percentage drops to less than 30%. Some of the practices that contribute to this success are the amount of time that scholars receive in reading instruction a week, the differentiated interventions we offer scholars, and the curriculum that is designed to expose scholars to critical thinking skills and procedural fluency skills. Our school provides scholars with 100 minutes a day of Math instruction, 2 days of math intervention for an additional 100 minutes a week, and after school

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

math tutoring for scholars performing multiple years behind grade level. Our math interventions are differentiated for the individual scholars, providing some scholars with abstract problems to encourage critical thinking and others with direct instruction on standards from previous grades. Our curriculum includes opportunities for scholars to complete problems that require problem solving skills and quick procedural skills. All lessons are standards aligned and include rigorous questioning that align to the rigor level of the state exams.

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
	27	31	22	20

$$\begin{array}{r}
 \text{PI} = 31 + 22 + 20 = 73 \\
 \phantom{\text{PI}} + 44 = 84 \\
 \phantom{\text{PI}} + 0.5 * 40 = 20 \\
 \phantom{\text{PI}} \text{PI} = 177
 \end{array}$$

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.⁶

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the school year, 2018-2019, our scholars exceeded the district average in terms of scholars performing proficient or advanced on the State Mathematics Exam. Our scholars, in their second year at the school, had 42% of scholars performing at a Level 3 or 4 and the district average was 21% of 7th grade scholars performing at a level 3 or 4.

2018-19 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	NA	NA	NA	NA

⁶ 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](#).

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

4	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	NA	NA	26	1136
7	42	110	21	1097
8	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	42	110		

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school exceeded the district average by 21%. Our school has only been open since the fall of 2017 so we have no additional years to compare to.

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					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	42	
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	NA	NA	NA	NA	42	

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. 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 2017-18 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the 2017-2018 school year, our school exceeded the effect size 0.3, with an effect size 1.60. Our school was predicted to have 25% of scholars achieve proficient and advanced, and we had an actual percentage of 49.6% of scholars achieving proficient and advanced.

2017-18 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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
5	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	94.7	127	49.6	25.0	24.6	1.60
7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	94.7	127	49.6	25.0	24.6	1.60

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to large degree

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school opened in the fall of 2017. We only have data from the 2017-2018 school, therefore, we do not have comparative performance data.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2015-16	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2016-17	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2017-18	94.7	127	49.6	25.0	24.6	1.60

Goal 2: Growth Measure⁷

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.

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

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2017-18 and also have a state exam score in 2016-17 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2016-17 scores are ranked by their 2017-18 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁸

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In the 2017-2018 school year, our school exceeded the target for mean growth percentile. That year our school only had scholars in 6th grade. Our school had a mean growth percentile of 66.7, exceeding the target by 16.7.

2017-18 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	NA	50.0
5	NA	50.0
6	66.7	50.0
7	NA	50.0
8	NA	50.0
All	66.7	50.0

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school opened in 2017, therefore we only have one year's worth of data to compare.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Target
4	NA	NA	NA	50.0

⁸ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

5	NA	NA	NA	50.0
6	NA	NA	66.7	50.0
7	NA	NA	NA	50.0
8	NA	NA	NA	50.0
All	NA	NA	<u>66.7</u>	50.0

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

The table below is a summary of our academic goals for Mathematics. Our school met four of the five Accountability Plan goals. In terms of absolute measures, our school met one of the goals, by exceeding the state's MIP. We did not meet the absolute goal of having 75 percent of all tested scholars perform at proficiency. In order to ensure that we have stronger results in this area for the upcoming school year, we have made significant changes to our curriculum and to the way that we analyze student data. We are confident that with these changes, we will see our school achieve stronger results in this area in the next school year. Our school met both of the comparative goals by exceeding the predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam, and by having a higher percentage of scholars perform at proficient than students in our school district. Finally, our school met the growth goal by achieving a mean growth percentile that was above the target set by the state.

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.	Not met
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's mathematics exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Met
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.	Met
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 meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2017-18 results.)	Met
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 2017-18 results.)	Met

ACTION PLAN

Based on the results of the 2018-2019 state exam, our school has made several changes to help improve our overall success that involve intervention, curriculum shifts, and data analysis.

Intervention

We have started the year with a rigorous intervention program for Math that occurs 2 to 3 days a week. The program is adapted to meet individual scholars' needs. Scholars receive a variety of

supports ranging from small group targeted review, SETSS services in Math, tutoring after school, and differentiated computer instruction through the iReady or IXL programs. In addition to the above changes, we are also utilizing more advanced curriculum for our scholars who are on or above grade level to make sure that they are being challenged throughout the year. These scholars are working on challenging problem-solving scenarios that are aligned to state standards. We are also asking these scholars to practice skills that are on a grade level above where they are performing to ensure they are consistently challenged this year.

Curriculum

In order to ensure that we have stronger results in the absolute goal for the upcoming school year, we have made significant changes to our curriculum and to the way that we analyze student data. We are confident that with these changes, we will see our school achieve stronger results in this area in the next school year. Our curriculum has been modified to include a stronger focus on problem solving and achieving mastery at solving word problems and constructive responses. Our teachers have increased the amount of support scholars receive in answering constructive response questions as that was an area where we performed below the city average in a question by question analysis.

Data Analysis

To ensure that we are consistently collecting and analyzing data on scholar progress we are also implementing a common assessment system for unit tests across all three grade levels. The assessments will be aligned to the Common Core State Standards and will assess scholars at the rigor level of the State exam. After the test, our teachers will analyze the data in a consistent way using the standards to drive the analysis. We have standardized this process as a school and are asking that teachers use this common method for collecting and analyzing data. We are confident that this process will help us have a better understanding throughout the year on what scholars' strengths and weaknesses are.

GOAL 3: SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will be proficient in science.

BACKGROUND

In Science scholars focus on a mixture of Physical Science, Life Science, and Earth Science in 6th, 7th, and 8th grades. Beginning this school year, we also have two cohorts of 8th graders who take the Living Environment Regents course. The courses will include the following concepts and skills: Understand how topography is reshaped by weathering of rock/soil and transportation/deposition of sediment; explain meaning of radiation, convection, conduction; recognize/describe that currents in air/ocean distribute heat energy; investigate/describe how pollutants can affect weather/atmosphere; discuss how plate tectonics explain important features of Earth's surface and major geologic events; recognize how organisms in ecosystems exchange energy/nutrients among themselves and with environment; formulate testable hypothesis; design/conduct an experiment specifying variables to be changed, controlled, measured; draw conclusions based on data/evidence

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

presented in tables/graphs; make inferences on patterns/trends; explain daily, monthly, and seasonal changes on earth; explain how the atmosphere, hydrosphere, and lithosphere interact, evolve, and change; describe volcano and earthquake patterns, the rock cycle, and weather and climate changes. All courses backwards plan using the Next Generation Science Standards. All lesson plans follow the 5 E's: Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. Our teachers use curriculum materials, including lesson plans and unit plans, from an established New York City charter school. The materials are adapted to meet the needs of our scholars based on their knowledge upon entering our school.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2019. 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

Our school did have 8th grade scholars during the 2018-2019 school year.

Charter School Performance on 2018-19 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency of Students in At Least 2 nd Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	NA	NA
8	NA	NA
All	NA	NA

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Performance on a Regents Science Exam Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

Grade	Year	Regents Exam	Percent Passing with a 65	Number Tested
8	2016-17	NA	NA	NA
8	2017-18	NA	NA	NA
8	2018-19	NA	NA	NA

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Our school did have 8th grade scholars during the 2018-2019 school year.

Our school will be offering a Living Environment Regents course in the 2019-2020 school year.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

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 2018-19 comparative data may not yet be available. If not, schools should report comparison to the district's **2017-18** data.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our school did have 8th grade scholars during the 2017-2018 or 2018-2019 school years.

2018-19 State Science Exam

Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students ⁹	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	NA	NA	NA	NA

⁹ This table uses the prior year's results as 2018-19 district science scores are not yet available.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school did have 8th grade scholars during the 2017-2018 or 2018-2019 school years.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
All	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Our school did have 8th grade scholars during the 2018-2019 school year.

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.	NA
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.	NA

ACTION PLAN

Our school did have 8th grade scholars during the 2018-2019 school year.

GOAL 4: ESSA

Goal 4: ESSA

Our school's goal is to remain in good standing according to ESSA.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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

Under the state accountability system, our school met the ESSA requirements. Our school had an MIP of 143, exceeding the required MIP of 103.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our school opened in the fall of 2017. We only have one year of data to compare.

Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2016-17	NA
2017-18	Met
2018-19	NA

