



**Eugenio María de Hostos  
Charter School**

**2016-17 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 3, 2017

By Maycanitza Pérez

27 Zimbrich Street  
Rochester, NY 14621

(585) 544-6170

## INTRODUCTION

Maycanitza Pérez, Executive Director prepared this 2016-17 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Julio Vazquez	President, Finance Committee, Personnel Committee, High School Committee, Building Committee, Academic Committee
Dr. Margaret Quackenbush	Vice Chair, Finance Committee, Nominating Committee
Brian Roulin	Treasurer, Finance Committee (Chair)
Hilda Escher	Secretary, Academic Committee
Gaynelle Wethers	Personnel Committee
George M. Romell	Finance Committee
Dr. Miriam Vazquez	Building Committee, High School Committee, Personnel Committee, Academic Committee (Chair)
Raymond Ciccarelli	Finance Committee, Building Committee
Fernan Cepero	Personnel Committee (Chair)
Eugenio Marlin	Building Committee, Nominating Committee (Chair)
Marcia DeJesus Rueff	Academic Committee, High School Committee (Chair)
María Dalmau	Parent Representative
Kristen Rogers	Parent Representative
Ashley Ruiz	Parent Representative

Maycanitza Pérez has served as the Executive Director since 2016.

## INTRODUCTION

The Eugenio Maria de Hostos Charter School completed its eighteenth year of operation in 2016-2017 as a kindergarten through ninth grade school, serving 607 students. The school opened in September 2000 as a kindergarten through second grade school, adding one grade each year. The faculty and staff work diligently to achieve the school's mission of preparing students to meet and/or exceed the New York State standards in Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. Students in grades kindergarten through second learn Spanish through the Dual Language model, where the language of instruction alternates between English and Spanish. Students in grades third through ninth continue their Spanish studies during the Spanish Language Arts block. The faculty and staff view themselves as self-reflective, continuous learners. Parents are encouraged to be active participants in their children's educational program.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2012-13	50	54	50	51	41	44	38	35	30					393
2013-14	52	52	52	50	47	42	42	33	27					397
2014-15	52	48	52	53	43	42	42	50	25					407
2015-16	51	52	52	51	44	40	41	37	40					408
2016-17	103	66	76	55	51	52	49	56	44	55				607

## HIGH SCHOOL COHORTS

### ACCOUNTABILITY COHORT

The state's Accountability Cohort consists specifically of students who are in their fourth year of high school after the 9<sup>th</sup> grade. For example, the 2013 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9<sup>th</sup> grade in the 2013-14 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state's annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2016-17 school year, and either remained in the school for the rest of the year or left for an acceptable reason. (See New York State Education Department's website for its accountability rules and cohort definitions: [www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/))

The following table indicates the number of students in the Accountability Cohorts who are in their fourth year of high school and were enrolled on BEDS Day in October and on June 30<sup>th</sup>.

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>
2014-15	2011-12	2011	N/A	N/A	N/A

## HIGH SCHOOL COHORTS

2015-16	2012-13	2012	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	2013-14	2013	N/A	N/A	N/A

### TOTAL COHORT FOR GRADUATION

Students are included in the Total Cohort for Graduation also 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. If the school has discharged students for one of the following acceptable reasons, it may remove them from the graduation cohort: if they transfer to another public or private diploma-granting program with documentation, transfer to home schooling by a parent or guardian, transfer to another district or school, transfer by court order, leave the U.S. or die.

#### Fourth Year Total Cohort for Graduation

Fourth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade Anywhere	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 <sup>th</sup> of the Cohort's Fourth Year (a)	Additional Students Still in Cohort <sup>1</sup> (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2014-15	2011-12	2011	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015-16	2012-13	2012	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	2013-14	2013	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### 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)	Additional Students Still in Cohort <sup>2</sup> (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2014-15	2010-11	2010	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015-16	2011-12	2011	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	2012-13	2012	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Number of students who had been enrolled for at least one day prior to leaving the school and who were not discharged for an acceptable reason.

<sup>2</sup> Number of students who had been enrolled for at least one day prior to leaving the school and who were not discharged for an acceptable reason

## GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at the Eugenio María de Hostos Charter school will become proficient in reading and writing of the English language.

### BACKGROUND

Teachers in grades Kindergarten through second grade used the *Engage NY skills strand and commoncore.org* as part of the core reading program. Teachers in grades third through ninth used the *Engage NYS ELA modules*. Teachers in grades Kindergarten through sixth grade used guided reading books and novels for the reading instruction. Supplemental material such as *National Geographic* and *Scholastic News* magazines are used to expand students' background knowledge on a wide variety of topics. Instruction is delivered in a workshop format. Teachers in grades seventh through ninth used the NYS Common Core Curriculum with fidelity. As a partner of EL Education, instruction also included implementation of an Expedition in grades 7 and 8. Each Expedition was aligned to a particular ELA module and was interdisciplinary in nature. Students were exposed to field experts and participated in relevant field studies and service learning opportunities. Each Expedition included field experts, field work, culmination of learning activities, and final products.

Students in Kindergarten through sixth grade are assessed and progress monitored with IRLA (Independent Reading Level Assessment) and the i-Ready program. Ready Instruction Books from i-Ready are used to reinforce skills and become acclimated with the Common Core ELA assessment in grades third through sixth. The New York State Common Core ELA exams are administered to all students in grades third through eighth.

Professional development sessions for grades Kindergarten through sixth grade are held once in a six-day cycle for 1½ hours. Topics are chosen based on observations, student data, school initiatives and staff request. Some of the topics covered were: 6+1 Traits of writing, examining student writing and social studies curriculum planning. Grade level meetings are also held once in a six-day cycle to address grade specific needs and planning instruction based on student data.

Professional development sessions for grades seventh through ninth were held every other day. Professional Learning opportunities were aligned to the EL Education Work Plan which included specific instructional priorities from the ELA Common Core Curriculum. Topics for PD included: the use of protocols, assessment for learning, lesson planning components and the use of student work to drive instruction.

### 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.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts (“ELA”) assessment to students in 3 through 8th grades in April 2017. 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).

2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>3</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	54	0	0	1	1	56
4	52	0	0	0	0	52
5	50	0	0	2	2	54
6	50	0	0	0	0	50
7	51	0	0	2	1	56
8	43	0	0	1	1	45
All	300	0	0	6	5	313

### RESULTS

The percent of EMHCS students scoring as proficient was greater for students who were enrolled in at least their second year. The percent of EMHCS students in all grades combined scoring as proficient was greater for those students who were enrolled in at least their second year.

Performance on 2016-17 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	59%	54	63%	43
4	42%	52	43%	44
5	28%	50	30%	27
6	12%	50	16%	37
7	25%	51	33%	33
8	30%	43	40%	30
All	33%	300	39%	214

<sup>3</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.

## EVALUATION

EMHCS fell short of the state’s 75% absolute measure of reaching proficiency. EMHCS has shown growth in all grade levels in cohort versus non-cohort students. Most notably, in grades three, five, seven, and eight.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In the 2014-2016 school years, the overall cohort data showed that the amount of students showing proficiency on the ELA exam plateaued. When looking at the 2016-2017 data in comparison to the previous two years, it shows a significant increase in percentage of students who demonstrated proficiency. Although it is noted that the number of students taking the tests varied from year to year, we are looking at the overall percentage achieving proficiency as outlined by the absolute measure.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	62.5%	40	64.4%	45	63%	43
4	21.4%	42	34.1%	41	43%	44
5	19.4%	36	5.7%	35	30%	27
6	46.9%	32	30.3%	33	16%	37
7	8.8%	34	27.3%	33	33%	33
8	28.6%	21	17.9%	39	40%	30
All	31.7%	205	31.4%	226	39%	214

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (“PLI”) on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (“AMO”) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

## METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 English language arts AMO of **111**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

# ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

## RESULTS

The EMHCS aggregate performance level index for the April 2017 ELA is 107, under the AMO by 4 points.

English Language Arts 2016-17 Performance Level Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
214	27%	41%	23%	10%

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 41 & + & 23 & + & 10 & = & 74 \\
 & & & & 23 & + & 10 & = & \underline{33} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 107
 \end{array}$$

### 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

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the Rochester City School District. Comparisons are between the results for each grade at EMHCS and the respective grades in the Rochester City School District. An additional comparison represents the total result of students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the Rochester City School District.

## RESULTS

The percent of EMHCS students scoring at or above Level 3 was greater than that of the Rochester City School District in the six grades tested. The percent of EMHCS students in all grades combined scoring at or above Level 3 was greater than that of the corresponding grades combined in the Rochester City School District.

## 2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	63%	43	10%	1299
4	43%	44	8%	1388
5	30%	27	6%	1326
6	16%	37	5%	1136
7	33%	33	5%	873
8	40%	30	9%	975
All	38%	214	7%	6,997

### EVALUATION

EMHCS has met the measure in 2016-17 by having a higher percent meeting proficiency overall in comparison to the Rochester City School District. The measure was exceeded by 31 percentage points. EMHCS also met the measure by outperforming the district in the six tested grades. This measure was exceeded as follows: 53 percentage points in grade 3; 35 percentage points in grade 4; 24 percentage point in grade 5; 11 percentage points in grade 6; 28 percentage points in grade 7 and 31 percentage points in grade 8.

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

EMHCS has outperformed the Rochester City School District for the past three years. This measure was exceeded as follows: 27 percentage points in 2014-2015 and 24 percentage points in 2015-2016, 32 percentage points in 2016-2017.

## 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					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	61%	7%	63%	8%	63%	10%
4	21%	5%	34%	8%	43%	8%
5	20%	4%	6%	5%	30%	6%
6	45%	5%	28%	6%	16%	5%
7	9%	3%	27%	5%	33%	5%
8	29%	4%	18%	6%	40%	9%
All	32%	5%	31%	7%	39%	7%

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

EMHCS has outperformed the Rochester City School District for the past four years. This measure was exceeded as follows: 14.4% percentage points in 2013-2014; 14.4% percentage points in 2014-2015; 27% percentage points in 2014-2015; 24% percentage points in 2015-2016 and 31.5% percentage points in 2016-2017.

English Language Performance of EMHCS and RCSD by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of EMHCS students enrolled in at least their second year at levels 3 and 4.							
	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2016	
	EMHCS	RCSD	EMHCS	RCSD	EMHCS	RCSD	EMHCS	RCSD
3	27%	5%	61%	7%	63%	8%	63%	10%
4	13%	7%	21%	21%	34%	8%	43%	8%
5	16%	6%	20%	20%	6%	5%	30%	6%
6	22%	4%	45%	45%	28%	6%	16%	5%
7	4.5%	4%	9%	9%	27%	5%	33%	7%
8	33%	6%	29%	29%	18%	6%	40%	9%
All	<b>19.7%</b>	<b>5.3%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>7.5%</b>

To show that at EMHCS ELA instruction enables its students to achieve at a higher level than similar schools, four neighborhood schools were chosen for comparison: School #8, School #22, School #9 and School #45. All four schools are located in the same neighborhood and have comparable demographics as EMHCS. EMHCS outperformed all four of its neighborhood comparison schools overall by an average of 32 percentage points. In addition, EMHCS outperformed each comparison school in each of its tested grades.

2016-2017 English Language Arts Performance of EMHCS 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 at Levels 3 and 4				
	EMHCS	RCSD – School #8	RCSD – School #22	RCSD – School #9	RCSD – School #45
3	63%	8%	39%	6%	14%
4	43%	4%	1%	4%	7%
5	30%	4%	0%	1%	9%
6	16%	6%	3%	6%	4%
7	33%	2%	NA	NA	9%
8	40%	7%	NA	NA	11%
All	<b>39%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>

#### 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 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## RESULTS

The chart below displays how the charter school students in each grade performed compared to students in public schools in New York State with the same grade and a similar percent of economically disadvantaged students.

*2015-16 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	72%	50	62%	34.8	27.2	1.62
4	74%	43	33%	33.6	-.6	-0.04
5	87%	39	5%	21.2	-16.2	-1.08
6	59%	41	29%	32.4	-3.4	-0.23
7	64%	36	25%	32.1	-7.1	-0.43
8	72%	39	18%	33.5	-15.5	-0.84
All	<b>71%</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>31.5</b>	<b>-1.2</b>	<b>-0.08</b>

**School’s Overall Comparative Performance:**

***Lower than expected***

## EVALUATION

EMHCS exceeded the overall Effect Size of 0.3 in the 2014-2015 school year. For the other two school years listed below, we fell within the range of -0.08 for the Effect Size.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2013-14	3-8	83.75%	240	18	19.8	-0.08
2014-15	3-8	81.1%	236	30.2	20	.76
2015-16	3-8	71.4%	248	30	31.5	-0.08

### Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>5</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 state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.

## METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2015-16 and also have a state exam score from 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 score are ranked by their 2015-16 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students’ growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school’s mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>6</sup>

## RESULTS

EMHCS students in all grades combined did not meet the Statewide Median of the Mean Growth Percentile. However, in grade six, the school exceeded the statewide median by 14.7 percentile points.

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

<sup>6</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### 2015-16 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	25.4	50.0
5	44.8	50.0
6	64.7	50.0
7	36.2	50.0
8	42.8	50.0
All	<b>42.3</b>	50.0

### EVALUATION

EMHCS did not meet the measure in the 2015-2016 school year. As a school, we fell below the measure by 7.7 percentile points.

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

EMHCS exceeded the measure in the 2013-2014 school year, but fell below in the following two consecutive school years from 2014-2016. Sixth grade consistently exceeds the mean growth percentile. As evidenced by the table, grades five and eight stay within a range that falls just below the statewide median.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Median
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	
4	40.6	39.2	25.4	50.0
5	44.7	51.4	44.8	50.0
6	67.4	60.2	64.7	50.0
7	54.9	35.6	36.2	50.0
8	46.2	49.1	42.8	50.0
All	50.9	46.8	42.3	50.0

## SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Based on the below table regarding types, measure, and outcomes, EMHCS achieved their goal of comparative data in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison but did not achieve their goals of 75% performing at proficiency, exceeding its predicted level of performance by an Effective size of 0.3 or above and under the state’s Growth Model did not meet or exceed the unadjusted growth percentile in ELA for all students tested.

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
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.	Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 results.)	Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each year, under the state’s Growth Model the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile. (Using 2015-16 results.)	Did Not Achieve

## ACTION PLAN

EMHCS staff will continue their work with the book *6+1 Traits of Writing*. Literacy Coaches as well as consultants have started providing staff with training on implementation and will spend time reviewing key concepts. The model will provide staff with a framework for looking at student writing and ensuring that students write for a variety of purposes and audiences.

Staff will also continue their work with the *RACE Strategy* and begin introducing the formula in all primary grades. By starting *RACE Strategy* in the primary grades, teachers and students in kindergarten through second grade will begin using the appropriate language and make it an easier transition for students into the testing grades. Using the *RACE Strategy* will help prepare them for the writing portion of the New York State Common Core ELA exam.

Instructional staff will utilize the Independent Reading Level Assessment (IRLA). This diagnostic program will allow us to develop a more comprehensive and data-driven approach to servicing intervention students. Through the use of the IRLA, teachers can provide students with centers that target their instructional needs and reinforce and/or enrich their understanding of a particular skill or concept. Enhancing classroom libraries with leveled books, will allow students to have access to materials that meet their independent reading level for both home and classroom instruction.

We will use the i-Ready program for benchmarking and progress monitoring students. Teachers will utilize the online program, as well as the print materials to supplement what is needed for students’ individual needs based on the data provided from the i-Ready program and the IRLA.

## HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career readiness standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. (N/A)

### METHOD

The school administered the [Choose an item.] that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department currently defines the college and career readiness standard as scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam or Level 4 (meeting Common Core expectations) on the Regents in Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core).<sup>7</sup> This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that passed the exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to do so. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2013 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance. (N/A)

English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 75 or Level 4 on Common Core Exam  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>8</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 75 or Level 4 on Common Core exam
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

<sup>7</sup> The statewide adaptation of new State Standards includes incorporating college and career readiness performance standards for the English language arts exam. The state has benchmarked student ELA test performance to the likely need for remedial course work when students enter college by comparing student 3-8 test results and Regents results to their post-secondary experience at SUNY and CUNY. Besides raising the cut scores for proficiency in the 3-8 testing program, the state has begun to set college and career readiness standards for passing Regents.

<sup>8</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure's target. (N/A)

English Regents Passing Rate with a score of 75 or Level 4 (Common Core) by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 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 75 on the New York State Regents English exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. (N/A)

### 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. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2013 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance. (N/A)

English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 75 or 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>9</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 75 or Level 4 on Common Core exam
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

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

## EVALUATION

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

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target.(N/A)

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (“APL”) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (“AMO”) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

## METHOD

In receiving a waiver for its federal No Child Left Behind accountability system, the New York State Education Department now holds high schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards meeting college and career readiness standards. See page 72 of SED’s ESEA waiver application for the high school AMOs:

[www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver\\_REVISED.pdf](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver_REVISED.pdf)

The AMO continues to be SED’s basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 English language arts AMO of **178**.

The APL is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of students in the Accountability Cohort at Levels 2 through 4 to the sum of the percent of students at Level 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible APL is 200. The Regents exam in Comprehensive English is scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Level 1, 65 to 74 is Level 2, 75 to 89 is Level 3, and 90 to 100 is Level 4. The Regents Common Core Examination in English is scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is level 1, 65 to 78 is level 2; 79 to 84 is level 3, and 85 to 100 is level 4.

## RESULTS

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. (N/A)

English Language Arts Accountability Performance Level (APL)  
For the 2013 High School Accountability Cohort

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & [?] & + & [?] & + & [?] & = & [?] \\
 & & & & [?] & + & [?] & = & [?] \\
 & & & & & & \text{APL} & = & [?]
 \end{array}$$

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure, by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas. (N/A)

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance. (N/A)

#### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (“APL”) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (N/A)

### 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. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

English Regents Accountability Performance Level (APL)<sup>10</sup>  
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2011	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas. (N/A)

<sup>10</sup> For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s APL, see page 31.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

<b>Goal 1: Optional Measure</b>
[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]
<b>METHOD:</b>
<b>RESULTS:</b>
<b>EVALUATION:</b>
<b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b>

## SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL <sup>11</sup>

EMHCS did achieve the comparative measure of performance relative to the district, and outscored the four school in the neighborhood with similar demographics. EMHCS did not meet or exceed the absolute measure of 75 percent of the students being proficient.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core)) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (Using 2015-16 school district results.)	N/A

<sup>11</sup> If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

### ACTION PLAN

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the *specific results* and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented. (N/A)

## GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: Mathematics

All students at the Eugenio Maria de Hostos Charter School will demonstrate mastery of mathematical concepts.

#### BACKGROUND

Teachers in grades kindergarten through eighth grade will be using the *New York State Common Core Math Module Curriculum*. Instruction includes fluency, concept development, student application, and a debrief. During the fluency portion, students practice with calculations through a variety of different activities in order to increase speed and accuracy. During the concept development, and student application, students will develop conceptual understanding of topics based on the New York State standards. Students learn and practice concepts through a number of perspectives as a class, independently and/or in groups. The debrief portion brings the class together in order to analyze student thinking, and reflect on learning. Teachers will also use this time to help students clear up misconceptions. The mathematics modules include exit tickets that teachers give to students at the end of each lesson. Students answer questions, and teachers use the exit tickets as a quick assessment.

Students in kindergarten through eighth grade are assessed and progress monitored with the math curriculum's exit tickets, mid-module and end-of-module assessments, and teacher observations. Students in grades Kindergarten through sixth use the i-Ready program for benchmarking and progress monitoring. Ready Instruction Books from i-Ready are used to reinforce skills and become acclimated with the Common Core math assessment in grades third through sixth. The New York State Math exams are administered to all students in third through eighth grade.

Professional development sessions for grades Kindergarten through sixth are held once in a six-day cycle for one hour. Topics are chosen based on observations, student data, school initiatives and staff request. Some of the topics covered in the past were: math centers, math vocabulary, differentiation, using games to practice math concepts and skills, curriculum alignment, and analyzing assessment data.

Professional development sessions for grades seventh through eighth were held every other day. Professional Learning opportunities were aligned to the EL Education Work Plan which included specific instructional priorities from the Math Common Core Curriculum. Topics for PD included: the use of protocols, assessment for learning, lesson planning components and the use of student work to drive instruction.

#### 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 third through eighth grades in April 2017. 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.

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>12</sup>				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	54	0	0	0	1	55
4	51	0	0	1	0	52
5	52	0	0	0	2	54
6	48	0	0	1	1	50
7	52	0	0	0	4	56
8	41	0	0	1	3	45
<b>All</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>312</b>

## RESULTS

The percent of EMHCS students scoring as proficient was greater for students who were enrolled in at least their second year. The percent of EMHCS students in all grades combined scoring as proficient was greater for those students who were enrolled in at least their second year.

Performance on 2016-17 State Mathematics Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	76%	54	86%	42
4	27%	51	30%	43
5	33%	52	36%	28
6	15%	48	14%	35
7	25%	52	33%	33
8	7%	41	10%	30
<b>All</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>211</b>

<sup>12</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.

## EVALUATION

EMHCS fell short of the state’s 75% absolute measure of reaching proficiency. EMHCS has shown growth in all grade levels (except sixth) in cohort versus non-cohort students. Most notably, in third grade with an increase of ten percentage points between cohort and non-cohort students.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

When looking at the overall grades 3-8 data, we have showed a decline in the number of cohort students meeting proficiency. There has been a steady increase in the number of third graders who have achieved proficiency. However, the other grades fluctuated from year to year and have not shown a steady pattern of growth.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	77.5%	40	80%	45	86%	42
4	33.3%	42	45.2%	42	30%	43
5	45.7%	35	25.7%	35	36%	28
6	61.3%	31	64.5%	31	14%	35
7	12.9%	31	18.8%	32	33%	33
8	5.6%	18	2.8%	36	10%	30
<b>All</b>	<b>43.1%</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>41.2%</b>	<b>221</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>211</b>

### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (“PLI”) on the State mathematics exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (“AMO”) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

## METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 mathematics AMO of **109**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> In contrast to NYSED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

## RESULTS

The EMHCS aggregate performance index for the 2016 Math exam is 94, this fell short of the states PI of 109.

Mathematics 2016-17 Performance Level Index (PLI)				
Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
211	38%	32%	18%	13%
	PI	=	32	+
			18	+
			13	=
			PI	=
				=
				63
				31
				94

### 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

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the Rochester City School District. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the Rochester City School District, as well as between the total result of students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for the corresponding grades in the Rochester City School District.

## RESULTS

The percent of EMHCS students scoring at or above Level 3 was greater than that of the Rochester City School District in all of the tested grades. Additionally, the percent of EMHCS students in all grades combined scoring at or above Level 3 was greater than that of the corresponding grades combined in the Rochester City School District by 29 percentage points.

**2016-17 State Mathematics 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	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	86%	42	11%	2040
4	30%	43	8%	2041
5	36%	28	6%	1755
6	14%	35	5%	1614
7	33%	33	7%	1388
8	10%	30	9%	1348
<b>All</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>10,234</b>

**EVALUATION**

EMHCS has met the measure in 2017 by having a higher percent overall in comparison to the RCSD. The RCSD had 8% of its students meeting and/or exceeding standards compared to EMHCS’s 37%. Additionally, EMHCS outperformed the district in all tested grades.

**ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE**

EMHCS has outperformed the Rochester City School District for the past three years.

**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					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	76%	13%	78%	11%	86%	14%
4	33%	9%	45%	11%	30%	9%
5	46%	7%	26%	5%	36%	8%
6	63%	7%	62%	7%	14%	6%
7	13%	4%	19%	4%	33%	5%
8	6%	1%	3%	1%	10%	1%
<b>All</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>9%</b>

# MATHEMATICS

## Additional Evidence

EMHCS has outperformed the Rochester City School District for the past four years.

### Mathematics Performance of EMHCS and RCSD by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of EMHCS Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2013-2014		2014-2015		2015-2016		2016-2017	
	EMHCS	RCSD	EMHCS	RCSD	EMHCS	RCSD	EMHCS	RCSD
3	54.5%	11%	76%	13%	78%	11%	86%	14%
4	52%	12%	33%	9%	45%	11%	30%	8%
5	43%	8%	46%	7%	26%	5%	36%	9%
6	64%	6%	63%	7%	62%	7%	14%	6%
7	26%	5%	13%	4%	19%	4%	33%	5%
8	17%	1%	6%	1%	3%	1%	10%	1%
All	<b>49%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>7%</b>

To demonstrate that EMHCS Math instruction enables its students to achieve at a higher level than similar schools, we have chosen four schools for comparison: School #8, School #22, School #9 and School #45. All four are located in the same neighborhood and have comparable demographics as EMHCS. EMHCS outperformed all four of its neighborhood comparison schools overall by an average of 31% percentage points.

### 2016-2017 Mathematics Performance of EMHCS 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 at Levels 3 and 4				
	EMHCS	RCSD – School #8	RCSD – School #22	RCSD – School #9	RCSD – School #45
3	86%	4%	3%	9%	16%
4	30%	2%	0%	18%	3%
5	36%	4%	0%	4%	11%
6	14%	2%	0%	11%	6%
7	33%	0%	NA	NA	2%
8	10%	0%	NA	NA	0%
All	<b>35%</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6%</b>

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

## MATHEMATICS

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 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

### RESULTS

In 2016, the school's overall comparative performance was higher than expected to a meaningful degree.

*2015-16 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	72%	50	76%	37.2	38.8	1.91
4	73%	44	48%	37.1	10.9	0.57
5	87%	39	26%	24.7	1.3	0.07
6	59%	39	66%	38.5	28.5	1.64
7	66%	35	17%	31.2	-14.2	-0.75
8	69%	36	3%	17.6	-14.6	-0.72
All	71%	243	39%	31.6	10.5	.56

**School's Overall Comparative Performance:**

**Higher than expected to a meaningful degree**

### EVALUATION

EMHCS met the comparative performance measure, which requires that schools perform better than expected at least to a small degree. The report indicates that the Effect Size was 0.56, which is higher than expected to a meaningful degree than the measure's goal of 0.3.

# MATHEMATICS

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

EMHCS exceeded the overall Effect Size of 0.3 for the Mathematics Comparative Performance for the past consecutive three years.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2013-14	3-8	78.5%	235	42.1	26	.9
2014-15	3-8	83.7%	228	42.5	26.2	.91
2015-16	3-8	71%	243	42	31.6	.59

### Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>14</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 state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

## METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2015-16 and also have a state exam score in 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 scores are ranked by their 2015-16 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>15</sup>

EMHCS students in all grades combined did not meet the Statewide Median of the Mean Growth Percentile. However, in grade six, the school exceeded the statewide median by 16.7 percentile points.

<sup>14</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>15</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

# MATHEMATICS

## 2015-16 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	17.3	50.0
5	44.7	50.0
6	68.4	50.0
7	14.8	50.0
8	26.3	50.0
All	<b>34.3</b>	50.0

### EVALUATION

EMHCS did not meet the measure in the 2015-2016 school year. As a school, we fell below the measure in all grade levels with the exception of sixth grade.

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

EMHCS exceeded the measure in the 2013-2014 school year, but fell below in the 2014-2016 school years. Sixth grade consistently exceeds the mean growth percentile. As evidenced by the table, each of the other grades is inconsistent in their results for Mean Growth Percentile from year to year.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Median
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	
4	34.8	28.6	17.3	50.0
5	41.1	40.1	44.7	50.0
6	81	68.9	68.4	50.0
7	58.8	29.2	14.8	50.0
8	41.9	24.1	26.3	50.0
All	<b>52.1</b>	<b>39.5</b>	<b>34.3</b>	<b>50.0</b>

### EVALUATION

EMHCS has met the measure in 2015-16 by having a higher percent meeting proficiency overall in comparison to the district. The measure was exceeded by 24 percentage points. EMHCS also met the measure by outperforming the district in the six tested grades. This measure was exceeded as follows: 55 percentage points in grade 3; 26 percentage points in grade 4; 1 percentage point in grade 5; 22 percentage points in grade 6; 22 percentage points in grade 7 and 12 percentage points in grade 8.

## SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

EMHCS did achieve the comparative measure of performance relative to the district, and outscored the four school in the neighborhood with similar demographics. EMHCS did not meet or exceed the absolute measure of 75 percent of the students being proficient.

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.	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 mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Achieve
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 2015-16 school district results.)	Achieve
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Did Not Achieve

## ACTION PLAN

EMHCS teachers will continue to revisit the curriculum maps and modify as needed. These curriculum maps help teachers to standardize expectations and identify gaps across grade levels. They will continue to use assessment data, including the NYS Math item analyses, to plan instruction. The data will also be used to determine which students need additional instruction.

Teachers will also continue using different web based programs to reinforce skills. Students will use i-Ready in grades Kindergarten through sixth grade. It will allow us to understand our students' needs and develop activities and lessons to best support them.

In grades Kindergarten through sixth, teachers will use Number Worlds, a math intervention program. Students will be assessed, and if needed, will begin in the level they tested into. Students will be progress monitored through weekly assessments.

EMHCS will persist in providing professional development to teachers. The kindergarten through sixth grade math teachers will continue to attend the math professional development opportunities provided by the math coach.

## HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career readiness standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents math exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents Common Core mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. (N/A)

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Regents Algebra I (Common Core), Geometry, Geometry (Common Core), Algebra 2/Trigonometry, and/or Algebra II (Common Core) exams. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department defines the college and career readiness standard as scoring 80 or Level 4 on a Common Core exam (fully meeting Common Core expectations).<sup>16</sup> This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to achieve the requisite score on any one of the Regents mathematics exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents mathematics exam multiple times or have taken multiple mathematics exams. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a mathematics exam. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2013 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance. (N/A)

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 80 or Level 4 on Common Core Exam by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>17</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 80 or Level 4 on Common Core exam
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

<sup>16</sup> The statewide adaptation of the revised State Standards includes incorporating college and career readiness performance standards for the English language arts exam. The state has benchmarked student mathematics test performance to the likely need for remedial course work when students enter college by comparing student 3-8 test results and Regents results to their post-secondary experience at SUNY and CUNY. Besides raising the cut scores for proficiency in the 3-8 testing program, the state has begun to set college and career readiness standards for passing Regents.

<sup>17</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

## MATHEMATICS

this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas. (N/A)

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

#### Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a score of 80 or Level 4 (Common Core) by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8<sup>th</sup> grade math exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents math exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents Common Core mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. (N/A)

### METHOD

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

### RESULTS

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2013 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance. (N/A)

#### Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 80 or Level 4 on Common Core exam among Students Who Were Not Proficient in 8<sup>th</sup> Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort <sup>18</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 80 or Level 4 on Common Core exam
--------------------	------------------	---

<sup>18</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

## MATHEMATICS

2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure's target. (N/A)

#### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Accountability Performance Level ("APL") on a Regents mathematics exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. (N/A)

### METHOD

In receiving a waiver for its federal No Child Left Behind accountability system, the State Education Department now law holds high schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards meeting college and career readiness standards. See page 72 of SED's ESEA waiver application for the high school AMOs:

[http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver\\_REVISED.pdf](http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver_REVISED.pdf)

The AMO continues to be SED's basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds 2016-17 mathematics AMO of **165**.

The APL is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of students in the Accountability Cohort at Levels 2 through 4 to the sum of the percent of students at Level 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible APL is 200. The Regents exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Level 1, 65 to 79 is Level 2, 80 to 89 is Level 3, and 90 to 100 is Level 4. The Regents Common Core exams in mathematics are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is level 1; 65 to 73 is level 2, 74 to 84 is level 3, and 85 to 100 is level 4. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

#### Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL) For the 2013 High School Accountability Cohort

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

# MATHEMATICS

Number in Cohort	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
N/A	[?]	[?]	[?]	[?]

$$\begin{array}{rcccccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & [?] & + & [?] & + & [?] & = & [?] \\
 & & & & [?] & + & [?] & = & [?] \\
 & & & & & & \text{APL} & = & [?]
 \end{array}$$

## EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure, by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas. (N/A)

## 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. (N/A)

### Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in mathematics of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (N/A)

## 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. (N/A)

## RESULTS

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

### Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL) of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District<sup>19</sup>

Cohort	Charter School	School District
--------	----------------	-----------------

<sup>19</sup> See page 39 above for an explanation of the APL.

## MATHEMATICS

	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2011	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas. (N/A)

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

<p><b>Goal 1: Optional Measure (N/A)</b></p> <p>[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]</p>
<p><b>METHOD:</b></p> <p><b>RESULTS:</b></p> <p><b>EVALUATION:</b></p> <p><b>ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:</b></p>

### SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS GOAL <sup>20</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. (N/A)

Type	Measures	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents Common Core mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80	N/A

<sup>20</sup> If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

## MATHEMATICS

	on a New York State Regents mathematics exam OR fully meeting Common Core expectations on a Regents Common Core mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a New York State Regents mathematics exam of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the school district of comparison. (Using 2015-16 school district results.)	N/A

### ACTION PLAN

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the *specific results* and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented. (N/A)

## GOAL 3: SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Science

All students at the Eugenio Maria de Hostos Charter School will demonstrate mastery of Science concepts.

### BACKGROUND

Teachers in kindergarten through fifth grade use the BSCS Science T.R.A.C.S. program, and supplement the program with teacher-made materials. The sixth through eighth grade teachers use the National Geographic Science program. Both these programs actively develop concepts, inquiry skills and problem-solving skills through a sequence of developmentally-appropriate activities. Teachers in grades K-8 work with the ELA teachers to create thematic units in science.

#### Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in fourth and eighth grade in spring 2017. 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

The table below includes EMHCS cohort and non-cohort data for the 2016-2017 School Year for grades four and eight. EMHCS did not meet the goal of 75 percent proficiency for both grade levels.

Charter School Performance on 2016-17 State Science Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	All Students		Charter School Students Enrolled In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	86%	51	86%	44
8	24%	45	32%	22
<b>All</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>66</b>

### EVALUATION

Based on percent of students at proficiency, EMHCS exceeded the goal of 75% achieving proficiency with regard to fourth grade students (both cohort and non-cohort with 86 percent achieving proficiency, but missed the benchmark for eighth grade cohort students with 32 percent at

## SCIENCE

proficiency. This table also shows that at eighth grade, cohort students outperformed non-cohort students by eight percent.

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The results indicate that EMHCS has met the goal of 75 percent of students meeting and/or exceeding standards in grade four for the past three years. In grade eight, the results indicate the EMHCS has not met the goal of 75 percent of students meeting and/or exceeding standards the prior three years.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	90%	43	93%	42	86%	44
8	52%	23	44%	36	32%	22
<b>All</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>68.5%</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>66</b>

### 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.

### RESULTS

The table below includes EMHCS Cohort data for the 2016-2017 School Year in comparison to the all students in grades four and eight who took the NYS science exam in the Rochester City School District. EMHCS outperformed the Rochester City School District.

2016-17 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	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	86%	44	53%	2,158
8	32%	22	13%	1,114
<b>All</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>3,272</b>

## EVALUATION

Based on percent of students at proficiency, EMHCS achieved proficiency with regard to fourth grade cohort students with 86 percent at proficiency but missed the benchmark for eighth grade students with 32 percent at proficiency. At fourth grade, EMHCS outperformed the Rochester City School District by 33 percent and at eighth grade by 19 percent.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The table below includes EMHCS Cohort data for the 2016-2017 School Year. Comparison data for the Rochester City School District is not available for the 2016-2017 School Year. EMHCS has outperformed RCSD the prior 2 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					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
4	90%	61%	93%	57%	86%	53%
8	52%	16%	44%	20%	32%	13%
All	71%	38.5%	68.5%	38.5%	59%	40%

## SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Based on the below table regarding types, measure, and outcomes, EMHCS achieved their goal of comparative data in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison but did not achieve their goal of 75% proficiency for each grade level tested, since it was only achieved for fourth grade.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Did Not Achieve
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

## ACTION PLAN

EMHCS continues to use the BSCS Science T.R.A.C.S. program. With new science learning standards having been released, we will begin to look at new programs to address the new standards. We will also be attending professional development at BOCES to gain further competency with the new standards and to become better prepared to meet the demands associated with the standards.

## HIGH SCHOOL SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents science exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. (N/A)

### 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. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2013 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance. (N/A)

Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>21</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

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

	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17

<sup>21</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

## SCIENCE

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

### 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. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

#### 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
2011	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

# SOCIAL STUDIES

## EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas. (N/A)

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

## GOAL 4: SOCIAL STUDIES

### Goal 4: Social Studies

N/A

### Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents U.S. History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. (N/A)

## 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. (N/A)

## RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2013 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance. (N/A)

U.S. History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>22</sup>

--	--	--

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

## SOCIAL STUDIES

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2011	N/A	<b>N/A</b>
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

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

Cohort Designation	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent to students in the high school Total Cohort passing the Regents U.S. History exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the school district of comparison. (N/A)

### 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. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

#### 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

**EVALUATION**

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

**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. (N/A)

**Goal 4: Absolute Measure**

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents Global History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. (N/A)

**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. (N/A)

**RESULTS**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2013 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance. (N/A)

Global History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>23</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

<sup>23</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

## SOCIAL STUDIES

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

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

Cohort Designation	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Total Cohort passing the Regents Global History exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the school district of comparison. (N/A)

### 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. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### 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. (N/A)

## GOAL 5: NCLB

### Goal 5: NCLB

The EMHCS will remain a school in good standing according to the state's NCLB accountability system.

#### Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

### METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind ("NCLB") accountability system.

### RESULTS

According to the New York State's <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/ESEADesignations.html> issued in August 2017, our school 2016-2017 Accountability Status is: *Charter School in Good Standing*.

### EVALUATION

The report indicates that the school met the goal of remaining a school in good standing.

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

EMHCS has been and continues to be designated as a school in good standing.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2012-13	Good Standing
2013-14	Good Standing
2014-15	Good Standing
2015-16	Good Standing
2016-17	Good Standing

## GOAL 6: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

### GOAL 5: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

All students in the 2016-2017 cohort will graduate and earn a high school diploma.

### Goal 6: Absolute Measure

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 high school cohorts and examines their progress toward graduation based on annual credit accumulation. The measure requires that, based on the school’s promotion requirements, the school will promote 75 percent of its students in each cohort to the next grade by the end of August OR that 75 percent of the first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn the requisite number of credits.

Students entering the 10<sup>th</sup> grade will have earned 5 high school credits as a result of earning credits in English I, Global I, Living Environment, Algebra I, Spanish, and PE.

### RESULTS

For the 2016-2017 we had 55 (9<sup>th</sup> grade) students enrolled and 62% of those students were promoted to the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.

Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts  
Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2016-17

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2015	N/A	N/A
2016	55	62%

### EVALUATION

The 2016-2017 school year was the first year as a high school for EMHCS. We fell short of the measure and with that we have implemented multi-faceted, intensive and customized supports in all areas to achieve social, emotional, and academic progress.

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

This was the first year with high school students.

## COLLEGE PREPARATION

### Goal 6: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the second year high school Total Graduation Cohort will score 65 on at least three different New York State Regents exams required for graduation. (N/A)

### METHOD

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of high school cohorts and examines their progress towards graduation based on Regents exam passage. The measure requires that 75 percent of students in each cohort have passed at least three Regents exams by their second year in the cohort. In August of 2017, the 2015 cohort will have completed its second year. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2013	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Present a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance. (N/A)

### Goal 6: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the fourth-year high school Total Graduation Cohort and 95 percent of students in the fifth-year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate. (N/A)

### METHOD

This measure examines students in two high school Graduation Cohorts: those who entered the 9<sup>th</sup> grade as members of the 2013 cohort and graduated four years later and those who entered as members of the 2012 cohort and graduated five years later. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams required for high school graduation in English language arts, mathematics, science, U.S. History and Global History or met the requirements for the 4+1 pathway

## COLLEGE PREPARATION

to graduation.<sup>24</sup> Students have through the summer at the end of their fourth year to complete graduation requirements.

The school's graduation requirements appear above under the graduation goal's first measure pertaining to annual grade-by-grade promotion or credit accumulation. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. (N/A)

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2010	N/A	N/A
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance. (N/A)

#### Goal 6: 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. (N/A)

### 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

<sup>24</sup> The state's guidance for the 4+1 graduation pathway can be found here:

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

## COLLEGE PREPARATION

of comparison<sup>25</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. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. (N/A)

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

Cohort Designation	Charter School		School District	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2011	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance. (N/A)

### SUMMARY OF THE HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION GOAL

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

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in 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.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Total Graduation Cohort will score at least 65 on at least three different New York State Regents exams required for graduation by the completion of their second year in the cohort.	N/A

<sup>25</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](#).

## COLLEGE PREPARATION

Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the fourth year high school Total Graduation Cohort and 95 percent of students in the fifth year high school Total Graduation Cohort will graduate.	N/A
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.	N/A

### ACTION PLAN

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the specific results and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented. (N/A)

## GOAL 7: COLLEGE PREPARATION

### GOAL 7: COLLEGE PREPARATION. (N/A)

#### Goal 7: Comparative Measure

Each year, the average performance of students in the 10<sup>th</sup> grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics. (N/A)

#### METHOD

This measure tracks student performance one of the most commonly used early high school college prep assessment. Students receive a scale score in critical reading, writing and mathematics. Scale scores range from 200 to 800 on each subsection with 1600 as the highest possible score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times, the school reports only on a student’s highest score on each subsection. Compare school averages to the New York State average for all 10<sup>th</sup> grade (sophomore) test takers in the given year. (N/A)

#### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. (N/A)

10<sup>th</sup> Grade PSAT Performance by School Year

School Year	Number of Students in the 10 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Number of Students Tested	Critical Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2014-15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015-16	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### EVALUATION

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

#### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance. (N/A)

#### Goal 7: Comparative Measure

Each year, the average performance of students in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics. (N/A)

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

### METHOD

This measure tracks student performance on one of the most commonly used high school college prep assessments.

For the SAT include this description: The SAT is a national college admissions examination. Students receive a scale score in reading, writing and mathematics. Scale scores range from 200 to 800 on each subsection with 2400 as the highest possible score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times during the year, the school only reports a student's highest score. The school compares its averages the New York State average for all 12<sup>th</sup> grade test takers in the given year.

For the ACT include this description: The ACT is a national college admissions and placement examination. Students receive scaled scores in reading, mathematics, English and science. Scaled scores range from 1 to 36 on each section; the school averages the three separate scores to calculate a student's composite score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times during the year, the school reports on only a student's highest scaled score for each section. The school compares its average to the New York State average for all 12<sup>th</sup> grade test takers in the given year. (N/A)

### RESULTS

[Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.]  
(N/A)

12<sup>th</sup> Grade SAT/ACT Performance by School Year

School Year	Number of Students in the 12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Number of Students Tested	Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2014-15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015-16	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance. (N/A)

### Goal 7: Comparative

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

The percent of graduating students that meets the state’s aspirational performance measure (“APM”), currently defined as the percentage of students in a cohort who graduate with a score meeting the college and career readiness standard on a math Regents exam AND an English Regents exam, will exceed the statewide average. (N/A)

### METHOD

Recognizing that remediation rates in New York’s colleges are far too high, the Board of Regents has reviewed data showing the gap between high school expectations and college attainment. They reviewed data comparing the graduation rate for the 2005 cohort with the "college and career ready" graduation rate – defined as the percentage of students in the cohort who graduated with a score meeting the college and career readiness standard on a math Regents exam and on an English Regents exam. The Regents view these data as an important indicator of future student success. Students who graduate high school – but do so with scores below the college and career readiness standard – are likely to require remediation in college. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. (N/A)

Percent of Graduates Meeting the Aspirational Performance Measure<sup>26</sup>

Cohort	Charter School	Statewide <sup>27</sup>
2011	N/A	40.0
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

#### Goal 7: Comparative

The percent of graduating students who graduate with a Regents diploma with Advanced Designation will exceed the district of comparison. (N/A)

### METHOD

In establishing measures to be used by schools, districts and parents to better inform them of the progress of their students, the Regents have also set as an additional aspirational measure of achievement the percent of graduating students who earned a Regents diploma with Advanced Designation (i.e., earned 22 units of course credit; passed seven-to-nine Regents exams with a score

<sup>26</sup> Schools can retrieve state level graduation rates from the SED’s Information and Reporting Services office. News releases and an Excel workbook containing these data are available from the [IRS Data Release webpage](#).

<sup>27</sup> Statewide results for the 2013 cohort are not yet available.

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

of 65 or above; and took advanced course sequences in Career and Technical Education, the arts, or a language other than English). (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. (N/A)

Percent of Graduates with a Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation<sup>28</sup>

Cohort	Charter School	School District <sup>29</sup>
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

#### Goal 7: Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by passing an Advanced Placement (“AP”) exam, a College Level Examination Program (“CLEP”) exam or a college level course. (N/A)

### METHOD

Discuss the achievement indicators used to demonstrate college preparation. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure. (N/A)

Graduates Passing a Course Demonstrating College Preparation

Cohort	Number of Graduates	Percent Passing the Equivalent OF a College Level Course <sup>30</sup>
2011	N/A	N/A
2012	N/A	N/A
2013	N/A	N/A

<sup>28</sup> Schools can retrieve information about diplomas conferred from the SED’s Information and Reporting Services office. News releases and an Excel workbook containing these data are available from the [IRS Data Release webpage](#).

<sup>29</sup> District results for the 2013 cohort are not yet available.

<sup>30</sup> Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam, or a college level course

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

### EVALUATION

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

#### Goal 7: Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation. (N/A)

### METHOD

Provide a brief description of the measure. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in a data table that directly address the measure. (N/A)

### EVALUATION

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

### SUMMARY OF THE COLLEGE PREPARATION GOAL

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

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	Outcome
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 10 <sup>th</sup> grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 12 <sup>th</sup> grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics.	N/A
	The percent of graduating students that meets the state's aspirational performance measure (APM), currently defined as the percentage of students in a cohort who graduate with a score of 80 or better on a math Regents exam AND 75 or better on the English Regents exam, will exceed the statewide average.	N/A
	Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by passing an Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam or a college level course.	N/A

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

	Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation.	N/A
	Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation.	N/A
	[Write in optional measure here]	

### ACTION PLAN

Provide a narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the specific results and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented. (N/A)

## 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. (N/A)

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

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

### METHOD

Provide a narrative explaining how the school developed, administered, collected and analyzed the survey. The school presents results as a percentage of all families in the school, not as a percentage of respondents only. (N/A)

### RESULTS

Provide a narrative of parents' responses. (N/A)

#### 2016-17 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
[N/A]	[N/A]	[N/A]

#### 2016-17 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
[N/A]	[N/A]
[]	[]
[]	[]
[]	[]
[]	[]

### 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. (N/A)

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September. (N/A)

#### METHOD

Provide a narrative explaining how students are tracked year to year. (N/A)

#### RESULTS

Present a narrative describing number of students in various categories and the retention rate. (N/A)

2016-17 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)
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### EVALUATION

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and how close the retention rate was to the target. (N/A)

#### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Year	Retention Rate
2014-15	N/A
2015-16	N/A
2016-17	N/A

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 95 percent. (N/A)

#### METHOD

Provide a narrative explaining how the school tracks student attendance and calculates its daily attendance rate. (N/A)

#### RESULTS

Provide a narrative describing the year's attendance rate. (N/A)

2016-17 Attendance

## APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
K	N/A
1	N/A
2	N/A
3	N/A
4	N/A
5	N/A
6	N/A
7	N/A
8	N/A
9	N/A
Overall	N/A

### EVALUATION

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

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2014-15	N/A
2015-16	N/A
2016-17	N/A

## 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 2016-17, 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. (N/A)

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.

2016-17 English Language Arts Performance  
by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### 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. (N/A)

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 2016-17; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

## APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

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							
	Charter School		School 1		School 2		School 3	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
2014-15	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015-16	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016-17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

### 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. (N/A)

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 2015-16 and 2016-17. 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. (N/A)

## APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

### RESULTS

#### Cohort Growth on [XXX] Test from Spring 2016 to Spring 2017

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2015-16	Target	2016-17	
A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES/NO
B	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES/NO
C	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES/NO
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	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. (N/A)

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Present a narrative providing an analysis of year-to-year cohort performance in previous years. (N/A)

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

School Year	Cohort met target?
2014-15	N/A
2015-16	N/A
2016-17	N/A

#### Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2013-14	[N/A]	N/A	N/A
2014-15	[N/A]	N/A	N/A
2015-16	[N/A]	N/A	N/A
2016-17	[N/A]	N/A	N/A

## ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

#### 2016-17 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

## APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

8	N/A							
---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

### 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. (N/A)

#### 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. (N/A)

#### 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. (N/A)

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	
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

#### 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. (N/A)

## APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Narrative provides an analysis of year-to-year cohort performance including the previous year.  
(N/A)

### HIGH SCHOOLS: SUBJECT AREA MEASURES

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2013	2014	2015	2016
Algebra I	N/A	N/A	N/A	78%
Geometry	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Algebra 2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2013	2014	2015	2016
Living Environment	N/A	N/A	N/A	78%
Earth Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chemistry	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Physics	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A