



**MIDDLE VILLAGE PREPARATORY  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2013-14 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 14, 2014

By Mr. Ronald E. Rivera, Principal

6802 Metropolitan Avenue, Middle Village N.Y. 11379

718-869-2933

[rrivera@middlevillageprep.org](mailto:rrivera@middlevillageprep.org)

Mr. Ronald E. Rivera prepared this 2013-14 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Loriann Temkin	Parent Representative (PTA)
Laura O'Gorman	Academic
Margaret V. Ognibene	Finance
Michael Michel	Finance
Serphin R. Maltese	Fundraising
Josephine Lume	Chairperson
Debbie Kueber	Fundraising
Kaiko Hayes	Fundraising
Rosemary DeGennaro	Academic
Maureen Campbell	Academic

**Mr. Ronald E. Rivera has served as the school Principal since February, 2013.**

## INTRODUCTION

### Mission and Vision

The mission of Middle Village Preparatory Charter School is to prepare students to succeed at the college-preparatory high school of their choice. The school's vision is that every single one of its graduating eighth-graders will be ready to enroll in a selective New York City public high school, a college-preparatory private high school or a prestigious boarding school, so that they can go on to succeed in college and beyond.

The school opened on September 3, 2013 after seven months of planning. It served grade 6 in this first year, with a total of 120 students admitted. Demographically, the school serves a diverse ethnic student population of Hispanic, African American, East European, Middle Eastern, Asian and other students. It was founded in primarily a middle class area in School District 24, an extremely overcrowded district, with schools at 130% or more, thus offering parents an alternative to a very overcrowded school situation.

Middle Village Preparatory Charter School will have a small, but positive, programmatic impact on the existing schools in the area. At full scale, the school will enroll 360 students in grades 6-8, under 3% of the middle school enrollment in CSD 24 district schools.

Middle Village Prep's programmatic impact will stem from being a high-performing school that serves as a model for other educators in the district. MVP will welcome teachers and school leaders who wish to visit the school and MVP staff will be encouraged to participate in educator-focused events in the community such as conference, conventions and panel discussions.

### School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2010-11														
2011-12														
2012-13														
2013-14							120							120

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

The Middle Village Preparatory Charter School students will demonstrate mastery of New York State Learning Standards in English Language Arts.

### Background

The Middle Village Preparatory Charter School's Language Arts curriculum for our first year involved our grade 6 students in the 100 Book Challenge, a reading program designed to engender a love of reading in the students. Students were able to pick literature of their own choosing and were required to read for at least one hour daily. Reading grade levels were measured at the beginning of the year and on an ongoing basis to provide evidence that students were making progress in their individual reading levels. In addition to the 100 Book Challenge, our grade 6 ELA teacher used the Pearson Series Textbook and explored a variety of literary genres with students. The students also benefited from a curriculum writing component administered by the Social Studies teacher who worked collaboratively with the ELA teacher.

Weekly ELA teacher assessments were administered by the classroom teacher as were monthly and trimester exams in order to measure students' progress. These assessments included the 100 Book Challenge Individual Student Conferences that measured students' prowess with their reading comprehension.

Professional development in ELA was given to ALL of the teaching staff at the beginning of the year, with each teacher being trained in the goals and methods of the 100 Book Challenge and in the Writing Process as it applied to each of their own subject areas. Four Co-Teachers each assigned to one of our grade six classes were thus able to assist in the ELA process in relevant ways as they assisted each day with the regular ELA teacher.

### Goal 1: 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 English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 6<sup>th</sup> grade in April 2014. 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. All students are in grade 6, our first and only class that has ever tested here.

**2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>1</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6	116			2	118
7					
8					
All					

**Results**

Since it is the first year of operations at MVP, we have no students in at least their second year.

**Performance on 2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7				
8				
All				

**Evaluation**

Because this is the first assessment year for our first set of students, we have no students that have been with us for a second year. Therefore, in the testing year 2013-2014, the goal of students achieving a 75% proficiency level does not apply.

---

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

## Additional Evidence

This year, since it is our first, we cannot demonstrate any year to year trends until our 2014-2015 test year result become available.

### English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7						
8						
All						

#### 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 Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 English language arts AMO of 89. 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>2</sup>

#### Results

The table below indicates that the percentage of students achieving Level 1 was not high enough to prevent the school from achieving above the AMO of 89 points. A strong showing in level 2 and a total of almost 30 percent at level 3 and 4 put the school over the required AMO of 89.

<sup>2</sup> In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

### English Language Arts 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
116	13.8	56.9	17.2	12.1

$$\begin{array}{rcccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & 56.9 & + & 17.2 & + & 12.1 & = & 86.2 \\
 & & & & 17.2 & + & 12.1 & = & \underline{29.3} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 115.5
 \end{array}$$

#### Evaluation

Overall, the school met this year’s AMO, exceeding the benchmark of 89 by 26.5 points. There does not seem to be any subgroup that performed exceptionally poorly. The numbers also suggest that a concerted effort be made to identify all of the Level 2 students who missed the Level 3 benchmark, paying attention to the needed help they will require to achieve Level 3 next year. Likewise, those students who are level one shall be challenged and assisted in achieving level 2 and beyond.

Having done an analysis of our grade 6 students (who are all new to this school) we estimated that 25 percent of them were on level 1 in their previous school for their grade 5 exam. This year’s assessment reduced this number by half, moving approximately 13 students into level 2, thus assisting us in achieving this year’s AMO. We believe that this improvement was the result of the 100 Book Challenge and the building of a reading culture that emphasized time on task in reading. The plan then, is to continue addressing and moving the level ones upward, accompanied by a significant movement of current level two’s into level three. We estimate approximately 30 students who are close enough to level 3, and with proper support for next year can be pushed up to proficiency.

#### 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 local school district.

#### Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>3</sup>

#### Results

<sup>3</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

This year is our first testing year with our first class of students. Therefore, we have no second year test data to draw upon. One positive sign as a predictor of next year's results however, is that our students' performance was higher in ELA than the overall District 24Q's performance.

**2013-14 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 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7				
8				
All				

**Evaluation**

This year is our first testing year with our first class of students. Therefore, we have no first second year data to report and compare (N/A).

**Additional Evidence**

Also, additional evidence may include demographic differences between the school and the district as well as compelling reasons for comparing the school to a subset of schools within the district.

This year is our first testing year and therefore there are not students in their second year to compare to local District students.

**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 Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District

3						
4						
5						
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7						
8						
All						

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>4</sup>

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. 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 economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools’ 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 small 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

**Results**

As informed by the Charter School Accountability Center, because MCP has no results history for 2012-2013, this Comparative Performance Analysis is not applicable and does not apply.

**2012-13 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						

<sup>4</sup> The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics.

4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
All	

<b>School's Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<b>N/A</b>

**Evaluation**

Because of a lack of history in 2012-2013, this Comparative Performance analysis regarding Effective Size does not apply (N/A).

**Additional Evidence**

Because of a lack of test history between the years 2010-2013, this Comparative Performance analysis regarding Effective Size does not apply (N/A).

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

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11	N/A					
2011-12	N/A					
2012-13	N/A					

**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 2012-13 and also have a state exam score from 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 score are ranked by their 2012-13 score and assigned a percentile

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

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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>6</sup>

**Results**

As informed by the Charter School Accountability Office, because MVP Charter has only completed its’ first year and has no testing history for the year 2012 – 2013, the Growth Model Measure does not apply this school year (N/A).

**2012-13 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
3		50.0
4		50.0
5		50.0
6	N/A	50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All		50.0

**Evaluation**

As stated, MVP Charter has no test history for the year 2012s-2013 and therefore there is no Mean Growth Percentile measure available (N/A).

**Additional Evidence**

As stated, we have no test history for the years 2010 to 2013

---

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

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11 <sup>7</sup>	2011-12 <sup>7</sup>	2012-13	Statewide Average
3				50.0
4				50.0
5				50.0
6			N/A	50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

Goal 1: Optional Measure
<p><b>Method</b></p> <p><b>Results</b></p> <p><b>Evaluation</b></p> <p><b>Additional Evidence</b></p>

### Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

The school achieved a successful Absolute outcome by scoring a Performance Level Index above the required 89 points required, thus meeting the school's AMO as set forth by the NCLB accountability system. All of the other measures were not applicable until we have a student population in their second year or beyond.

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.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/
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 local school district.	N/A

<sup>7</sup> Grade level results not available.

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 2012-13 school district results.)	N/A
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.	N/A
		None

**Action Plan**

Students in year one who performed close to the proficiency level (level 3) but did not attain proficiency will be identified. These targeted children will have their data analyzed in order to determine what Core standards they need help with in order to achieve proficiency above level 3. Likewise, students who performed slightly above proficiency but who are may be in danger of slipping below a level 3 next year will also be targeted for assistance in their needed areas. The same strategy will be used to move the high level 1's and low level 2'. Teachers will collaborate and plan for student success at monthly data meetings in order to facilitate this process.

**MATHEMATICS**

**Goal 2: Mathematics**  
 Middle Village Preparatory Charter School students will demonstrate mastery of New York State Learning Standards in Mathematics.

**Background**

The mathematics curriculum is a Core Based one, utilizing Sadlier instructional materials and text. The curriculum has been designed to be a hands-on one, with students using manipulatives, Smart Board technology and a Team Teaching approach. The two teachers this year responsible for delivering the curriculum to the students have had extensive PD in the planning, the uniformity and the delivery of the lessons to their classes. Each of these two teachers have also been supplied with a Co-Teacher, thus using a Team Teaching format for the entire year in order to address the needs of the students who may be at risk.

These structures were responsible for the excellent math testing outcomes that MVP achieved.

**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 grade 6 in April 2014. 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.

**2013-14 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>8</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6	116			1	117
7					
8					
All	116			1	117

**Results :**

MVP Charter School, in its’ first year of operation, has no test date prior to 2013-2014. Therefore, we have no students in their second year to evaluate.

**Performance on 2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				

<sup>8</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.

4				
5				
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7				
8				
All				

**Evaluation**

Again, since there were no students this year in their second year, an evaluation of performance is not possible at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no additional evidence this year to indicate a trend of year to year progress since MVP has no students who have attended more than one year.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school’s instructional program.

**Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6					n/a	n/a
7						
8						
All						

**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 Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 mathematics AMO of 86. 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>9</sup>

## Results

### Mathematics 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
116	.8 %	30.17 %	32.83%	36.20

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 30.17 & + & 32.83 & + & 36.20 & = & 99.20 \\
 & & & & 32.83 & + & 36.20 & = & \underline{69.03} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 168.23
 \end{array}$$

## Evaluation

The school exceeded its AMO by more than 82 points. These results were likely due to the Co-Teaching Model that was used in the classroom and the special attention paid to those At-Risk and Special Education students who receive much small group and one-on-one instruction in these four classes of thirty students. In addition, much emphasis was placed on small group work and collaborative teaching, with close planning between the two math teacher planners.

### 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 local school district.

## Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>10</sup>

## Results

Because there were no students in at least their second year, no results are reportable.

<sup>9</sup> In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

<sup>10</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

No results are reportable because MVP Charter School had no students in at least their 2<sup>nd</sup> year.

**2013-14 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				
4				
5				
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7				
8				
All				

**Evaluation**

No comparison is possible since the school had no students in at least their second year.

**Additional Evidence**

No comparison is possible since the school had no students in at least their second year.

Also, additional evidence may include demographic differences between the school and the district as well as compelling reasons for comparing the school to a subset of schools within the district.

**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					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3						
4						
5						
6					N/A	N/A
7						
8						
All						

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>11</sup>

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. 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 economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools’ 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 small 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

**Results**

No results are reportable this year because the school had no 2012 – 2013 results to compare with the present year.

**2012-13 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6		N/A	N/A	N/A		
7						
8						
All						

<b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<b>N/A</b>

<sup>11</sup> The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics.

## Evaluation

No results reportable this year because the school had no 2012-2013 results to compare with the present year.

## Additional Evidence

No evidence is available, since MVP did not exist or test in the years indicated.

### Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11	N/A					
2011-12	N/A					
2012-13	N/A					

### Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>12</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 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>13</sup>

The school has no 2012-2013 results to compare with this year's performance.

<sup>12</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>13</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

**2012-13 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Average
3		50.0
4		50.0
5		50.0
6	N/A	50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All	<b><u>N/A</u></b>	50.0

**Evaluation**

N/A due to lack of pre and 2012-2013 data for the school.

**Additional Evidence**

N/A due to lack of pre and 2012-2013 data

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11 <sup>14</sup>	2011-12 <sup>14</sup>	2012-13	Statewide Average
3				50.0
4				50.0
5				50.0
6	N/A	N/A	N/A	50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

---

<sup>14</sup> Grade level results not available.

<b>Goal 2: 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 Mathematics Goal**

The school attained an AMO well in excess of the required 86 points, scoring an AMO 168.23. In addition, 69% of the students achieved proficiency levels of 3 or 4 in mathematics, well above the State level for testing year 2013-2014.

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.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/
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 local school district.	N/A
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 2012-13 school district results.)	N/A
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.	N/A
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

**Action Plan**

The school will analyze the mathematics test data to determine which students are “pushables”, that is, students who would likely be able to be targeted for extra needed support in meeting their proficiency requirement. These students will be encouraged to attend extra tutorials and will be given additional small group and one-on-one attention.

## SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Science

Middle Village Preparatory Charter School students will demonstrate mastery of New York State Learning Standards in Science.

### Background

The school utilized the CPO Life Science Curriculum for its' first year, incorporating a lab weekly. The school also provided professional development training for two of the science teachers in order to begin Project Lead the Way, a new hands on science program to begin in year 2 with our grade 7 students in 2014-2015. The goal is to provide a hands-on experience for all the students and to ready them for the grade 8 Science Assessment in 2015-2016.

### 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 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in spring 2014. 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 (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at proficiency.

### Results

The school does not have students in the targeted grade 4 and grade 8 classes. Therefore, no results are forthcoming this year.

### Charter School Performance on 2013-14 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	N/A			
8	N/A			

**Evaluation**

No evaluation is possible this year, since no students were tested.

**Additional Evidence**

No additional evidence is available at this time.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the science program.

**Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	N/A					
8	N/A					
All	N/A					

**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 local school district.

**Method**

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. 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 local school district.

**Results**

No results are forthcoming since we have no grades that tested this year and no students who have completed two or more years.

**2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4				
8				

**Evaluation**

No results are forthcoming since we have no grades that tested this year.

**Additional Evidence**

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4					N/A	
8					N/A	
All						

<p><b>Goal 3: Optional Measure</b> N/A</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 Science 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 all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	N/A
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 local school district.	N/A
	None	N/A

**Action Plan**

N/A

**NCLB**

**Goal 4: NCLB**  
The School will meet all of the NCLB accountability measures and will remain in good standing.

**Goal 4: 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 a local-assistance-plan school.

**Method**

Since *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**

The school is in its’ first year and has not received a School Report Card yet. Therefore, the school is in “good standing”

**Evaluation**

N/A

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2011-12	Good Standing/ Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School
2012-13	Good Standing/ Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School
2013-14	Good Standing/ Focus School/ Local-Assistance-Plan School

## APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES

\*

**In keeping with College and Career Readiness Standards, the Institute has revised many of the high school measures.**

**These measures are in effect for any school that was renewed in 2013 or thereafter. (See the Institute’s 2013 Guidelines.) Only high schools with Accountability Plans based on the Institute’s 2013 Guidelines need report on the measures flagged below with the symbol “(§)” and reflecting college and career readiness standards. They *may* report on the other measures as optional measures.**

**The Institute encourages all high schools to report on the flagged (§) measures, as they represent the college and career readiness standards and will be the measures used in the high school’s next Accountability Period.**

# # #

*Note: Add the following section following the School Enrollment section on page 4.*

### 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 2010 state Accountability Cohort consists of students who entered the 9<sup>th</sup> grade in the 2010-11 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state’s annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2013-14 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: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/accountability/home.shtml>)

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 30th
2011-12	2008-09	2008	??	??	??
2012-13	2009-10	2009	??	??	??
2013-14	2010-11	2010	??	??	??

## 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. Prior to 2012-13, students who have enrolled at least five months in the school after entering the 9<sup>th</sup> grade are part of the Total Cohort for Graduation; as of 2011-12 (the 2008 cohort), students who have enrolled only one day in the school after entering the 9<sup>th</sup> grade are part of the school's Total Cohort for 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>15</sup> (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2011-12	2008-09	2008	??	??	??
2012-13	2009-10	2009	??	??	??
2013-14	2010-11	2010	??	??	??

### 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>16</sup> (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2011-12	2007-08	2007	??	??	??
2012-13	2008-09	2008	??	??	??
2013-14	2009-10	2008	??	??	??

#

#

#

<sup>15</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>16</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.

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan English language arts goal.

# # #

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: 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 English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(S) 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) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

### Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Comprehensive English exam that students must pass to graduate. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department defines the following pass levels: scoring 65 to meet the graduation requirement for a Regents diploma / 75 to meet the college and career readiness standard.<sup>17</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.

### Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Indicate 65 or 75 passing score.

English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 /75  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>18</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 /75
2008		
2009		
2010		

<sup>17</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>18</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.

## 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.

**English Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 / 75 by Cohort and Year**

Cohort Designation	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2010						
2011						
2012						
2013						

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on the New York State 8<sup>th</sup> grade English language arts exam will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13**

**(S)** 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 ready standard (currently scoring 75 on the New York State Regents English exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER**

## Method

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its English language arts program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to meet the English requirement for **graduation with a Regents diploma / the college and career readiness standard.**

## Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2009 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Indicate 65 or 75 passing score

**English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 / 75 among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort <sup>19</sup>**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 75
2007		
2008		
2009		

**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.

**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.

**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.

**SAME FOR ALL SCHOOLS**

**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:

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

<sup>19</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the English Regents exam

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 2013-14 English language arts AMO of 166.

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 74 is Level 2, 75 to 89 is Level 3, and 90 to 100 is Level 4.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**English Language Arts Accountability Performance Level (APL)  
For the 2010 High School Accountability Cohort**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	?	?	?	?

$$PI = ? + ? + ? = APL = ?$$

**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.

**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.

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

(S) Each year, students in the high school *Total Cohort* will exceed the predicted pass rate on the English language arts Regents 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 high schools in New York State.

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, as it has for 3-8 schools. The Institute examines the school’s performance in terms of demographically similar high schools state-wide by using a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. The Institute compares the

School's actual performance to the predicted performance of high schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other high schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a small degree, is the target for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available.

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13**

**(S)** 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 local school district.

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER**

**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 local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.<sup>20</sup>

**Results**

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

**English Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District <sup>21</sup>	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2008				
2009				

<sup>20</sup> The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65. The New York State Accountability Report provides the district results for students scoring at or above 75.

<sup>21</sup> District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

2010			N/A	N/A
------	--	--	-----	-----

OR

**English Regents Accountability Performance Level (APL)<sup>22</sup>  
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District<sup>23</sup>**

Cohort	Charter School		School District <sup>24</sup>	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2008	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009				
2010			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.

**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.

**Goal 1: Growth Measure**

(§) Each year, under the state’s high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state’s median growth.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students during the course of their high school careers and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the similar scores in the eighth grade. The analysis only includes students from whom the eighth grade scores are available. In following the existing 3-8 Growth Model, students with the same scores are ranked and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean 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 will have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

<sup>22</sup> For an explanation of the procedure to calculate the school’s APL, see page 31.

<sup>23</sup> See page 30 above for an explanation of the APL.

<sup>24</sup> District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

*The State Education Department has not yet developed the high school Growth Model.*

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

<p><b>Goal 1: Optional Measure</b>          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 English Language Arts Goal**<sup>25</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.

Use the first summary if the Accountability Plan is prior to 2012-13; use the second if it is from 2012-13 or later.

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade English language arts exam will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing the Regents English exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

<sup>25</sup> If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	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) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
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) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	(§) Each year, students in the high school Total Cohort will exceed the predicted pass rate on the Regents English 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 high schools in New York State.	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 local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Growth	(§) Each year, under the state's high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state's median growth.	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.

# # #

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan mathematics goal.

# # #

## MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: 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 mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(S) 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 math exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

### Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Geometry, Integrated Algebra and Algebra 2 exams. The school scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100. The State Education Department defines the following pass levels: scoring 65 to meet the graduation requirement for a Regents diploma / scoring 80 to meet the college and career readiness standard.<sup>26</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.

### Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure, i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Indicate 65 or 80 passing score.

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 / 80  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>27</sup>**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 80
2008		
2009		
2010		

<sup>26</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>27</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics 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.

## 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.

### Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a score of 65 / 80 by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2010						
2011						
2012						
2013						

#### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on the New York State 8<sup>th</sup> grade mathematics exam will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(S) 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) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

## 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 graduation with a Regents diploma / the college and career readiness standard.

## Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2009 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Indicate 65 or 80 passing score

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 / 80 among Students Who Were Not Proficient in the 8<sup>th</sup> Grade by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort** <sup>28</sup>

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 80
2007		
2008		
2009		

**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.

**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.

**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.

**SAME FOR ALL SCHOOLS**

**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

<sup>28</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds 2013-14 mathematics AMO of **148**.

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.

## Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

**Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL)  
For the 2010 High School Accountability Cohort**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level								
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4					
	?	?	?	?					
	PI	=	?	+	?	+	?	=	?
							APL	=	?

## 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.

## Additional Evidence

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

### Goal 2: Comparative Measure

(S) Each year, students in the high school *Total Cohort* will exceed the predicted pass rate on a Regents 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 high schools in New York State.

## Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, as it has for 3-8 schools. The Institute examines the school's performance in terms of demographically similar high schools state-wide by using a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State. The Institute compares the

school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of high schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools’ actual and predicted performance, relative to other high schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a small degree, is the target for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available.

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district.

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13**

**(§)** 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 local school district.

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER**

**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 local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.<sup>29</sup>

**Results**

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District <sup>30</sup>	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2008				

<sup>29</sup> The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65. The New York State Accountability Report provides the district results for students scoring at or above 75.

<sup>30</sup> District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

2009				
2010			N/A	N/A

OR

**Mathematics Accountability Performance Level (APL)  
of Fourth-Year Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District<sup>31</sup>**

Cohort	Charter School		School District <sup>32</sup>	
	APL	Cohort Size	APL	Cohort Size
2008	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009				
2010			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.

**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.

**Goal 2: Growth Measure**

(S) Each year, under the state’s high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state’s median growth.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students during the course of their high school careers and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the similar scores in the eighth grade. The analysis only includes students from whom the eighth grade scores are available. In following the existing 3-8 Growth Model, students with the same scores are ranked and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students’ growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school’s

<sup>31</sup> See page 38 above for an explanation of the APL.

<sup>32</sup> District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it will have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

*The State Education Department has not yet developed the high school Growth Model.*

**Results**

*Leave Blank*

<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 Mathematics Goal** <sup>33</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.

Use the first summary if the Accountability Plan is prior to 2012-13; use the second if it is from 2012-13 or later.

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a New York State Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

<sup>33</sup> If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	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) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
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 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	(§) Each year, students in the high school Total Cohort will exceed the predicted pass rate on a New York State Regents 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 high schools in New York State.	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 local school district. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Growth	(§) Each year, under the state's high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state's median growth.	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.

# # #

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan science goal.

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.

**Method**

New York State administers multiple high school science assessments; current Regent exams are Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. The school administered Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. It scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100; students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass any one of the Regents science exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents science exam multiple times or have taken multiple science exams. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a science exam.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

**Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>34</sup>**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2008		
2009		
2010		

**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.

**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.

<sup>34</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

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

Cohort Designation	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2010						
2011						
2012						
2013						

**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 local school district.

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

**Results**

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

**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
2008				
2009				
2010				

**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.

**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.

Include the following section as a separate Accountability Plan subject area goal following the science section.

# # #

## SOCIAL STUDIES

### Goal 4: Social Studies

Write the school's Accountability Plan social studies goal here.

### 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.

### Method

New York State administers two high school social studies assessments: U.S. History and Global History. In order to graduate, students must pass both of these Regents exams with a score of 65 or higher. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass the two exams by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken the exams multiple times and have until the summer of their fourth year to pass it. Once students pass it, performance on subsequent administrations of the same exam do not affect their status as passing.

### Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

**U.S. History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65  
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>35</sup>**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2008		
2009		
2010		

### 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

<sup>35</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

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.

**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.

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

Cohort Designation	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2010						
2011						
2012						
2013						

**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 local school district.

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

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

**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
2008				
2009				
2010				

**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.

**Additional Evidence**

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

**Goal 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.

**Method**

This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass the Global History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken the exam multiple times, and had until the summer of their fourth year to pass it. Once students pass it, performance on subsequent administrations of the same exam do not affect their status as passing.

**Results**

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

**Global History Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>36</sup>**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2008		
2009		
2010		

**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.

<sup>36</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on a science Regents exam

**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.

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

Cohort Designation	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2010						
2011						
2012						
2013						

**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 local school district.

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

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

**Global History Passing Rate of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort
2008				
2009				
2010				

**Evaluation**

Narrative explicitly stating whether the 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.

**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.

#

#

#

Include the following section as a separate Accountability Plan goal following the NCLB goal.

# # #

**HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION**

**GOAL 6: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION**  
Write the school's graduation goal here.

**Goal 6: Absolute Measure**  
Each year, 75 percent of students in each cohort will pass their core academic subjects by the end of August and the school will promote them to the next grade.  
**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13**

**(S)** 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.  
**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER**

**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.

Present the school's promotion requirements here; include a list of all core academic subjects and other relevant information, ensuring that the school's requirements are consistent with the State Commissioner's Part 100.5 Diploma Requirements.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

**Percent of Students Promoted by Cohort in 2013-14**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2010		
2011		
2012		
2013		

OR

**Percent of Students in First and Second Year Cohorts  
Earning the Required Number of Credits in 2013-14**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2012		
2013		

**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.

**Additional Evidence**

Provide narrative discussing results from previous years and analysis of 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.

**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.

**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 2014, the 2012 cohort will have completed its second year.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2010		
2011		
2012		

## 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.

## 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.

### 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.

## Method

This measure examines students in two high school Graduation Cohorts: those who entered the 9<sup>th</sup> grade as members of the 2010 cohort and graduated four years later and those who entered as members of the 2009 cohort and graduated five years later. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams in English language arts, mathematics, science, U.S. History and Global History. 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.

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2008		
2009		
2010		

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2007		
2008		
2009		

## 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.

## 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.

### 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 local school district.

## 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 local school district<sup>37</sup>. Given that students may take Regents exams through the summer of their fourth year, district results for the current year are generally not available at this time.

## Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

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

Cohort Designation	Charter School		School District <sup>38</sup>	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2008				
2009				
2010				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

<sup>37</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](#).

<sup>38</sup> District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

**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.

**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 the high school Total Graduation Cohort will pass their core academic subjects by the end of August and be promoted to the next grade. <b>Required for Accountability Plans developed prior to 2012-13</b>	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/
	(§) 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. <b>Required for Accountability Plans developed in 2012-13 or later</b>	
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
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 local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable

**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.

# # #

Include the following section as a separate Accountability Plan goal following the NCLB goal.

## COLLEGE PREPARATION

### GOAL 7: COLLEGE PREPARATION

Write the school's college preparation goal here.

#### 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.

#### 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.

#### Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

#### 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
2011-12						
2012-13						
2013-14						

#### 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.

#### 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.

### 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.

#### 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 (senior) 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 reposts 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 (senior) test takers in the given year.

#### Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

#### 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
2011-12						
2012-13						
2013-14						

#### 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.

## 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.

### Goal 7: School Created College Preparation Measure

Each Year, the school will demonstrate the preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design. Insert school-developed measure.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(See below for measures in more recent Plans.)

### Method

Provide a brief description of the measure.

### Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in a data table that directly address the measure.

### 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.

(S) 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.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

### 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 80 or better on a math Regents exam and 75 or better on the 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 a score below 80 on a math Regents exam and below 75 on the English exam – are likely to require remediation in college.

### Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

#### Percent of Graduates Meeting the Aspirational Performance Measure<sup>39</sup>

Cohort	Charter School	Statewide <sup>40</sup>
2008		35.3
2009		35.3
2010		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.

**(§)** The percent of graduating students who graduate with a Regents diploma with Advanced Designation will exceed the local district.

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER**

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

### Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

#### Percent of Graduates with a Regents Diploma with Advanced Designation<sup>41</sup>

<sup>39</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>40</sup> Statewide results for the 2010 cohort are not yet available.

<sup>41</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](#).

Cohort	Charter School	School District <sup>42</sup>
2007		
2008		
2009		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.

**(§)** 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.

**REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER**

### Method

Discuss the achievement indicators used to demonstrate college preparation.

### Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

### Graduates Passing a Course Demonstrating College Preparation

Cohort	Number of Graduates	Percent Passing the Equivalent OF a College Level Course <sup>43</sup>
2007		
2008		
2009		

### 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.

<sup>42</sup> District results for the 2009 cohort are not yet available.

<sup>43</sup> Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level Examination Program (CLEP) exam, or a college level course

**Goal 7: School Created College Attendance or Achievement Measure**

Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design. Insert school-developed measure.

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

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

REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

**Method**

Provide a brief description of the measure.

**Results**

Provide a brief narrative highlighting results in a data table that directly address the measure.

**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.

**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.

Use the first summary if the Accountability Plan is prior to 2012-13; use the second if it is from 2012-13 or later.

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
College Preparation	Each Year, the school will demonstrate the preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
College Attainment	Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	(S) 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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	(S) 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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	(S) Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	(S) Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will matriculate in a college or university in the year after graduation.	
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

### **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.

## APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

**Goal S: Parent Satisfaction**  
Write the school's goal here.

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**  
Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school's program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

**Method**

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.

**Results**

Provide a narrative of parents' responses.

**2013-14 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate**

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

**2013-14 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results**

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
	%
	%
	%
	%
	%

**Evaluation**

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

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

Provide a narrative explaining how students are tracked year to year

**Results**

Present a narrative describing number of students in various categories and the retention rate.

**2013-14 Student Retention Rate**

2012-13 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2012-13	Number of Students Who Returned in 2013-14	Retention Rate 2013-14 Re-enrollment ÷ (2012-13 Enrollment – Graduates)
#	#	#	%

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

Year	Retention Rate
2011-12	%
2012-13	%
2013-14	%

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

Provide a narrative describing the year’s attendance rate.

### 2013-14 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	%
2	%
3	%
4	%
5	%
6	%
7	%
8	%
Overall	%

### Evaluation

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

### Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2011-12	%
2012-13	%
2013-14	%

## APPENDIX C: 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 2013-14, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.

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

#### 2013-14 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								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

#### Comparative Measure

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

While schools are required to compare themselves to the local school district, there may be individual schools that also provide a compelling comparison. These comparisons might be schools in the same neighborhood, with the same demographics, or have similar programs. The first table features a grade level breakdown for 2013-14; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

**2013-14 English Language Arts Performance of  
Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level**

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

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

School Year	Grades	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on State Exam by Year							
		Charter School		School 1		School 2		School 3	
		Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
2011-12									
2012-13									
2013-14									

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

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

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they made towards the desirable outcome of grade level or an NCE of 50. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the same norm-referenced exam in 2012-13 and 2013-14. It includes students who repeated the grade. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students who took the exam in both years.

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

**Results**

**Cohort Growth on XXX Test from Spring 2013 to Spring 2014**

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2012-13	Target	2013-14	
A					YES/NO
B					YES/NO
C					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

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

School Year	Cohort met target?
2011-12	
2012-13	
2013-14	

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2010-11	?-?		
2011-12	?-?		
2012-13	?-?		
2013-14	?-?		

## ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

### 2013-14 Science Performance by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

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

## HIGH SCHOOLS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

### Growth Measure

Each year, the group of students in their second year in the school who have taken a norm-referenced reading test for two years will reduce by one-half the difference between the average of their first year in the school and an NCE of 50. If the cohort already achieved an average NCE of 50 in the first year, it will show an increase in their average NCE.

### Method

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

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

### Results

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

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		First Year Baseline	Second Year Target	Second Year Result	
2009					YES/NO

2010					YES/NO
2011					YES/NO
2012					YES/NO

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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

**HIGH SCHOOL: SUBJECT AREA MEASURES**

**Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam**

Exam	Cohort			
	2007	2008	2009	2010
Math A				
Math B				
Integrated Algebra				
Geometry				
Algebra 2				

**Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam**

Exam	Cohort			
	2007	2008	2009	2010
Living Environment				
Earth Science				
Chemistry				
Physics				