

REFERENCE GUIDE TO TEMPLATE SECTIONS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL GOALS..... | 3 |
| NCLB GOAL..... | 25 |
| OPTIONAL GOALS | 26 |
| SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES..... | 29 |

The Accountability Plan Progress Report Template Is Below.



**Middle Village Preparatory Charter
School**

**2016-17 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 10, 2017

By: NANCY VELEZ, Principal

6802 Metropolitan Ave
Middle Village, NY 11379

718-869-2933

INTRODUCTION

Nancy Velez, Principal and Christian Quezada, Director of Operations prepared this 2016-17 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

| Trustee's Name | Board Position |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Ms. Josephine Lume | Chair, Finance & Executive |
| Mr. Serphin R. Maltese | Vice Chair, Executive |
| Mr. Michael Michel | Founder/Advisor, Finance & Executive |
| Ms .Margaret Ognibene | Treasurer, Finance |
| Ms. Maureen Campbell | Trustee, Education |
| Ms Kaiko Hayes | Trustee |
| Ms. Debbie Kueber | Trustee |
| Mr. Rosemary Degennaro | Trustee, Education |
| Mrs. Monika J. Konopka | Trustee, Education |
| Name | Office, Committees |

Josephine Lume has served as the Board Chair since 2013.

INTRODUCTION

Middle Village Prep is a small, independent, public charter school which serves students in grades 6-8. It is located on the Christ the King Campus. Admission to MVP is conducted via lottery with District 24 as a priority.

The mission of the Middle Village Preparatory Charter School (MVP) is to prepare students for success at a selective college prep high school of their choice. The MVP curriculum is a rigorous curriculum designed to meet and surpass the New York State Education Department requirements. Central to the instructional model is a longer school day and increased classroom instructional time that is devoted to curriculum subjects. Students will master skills and attain subject proficiency by the end of the 8th grade. The curriculum of MVP includes a requirement that all students study Latin for three years, a key language for building a strong vocabulary and understanding of romance languages such as Spanish and Italian.

Mathematics and English Language Arts are prioritized by allocating twice the amount of instructional time that is customarily devoted to these critical instructional areas. Science, Social Studies, the Arts, Physical education and Health, along with time allocated for enrichment and extracurricular activities round off the typical daily schedule. It requires that all students take available Regent-level courses, such as the Common Core Algebra 1, Earth Science, and United States History and Government Regents in Grade 8.

Middle Village Preparatory Charter School (MVP) strives for academic excellence by creating an environment for students to succeed in both school and beyond. Curriculum is built around a strong emphasis of math, reading, science, social studies and the study of the Latin language. A constructivist approach “where students learn by doing” is maximizing student involvement. MVP expects to enroll an academically diverse population. Therefore the curriculum will be challenging for students who enter at or above grade level as well as flexible enough to support students who enter the school below grade level.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| 2012-13 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2013-14 | | | | | | | 116 | | | 116 |
| 2014-15 | | | | | | | 118 | 109 | N/A | 227 |
| 2015-16 | | | | | | | 141 | 107 | 106 | 354 |
| 2016-17 | | | | | | | 147 | 124 | 102 | 373 |

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

The ELA Goal for our students is to attain Proficiency and Beyond for all of our students. MVP believes that with dedicated reading and writing time, combined with rigorous literary skills instruction, every student has the ability to excel in reading and writing. The ELA curriculum exposes students to a variety of historical and contemporary text, including novels (both classical and current), poetry, journalism, non-fiction, memoirs and blogs. Our writing program includes both independent journal writing as well as instruction in writing technique.

BACKGROUND

Middle Village Prep believes that the instruction in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and language is a *shared responsibility* within the school. All fields of study demand analysis of complex texts and strong oral and written communication skills. As with all major subject areas, the ELA program is aligned to the Common Core State standards. Fulfilling the ELA standards for grades 6-8 requires much greater attention to a specific category of informational text — literary nonfiction — than has been traditionally taught. ELA teachers focus on literature (stories, drama, and poetry) as well as literary nonfiction, while informational reading in grades 6-8 is incorporated in other content areas to help meet the demands of the standards. Rigor is also infused through the requirement that students read increasingly complex texts through the grades.

The ELA curriculum is aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards. Teachers use the Pearson Reading Series to help students read at a more complex level, including exposing students to a variety of reading texts and genres that fosters critical and extended thinking. Teachers incorporate an array of teaching activities and strategies that enable students to focus on examining how authors use reasons to make their points and support arguments with evidence.

In grade six, we have experienced that our students come with skills that are below the expectations of the Common Core Learning Standards. While at MVP, our sixth graders will be exposed to learning experiences that will enable them to become familiar with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers will enhance student learning by helping them get to proficient levels through reading grade appropriate complex literature and informational text, while further developing the ability to cite textual evidence. They will be able to look at both, the structure and content of complex, grade-appropriate texts, determining how sentences and paragraphs within texts influence and contribute to the unfolding of a plot and the development of events or ideas. Students will be increasingly challenged to sharpen their ability to write and speak with more clarity and coherence, providing clear reasons and relevant evidence. Students will learn how writers try to influence readers while discovering how they can do the same in their own prose. They discover how to answer questions through writing and can use rewriting opportunities to refine their understanding of a text or topic. Writing is a critical component of ELA/Literacy, they go hand in hand, and as such this area will

not be a separate subject as it had been in the past. It will be embedded across content areas and highly emphasized in ELA.

In grade seven, students will be expected to gain the necessary skills to allow them to read challenging complex texts closely so that they can cite multiple instances of specific evidence to support their claims. Students will be able to recognize setting, plot and, characters and provide an objective summary of a text apart from their own reaction to it. They will be able to compare and contrast different interpretations of a topic, identifying how authors shape their information and choose to highlight certain facts over others. Students will work with high-quality, complex nonfiction texts and great works of literature. MVP students will take part in discussions and in writing, students will make their reasoning clear to their listeners and readers, constructively evaluating others' use of evidence while offering several sources to back up their own claims. While growing as writers, students will be able to cite several sources of specific, relevant evidence when supporting their own point of view about texts and topics.

In grade 8, teachers work with high-quality, complex nonfiction texts and great works of literature. The focus of informational texts begins to shift from narrative to discussion students will be well-informed to question an author's assumptions and assess the accuracy of his or her claims. Students will develop a rich vocabulary of academic words, which they use to speak and write with more precision. In addition, students will write with increasing sophistication, focusing on organizing ideas, concepts, and information into broader categories; choosing relevant facts well; and using varied transitions to clarify or show the relationships among elements. We will continue to emphasize the use of the journal writing across all classrooms and to make it a part of our instruction. Students are well-informed to question an author's assumptions and assess the accuracy of his or her claims. We encourage and ensure that students read independently at least 15 minutes daily in each content area, and at least 30 minutes in ELA/Literacy classes. Practice targets will be set and monitored, ensuring every student adopts the independent reading routines of academically successful students. This supplementary program will also strengthen students' skills in becoming highly effective readers and instill in students love for reading books of all genres.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts ("ELA") assessment to students in 6TH through 8th grade in April 2017. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year).

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

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested ¹ | | | | Total Enrolled |
|-------|--------------|-------------------------|-----|--------|---------|----------------|
| | | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 145 | | | | 2 | 147 |
| 7 | 121 | | | | 3 | 124 |
| 8 | 103 | | | | | 103 |
| All | 369 | | | | 5 | 374 |

RESULTS

The 2016-2017 school year completes Middle Village Prep Charter School fourth year. As the chart indicates, out of the 103 eighth grade students tested, 61.16% are proficient and in grade 7 out of the 121 students who were tested, 63.63% were proficient in ELA.

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

| Grades | All Students | | Enrolled in at least their Second Year | |
|--------|--------------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | 46 | 145 | N/A | N/A |
| 7 | 64 | 121 | 63.63 | 121 |
| 8 | 61 | 103 | 61.16 | 103 |
| All | 57.0 | 369 | 62.4 | 224 |

EVALUATION

For students enrolled at least two years, the school did not meet the measure of 75% ELA Proficiency, as initially proposed. Proficiency for students in grade 8 fell short by 13.84% while the grade 7 students fell short of 11.37%. The students who are currently in the 8th grade increased the number of proficient students from the previous year by 16.76%.

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

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Additional evidence that shows that Middle Village Prep is making progress that demonstrates the schools effectiveness of the schools instructional program is by the use of incorporating a program called Castle Learning. Teachers can easily search for content related questions within Castle Learning to create their own assignments, or access pre-built *activities* and assessments. Instant grading, detailed assessment reports, and instructional feedback are benefits of incorporating such program.

A second program that we added to our instruction is Achieve 3000. This programs is used to first level the students according to their lexile level. After this is identified, students then work on different reading passages with multiple choice questions and extended responses that will continue to help strengthen vocabulary, writing, and help in college and career readiness goals.

A third support system we have initiated is the addition of “classroom libraries” in our content area classrooms. Although the libraries are not at the level where they should be, we are aiming to have full classroom libraries to include trade books, fiction and nonfiction books by the end of 2018.

It is worth noting that improvement was obtained in the ELA area between 2015 and 2017. As reflected on the chart below, students in grade 7 scored on or above grade level, demonstrating proficiency and an increase of 19.2 % between SY2015 and SY2017. In grade 8, there was an improvement of 4.5%. Some factors can be attributed to this growth, among them are the use of Castle Learning that provided teachers with instant feedback of skills that students were having difficulty with individually and as a class. Teachers also used a variety of resources such as engageny.com and other ELA test preparation books, to create mock state test exams for students to practice before the actual state test was administered. Middle Village Prep also offered testing preparation classes on Saturday morning for students at all grade levels.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| 7 | 44.8 | 105 | 44.4 | 108 | 64 | 121 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | 56.5 | 108 | 61 | 103 |
| All | 44.8 | 108 | 50.2 | 217 | 62.5 | 224 |
| | | | | | | |

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 English language arts AMO of **111**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.²

RESULTS

The ELA results below indicate that the Cohort that includes grades six through eight, reflects that 369 students achieved a total PLI of 149, this is above the required 111 minimum.

English Language Arts 2016-17 Performance Level Index

| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | |
|------------------|---|---------|---------|---------|
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| 369 | 7 | 37 | 38 | 18 |

$$\begin{array}{r} \text{PI} \\ = \\ 37 \\ + \\ [38] \\ + \\ [38] \\ + \\ [18] \\ = \\ 149 \end{array}$$

EVALUATION

Middle Village Prep exceeded the PLI measure set for ELA. This is attributed to the careful monitoring of each student's data, and addressing the ELA core curriculum with our students and staff.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

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

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

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.³

RESULTS

In the table below, Middle Village Prep Charter School shows that Grade 7 students scored at or above 64% proficiency. This reflects an 18.5% higher than the district while students in Grade 8 who tested proficient with a score of 61% scored 9.5% higher than the district.

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

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency | | | |
|-------|---|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | 0 | 3 | 32.7 | 4218 |
| 7 | 64 | 121 | 45.5 | 4215 |
| 8 | 61 | 103 | 51.5 | 4060 |
| All | 62.5 | 224 | 43.2 | 8,275 |

EVALUATION

Middle Village Prep exceeded the measure of proficient students when compared to the district with an overall score of 62.5% proficient as compared to 43.2%. This is a total of 19.3% above the district level.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

As demonstrated in the data table below, during the school year 2014-2015, students in grade 7 increased their level of proficiency by 11.7%. This percentage was higher than the district. Students who were in grade 7 in 2015-2016 school year also increased from 45% and increased their proficiency by 16%. Each year the performance of students who are above proficiency has also increased.

English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to District Students | | | | | |
|-------|--|----------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|
| | 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| | Charter School | District | Charter School | District | Charter School | District |
| 3 | | | | | | |

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 7 | 43.5 | 31.6 | 44.4 | 38.5 | 64 | 45.5 |
| 8 | N/A | 37.5 | 56.5 | 44.3 | 61 | 51.5 |
| All | 43.5 | 33.5 | 50.2 | 39.8 | 62.5 | 48.5 |

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

The SUNY Charter Schools Institute (“Institute”) conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

The Chart below reflects the actual 2015-2016 school results for calculating the overall Effect Size for each of the grades tested. Students in Grade 6- Grade 8 combined aggregate score of .43, which is above the minimum required .3.

Based on the 2015-2016 school results the predicted number of students who perform at a level 3&4 in grade 6 is often close to the actual number of students who performed proficiently since they come in at many different levels. You can see how in Grade 7 and Grade 8 there is over a 10% difference of proficiency for students who are with us for two and three years because we use a variety of strategies to help target specific skills and individual needs.

2015-16 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Percent of Students at Levels 3&4 | | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect Size |
|-------|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|---|-------------|
| | | | Actual | Predicted | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----|------|------|------|-------|
| 6 | 53.7 | 146 | 34 | 34.3 | -0.3 | -0.02 |
| 7 | 56.3 | 110 | 45 | 34.5 | 10.5 | 0.67 |
| 8 | 51.9 | 108 | 56 | 42.4 | 13.6 | 0.80 |
| All | 53.9 | 197 | 43.9 | 36.7 | 7.1 | 0.43 |

School's Overall Comparative Performance: .3

Higher than expected to a meaningful degree ; .43

EVALUATION

The School met the Comparative Performance Level with a positive Effective Size of .43 in Grades 6-Grade 8, as reflected on the chart below.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

| School Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size |
|-------------|--------|--|---------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| 2013-14 | 6 | 50.0 | 116 | 29 | 33.4 | -0.34 |
| 2014-15 | 6-7 | 59.9 | 94 | 37.4 | 27.2 | 0.71 |
| 2015-16 | 6-8 | 53.9 | 364 | 43.9 | 36.7 | 0.43 |

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁴

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2015-16 and also have a state exam score from 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 score are ranked by their 2015-16 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth

⁴ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁵

RESULTS

The school's mean growth percentile in 2015-2016 in ELA was at 47.0 %, 3% less of the Statewide Median of 50.0

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

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
|-------|------------------------|------------------|
| | School | Statewide Median |
| 4 | N/A | 50.0 |
| 5 | N/A | 50.0 |
| 6 | 39.1 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 55.9 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 47.7 | 50.0 |
| All | 47.6 | 50.0 |

EVALUATION

The Aggregate Mean Growth Percentile for the school in ELA is less than the required 50 percentile needed to be at level.

The school met the overall mean growth percentile on 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years by exceeding the 50th percentile mark.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

These charts therefore, indicate a Mean Growth Percentile increase/decrease from 2014-2015 to 2015- 2016.

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

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | | | Statewide Median |
|-------|------------------------|---------|---------|------------------|
| | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | |
| 4 | | | | 50.0 |
| 5 | | | | 50.0 |
| 6 | 42.5 | 55.8 | 39.1 | 50.0 |
| 7 | N/A | 66.5 | 55.9 | 50.0 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | 47.7 | 50.0 |
| All | 42.5 | 61.2 | 47.6 | 50.0 |

⁵ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

| |
|---|
| Goal 1: Optional Measure |
| [Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.] |
| METHOD: |
| RESULTS: |
| EVALUATION: |
| ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE |

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Middle Village Preparatory Charter School did not meet its target goal of 75 percent proficiency for all those students tested on the New York State English language arts exam. However, each year tested, Middle Village Preparatory Charter School was able to outperform Grades 6 through 8 in District 24. As a result of this, the school was able to exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size greater than 0.3 according to the regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. Finally, Middle Village Prep was able to demonstrate growth in proficiency of the New York State English language arts exam. However, under the state’s Growth Model, MVP’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts was not above New York State’s unadjusted median growth percentile.

| 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. | NO |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison. | YES |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 results.) | YES |
| Growth | Each year, under the state’s Growth Model the schools mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile. (Using 2015-16 results.) | NO |
| | | |

ACTION PLAN

Middle Village Prep will continue to have teachers work with Castle Learning, however the administration (supervisors) must ensure that the program is implemented with fidelity, that data is gathered on a regular basis and used to drive instruction. Within this program teachers can easily search for content related questions to create assignments and assessments. The program of Achieve 3000 will be used to level students and monitor weekly progress of their reading levels as they complete different articles based on their reading ability. Articles and questions will progressively become more complex as they continue to strengthen their skills in all areas. MVP is also offering teacher support by working with Teachers College to strengthen the Literacy and Writing across all content areas. This include whole group professional development as well as individual coaching of teachers.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will meet 75% at or above proficiency level by the end of the students' second year.

Middle Village Prep feels that it is important to support students in developing a sense of mathematics and learning so that they can be mathematical thinkers. To help us accomplish this, one of MVP main focus will be on computational fluency: being flexible, accurate and efficient with whole numbers with the broader goal of developing strong number sense. Teachers want to emphasize reasoning about mathematical ideas through conversation and writing. We want students to problem solve and use mathematics to understand our world through real-life problem solving opportunities. In addition, MVP would like to increase percentage of students successfully being promoted, from 60% to 75% by 2018.

BACKGROUND

The mathematics program at Middle Village Prep Charter School will be based on the New York Common Core standards, as such, it will emphasize the development of mathematical literacy, deep understanding of concepts, an ability to communicate effectively about mathematics, and the skills to solve problems. These areas will be addressed in a variety of ways, including but not limited to: providing balanced instruction in thinking and problem solving, using resources and materials to enhance teaching and learning (ex: Math books Glencoe/McGraw Hill Publishing), effectively utilizing Smart Boards, differentiated instruction, team teaching that supports SWDs, use of a variety of assessments from traditional teacher made tests to standards-based, pre-assessments, conferences with students, mock state tests, and mock Regents exams.

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 through 7 grade in April 2017. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

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

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested ⁶ | | | | Total Enrolled |
|-------|--------------|-------------------------|-----|--------|---------|----------------|
| | | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 146 | | | | 1 | 147 |
| 7 | 119 | | | 3 | 2 | 124 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| All | 265 | | | 3 | 3 | 271 |

RESULTS

The table below illustrates that two grades were tested this year of 2015-2016 but only one grade, grade 7 has been enrolled for at least their second year. Their performance of proficiency was 62.2% at Proficiency level.

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

| Grades | All Students | | Enrolled in at least their Second Year | |
|--------|--------------------|---------------|--|---------------|
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | 57.5 | 146 | 0 | 3 |
| 7 | 62.2 | 119 | 62.2 | 119 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| All | 59.8 | 265 | 62.2 | 122 |

EVALUATION

The school's goal for mathematics proficiency level is 75% at Proficiency level or higher by the end of the students' second year. The chart above indicates that Grade 7 met proficiency level of 62.2%. Therefore, the students missed their mark by approximately 12.8%. This may have been attributed to the new "layout" of the math state test exam that was presented to the students this year.

⁶ 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

The school is maintaining a high level of performance in mathematics. The program has proven to be effective not only for Gen Ed students but also for IEP students who for the first time are having success in mathematics.

Also, additional evidence may include assessment results from mock exams and Castle Learning that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school’s instructional program.

In January, MVP administered a first mock exam in mathematics across Grades 6, 7, and 8. Upon scoring the exams, the findings reflected that student proficiency levels across grades varied as follows: **Grade 6 = 65%; Grade 7= 46%; and Grade 8= 80%**. The second round of “Mock exams” was administered at the end of April. An increase in two grades (7 and 8th) is reflected as demonstrated by these results: **Grade 7=57% (+11) and Grade 8 =91% (+11)**. There was a decrease in the proficiency levels of students in **Grade 6=53% (difference of 12%)**. Math teachers in grade 6 met and identified the standards in which students demonstrated the greatest challenges, namely: apply the properties of operations to equivalent expressions, interpret statements of inequalities as statements about the relative position of two numbers on a number line diagram and solve unit rates problems. They immediately planned as a grade, to focus on the areas determined to be in need of improvement. Several strategies were discussed and practiced in order to reinforce concepts and skills to ensure student progress, among them: re-teaching select skills using different teaching approaches, providing extensive “one to one” support, doing more frequent small group instruction, maximizing the use of “team teachers”, and using the Enrichment time in the morning to revisit the areas identified. Due to the frequent technical problems experienced with the Castle Learning Program, and the inconsistency of data collection, results gathered from this platform will not be used for the purpose of assessing and measuring student growth within specific time periods. The Castle Learning program will be fully implemented and monitored during the 2017-18 school year.

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

While the chart below reflects a decrease on proficiency levels between 2014 and 2015 of 24.6% points in grade 6, and a decline of 23% points in grade 7 during the same time period, students demonstrated 17.3 % improvement in 2016-17 school year. MVP staff must make every effort to ensure that improvement is consistent. Reviewing data on a regular basis, by grade levels, content and as a faculty, will enable teachers to plan effectively and accordingly, including modifying instruction and individualizing learning. This practice will be embedded in school year 2017-18.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 33.3 | 3 | N/A | N/A | 0 | 3 |
| 7 | 69.5 | 105 | 44.9 | 107 | 62.2 | 119 |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| All | 68.5 | 108 | 44.9 | 107 | 62.2 | 122 |
| | | | | | | |

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 mathematics AMO of **109**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.⁷

RESULTS

As reflected on the table below, Middle Village Prep students received an overall PLI number of 159 which is 50 points higher than the required score of at least 109

| Mathematics 2016-17 Performance Level Index (PLI) | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---------|---------|----|---|-----|---|-----|
| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | | | | | | |
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | | | | | |
| | 9 | 23 | 47 | 21 | | | | | |
| | PI | = | 23 | + | 47 | + | 21 | = | 91 |
| | | | | | 47 | + | 21 | = | 68 |
| | | | | | | | PLI | = | 159 |

EVALUATION

The PLI achieved by the 2015-2016 student cohort at MVP exceeded the AMO target of 109 by 50 points. These strong results can be attributed to purposeful planning, grade level teacher discussions, teachers monitoring students’ progress, and the delivery of rigorous instruction provided to students.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

⁷ In contrast to NYSED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

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

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.⁸

RESULTS

The Chart below shows a comparison of MVP Charter Prep’s performance of students in attendance for at least their second year. 62.2 % of the students are at Proficiency level, while only 41.5 % of the District students achieved Proficiency.

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency | | | |
|-------|---|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year | | All District Students | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | 0 | 3 | N/A | N/A |
| 7 | 62.2 | 119 | 41.5 | 4305 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| All | 62.2 | 119 | 41.5 | 4305 |

EVALUATION

Our school exceeded the aggregate district performance of District 24 by 20.7%. Our Grade 7 students who have been with us after two years, have succeeded in performing at this level.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Over the last three years, Middle Village Preparatory Charter School has outperformed the District in the area of Mathematics. In fact, MVP’s proficiency scores were higher than expected to a meaningful degree over this same time period. In the 2014-15 school year, MVP achieved a 68.5% proficiency level in Mathematics. We demonstrated a 27.3% higher level of proficiency in

⁸ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

comparison to District 24's 41.2% proficiency levels. Similar results occurred in the 2015-16 school year, when MVP was able to obtain a 44.9% proficiency percentage, while District 24 decreased to a 39.6% proficiency percentage. Lastly, in the 2016-17 school year, MVP demonstrated growth once again, reflecting a 62.2 proficiency percentage, while District 24's proficiency level was at 41.5 proficiency percentage.

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

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students | | | | | |
|-------|---|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| | 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| | Charter School | District | Charter School | District | Charter School | District |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 33.3 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 0 | N/A |
| 7 | 69.5 | 41.2 | 44.9 | 39.6 | 62.2 | 41.5 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| All | 68.5 | 41.2 | 44.9 | 39.6 | 62.2 | 41.5 |

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

The number of students in both grade 6 and grade 7 who were proficient at levels 3 & 4 exceed the number of students predicted which is higher than expected.

2015-16 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Percent of Students at Levels 3&4 | | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect Size |
|-------|------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|-------------|
| | | | Actual | Predicted | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | 53.7 | 145 | 48 | 41.1 | 6.9 | 0.40 |
| 7 | 56.3 | 109 | 46 | 34.1 | 11.9 | 0.70 |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| All | 54.8 | 254 | 47.1 | 38.1 | 9.0 | 0.53 |

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a meaningful degree

EVALUATION

The school met and exceeded the Effective Size minimum with a score of 0.53, well above the required score of .3

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size |
|-------------|--------|---|---------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| 2013-14 | 6 | 50 | 116 | 68.4 | 38.8 | 1.76 |
| 2014-15 | 6-7 | 59.9 | 227 | 58.1 | 33.8 | 1.41 |
| 2015-16 | 6-8 | 54.8 | 254 | 46.9 | 38.1 | 0.53 |

Goal 2: Growth Measure⁹

Each year, under the state’s Growth Model, the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.

METHOD

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.¹⁰

Student in grade 6 had a score of 42.8% and fell short of the state wide median by 7.2%. Students who have been in Middle Village Prep for two consecutive years scored at 59.6% which is 9.6% above the statewide median.

2015-16 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
|-------|------------------------|------------------|
| | School | Statewide Median |
| 4 | | 50.0 |
| 5 | | 50.0 |
| 6 | 42.8 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 59.6 | 50.0 |
| 8 | N/A | 50.0 |
| All | 50.4 | 50.0 |

EVALUATION

The overall score of Grades 6 and Grade 7 for the 2015-1016 school year exceeded the statewide median by .4%

⁹ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

¹⁰ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Middle Village Prep’s test scores have continued to increase throughout its years of operation. As recent as 2015-16, MVP was able to obtain 47% proficiency on the New York State Mathematics exam, compared to the New York State proficiency percentage of 39%. The following school year, Middle Village Prep thrived, once again by outperforming New York State by 20% with a proficiency percentage of 60%(New York State performed at 40%). It is evident that Middle Village Prep continues to excel in Mathematics consistently surpassing its neighboring schools in District 24 and New York State.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | | | |
|-------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------------|
| | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | Statewide Median |
| 4 | | | | 50.0 |
| 5 | | | | 50.0 |
| 6 | 67.6 | 59.7 | 42.8 | 50.0 |
| 7 | N/A | 59.6 | 59.6 | 50.0 |
| 8 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 50.0 |
| All | 67.6 | 59.7 | 50.4 | 50.0 |

Goal 2: Optional Measure

[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]

METHOD:

RESULTS:

EVALUATION:

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

In Grade 6, teachers will focus on connecting ratio and rate to whole number multiplication and division; understanding division of fractions and the system of rational numbers, which includes negative numbers. Students will begin to develop understanding of statistical thinking. Writing, interpreting, and using expressions and equations with the use of variables in mathematical expressions will be the foundation needed for students to move into grade seven. In Grade 7, students will be exposed to a mixture of two mathematical curriculums, as we prepare all students to take the Algebra 1 Regents exam. In this grade, instructional time will focus on developing

understanding and applying proportional relationships by extending their understanding of ratios and develop understanding of proportionality to solve single- and multi-step problems. Students will begin to solve problems involving scale drawings and informal geometric constructions, and working with two- and three-dimensional shapes to solve problems involving area, surface area, and volume. Teachers help students make appropriate connections by building on previous work to generate data sets and learn about the importance of representative samples for drawing inferences. They will learn to solve real-world and mathematical problems involving area, surface area, and volume of two- and three-dimensional objects composed of triangles, quadrilaterals, polygons, cubes and prisms. The 8th grade curriculum will focus on understanding the concepts of and becoming proficient with the skills of mathematics, communicating and reasoning mathematically and becoming efficient problem solvers by using appropriate tools and strategies. Students will receive the Algebra I content that will prepare them to take the Algebra I Regents exam at the end of eighth grade.

| 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. | NO |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison. | YES |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 school district results.) | YES |
| 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. | YES |
| | | |
| | | |

ACTION PLAN

Middle Village Preparatory Charter School’s action plan is put into place to demonstrate a strong understanding for the New York State Mathematics curriculum. In order to maintain, or even further improve academic performance, Middle Village Prep will continue to offer extra help, as well as host mock exams. Grade 6 was able to achieve an average of 53% at Level 3 proficiency, and 9% Level 4 proficiency on these mock exams, while Grade 7 compared similarly, achieving 36% Level 3 and 18% Level 4 on average. Based on results from these mock exams, MVP anticipated 57% proficiency in the grades taking the New York State Mathematics exam. Middle Village Prep not only met that anticipated percentage, but exceeded it, with actual scores translating to 59.8 proficiency percentage.



Additionally, Middle Village Prep offer enhanced support to our students in Grades 6-8 outside of our typical school day. MVP offers New York State test preparation help through a neighboring program. This program provides MVP students with one and a half hours of Mathematics test prep on a Saturday, or one day during the week. Students are provided the opportunity to enroll in the program, and attendance is monitored on both MVP's part and the program director in order to make sure students are getting the best possible support.

In addition to the test prep program, MVP has partnered with an afterschool program in an effort to further support our students. This supplemental program offers homework help to students enrolled in the program Monday through Friday for one hour. It also offers a Saturday program in which students are assisted with homework prior to branching off into other extracurricular activities.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Write the school's Accountability Plan science goal here

BACKGROUND

Middle Village Prep's Science program is based on the New York State Learning Standards. Students in grade 6 begin with Life Science, which takes the student through discovery and learning of the living environment. Topics include: cell and human Biology, genetics, biochemistry, ecology, and survey of the five kingdoms of living organisms. In Grade 6, students participate in a science fair at the end of the school year demonstrating an experiment based on a skill/topic that they learned in science during the year and create a visual board of their topic along with a hypothesis including steps and results of their procedure.

Students are introduced to Physical Science in grade 7. Within this area, students examine the areas of energy, motion, forces, heat waves, light, sound, electricity and atomic structures and their applications. In grade 7, students visit Adventure Land for the Day to participate in Technology day. It serves as an introduction to the Technical World, through the students' investigation of the various rides at the amusement park. A workbook with activity sheets guides students through the learning process as they observe, record time, sketch, and calculate specific aspects of the rides.

The students in Grade 8 prepare for the Earth Science Regents. For the latter, students are exposed to activities and hands on projects that study our planet, its composition, history, geological processes, and the environment in space. Our Regents level program meets New York State Regents standards and our students take the Regents exam in June. All Science programs have 30 hours of lab. Laboratory activities with reports are an essential part of the program. In the 2015-2016 school year, the 8th grade students scored 65% proficient on the exam

In line with the school's constructivist approach, MVP believes that students learn most effectively when they have a central role in the learning process and that science skills should be based on a series of discoveries. Therefore, MVP will ensure that students master the skills they need to grow towards scientific literacy, including an understanding of scientific explanations, and the ability to generate evidence, understand the scientific method and its applications over time through an exploratory student-centered problem solving approach in MVP's Science Lab.

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 4th and 8th grade in spring 2017. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level

and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

RESULTS

Middle Village Prep Students in Grade 8 do not take the NYS Science 8th grade exam. We offer Earth Science Regent to all Grade 8 Students. There is no data available for this area.

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table below that directly addresses the measure, i.e. the overall percent of students *in at least their second year* achieving proficiency.

**Charter School Performance on 2016-17 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 nd Year | | All District Students | |
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 | | | | |
| 8 | N/A | | | |
| All | | | | |

EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as 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.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period. This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The school can use a supplemental table for this section on performance disaggregated by number of years in the school. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

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 | | | | | |
|-------|---|------------------|---------|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| | 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| All | | | | | | |

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

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

RESULTS

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; e.g. the charter school performance compared to the district performance in the same tested grades.

2016-17 State Science Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

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

EVALUATION

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure; i.e. whether the charter school fell short of, equaled or exceeded the district performance in each grade and by how much.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school’s performance in comparison to the local district in previous years.

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

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students | | | | | |
|-------|--|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|----------|
| | 2014-15 | | 2015-16 | | 2016-17 | |
| | Charter School | District | Charter School | District | Charter School | District |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| All | | | | | | |

Goal 3: Optional Measure

[Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.]

METHOD:

RESULTS:

EVALUATION:

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:

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. | |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison. | |
| | [Write in optional measure here] | |

ACTION PLAN

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.

Goal 4: NCLB

To surpass the current State status of “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 school requiring a local assistance plan.

METHOD

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

RESULTS

MVP is Good Standing.

EVALUATION

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and any changes over time.

The school met the measures set forth by the NCLB accountability system, as evidenced by the informational chart provided below and on page 31. The school’s instructional approach has focused on the selected strategies in order to improve student outcomes in ELA and across other core subject areas. Students are increasingly challenged to sharpen their ability to write and speak with more clarity and coherence, providing clear reasons and relevant evidence. Greater emphasis is being placed in improving writing skills within the ELA curriculum, as well as across content areas like History, Science and Math. In addition, substantial support has been provided to the faculty members through meaningful and regular assistance offered by higher education institutions such as Teachers College.

These efforts have helped us for the past three years to meet the State’s AMO on the NCLB accountability; we have met our comparative measures goals with the District and the State; in addition, MVP has exceeded the predicted proficiency based on our percentage of economically disadvantaged students as indicated on the chart displayed on page 31, from the Charter Schools Institute Accountability Dossier.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

PROVIDE A NARRATIVE REVIEWING THE SCHOOL’S NCLB STATUS DURING EACH YEAR OF THE CURRENT ACCOUNTABILITY PERIOD.

NCLB Status by Year

| Year | Status |
|---------|---------------|
| 2014-15 | Good Standing |

| | |
|---------|---------------|
| 2015-16 | Good Standing |
| 2016-17 | Good Standing |

Charter Schools Institute Accountability Dossier.

| | 2013-14 | | | | 2014-15 | | | | 2015-16 | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|------|------|-----|
| | Grades Served: 6 | | | MET | Grades Served: 6-7 | | | MET | Grades Served: 6-8 | | | MET | | | |
| | Grades | All Students % (N) | 2+ Years Students % (N) | | Grades | All Students % (N) | 2+ Years Students % (N) | | Grades | All Students % (N) | 2+ Years Students % (N) | | | | |
| ELA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ABSOLUTE MEASURES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 75 percent proficiency. | 6 | 29.1 (116) | (0) | | 6 | 30.5 (118) | 0.0 (3) | | 6 | 34.2 (146) | 0.0 (1) | | | | |
| | 7 | (0) | (0) | | 7 | 45.0 (109) | 44.8 (105) | | 7 | 44.5 (110) | 44.4 (108) | | | | |
| | 8 | (0) | (0) | | 8 | (0) | (0) | | 8 | 56.5 (108) | 56.5 (108) | | | | |
| | All | 29.1 (116) | (0) | | All | 37.4 (227) | 43.5 (108) | NO | All | 44.0 (364) | 50.2 (217) | NO | | | |
| 2. State's NCLB | Grades | PLI | AMO | | Grades | PLI | AMO | | Grades | PI | AMO | | | | |
| | 6 | 115 | 89 | YES | 6-7 | 127 | 97 | YES | 6-8 | 131 | 104 | YES | | | |
| COMPARATIVE MEASURES | Comparison: Queens District 24 | | | | Comparison: Queens District 24 | | | | Comparison: Queens District 24 | | | | | | |
| 3. students in 2 nd yr compared to district. | Grades | School | District | | Grades | School | District | | Grades | School | District | | | | |
| | NA | | | NA | 7 | 43.5 | 31.6 | YES | 7-8 | 50.2 | 41.4 | YES | | | |
| 4. predicted % based on % of ED students. | % ED | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size | % ED | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size | % ED | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size | | | |
| | 50.0 | 29.1 | 29.1 | 0.00 | NO | 59.9 | 37.4 | 27.2 | 0.71 | YES | 53.9 | 44.0 | 36.7 | 0.43 | YES |
| GROWTH MEASURE | Grades | School | State | | Grades | School | State | | Grades | School | State | | | | |
| | 6 | 42.5 | | | 6 | 55.8 | | | 6 | 39.1 | | | | | |
| | 7 | 0.0 | | | 7 | 66.5 | | | 7 | 55.9 | | | | | |
| | 8 | 0.0 | | | 8 | 0.0 | | | 8 | 47.7 | | | | | |
| | All | 42.5 | 50.0 | NO | All | 61.2 | 50.0 | YES | All | 47.0 | 50.0 | NO | | | |

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

Goal S: Parent Satisfaction

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.

2016-17 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

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

2016-17 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

| Item | Percent of Respondents Satisfied |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| [List Item Here] | % |

EVALUATION

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

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

Goal S: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

Provide a narrative explaining how students are tracked year to year

Student data is compiled/gathered by our Director of Student Services, from the beginning of the school and throughout the year. The data is also maintained on ATS and SIS (Teacherease)

RESULTS

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

2016-17 Student Retention Rate

| 2015-16 Enrollment | Number of Students Who Graduated in 2015-16 | Number of Students Who Returned in 2016-17 | Retention Rate 2016-17 Re-enrollment ÷ (2015-16 Enrollment – Graduates) |
|--------------------|---|--|---|
| 369 | 105 | 255 | 96.6% |

EVALUATION

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

As per the chart below, the school continues to be above the set rate of 90%, each year, as such the goal was met. Each year, the goal has surpassed its' goal by an average of 6.3%.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

| Year | Retention Rate |
|---------|----------------|
| 2014-15 | 97.3% |
| 2015-16 | 96.9% |
| 2016-17 | 96.6% |

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.

Students' attendance is recorded daily and maintained on ATS. The school reviews it on a weekly basis to identify trends, communicate with parents/students and to take appropriate measures with students who may be having difficulties attending school regularly. As per the chart provided on page 33, the school has reached an overall rate of 95.86%. The school will work aggressively to improve the attendance of 8th grade students.

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS

RESULTS

Provide a narrative describing the year's attendance rate.

As per the chart below, the school has reached an overall rate of 95.86%, this meeting its yearly target. The school will work aggressively to improve the attendance of 8th grade students to ensure they are attending school consistently and on or above the current rate of 95%.

2016-17 Attendance

| Grade | Average Daily Attendance Rate |
|---------|-------------------------------|
| 1 | N/A |
| 2 | N/A |
| 3 | N/A |
| 4 | N/A |
| 5 | N/A |
| 6 | 96.2% |
| 7 | 96.7% |
| 8 | 94.7% |
| Overall | 96% |

EVALUATION

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

The school met its goal as evidence by the data provided in the chart below. The school was able to maintain an attendance rate average of 95% and increased it by 1 % in school years 2016 and 2017. Students are encouraged to be consistent with their attendance and are rewarded at school wide assemblies. Certificates of recognition, among other "rewards", are issued. Before school programs (Enrichment/ Support) are offered to students so that they can increase their level of performance thus building confidence and motivating them to attend on a daily basis. Students' attendance is recorded daily and maintained on ATS. The school reviews it on a weekly basis to identify trends, communicate with parents/students and to take appropriate measures with students who may be having difficulties attending school regularly. Attendance data is shared with the faculty and especially the Guidance Counselors, in order to identify common strategies to address any lateness or absenteeism issues

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

| Year | Average Daily Attendance Rate |
|---------|-------------------------------|
| 2014-15 | 95% |
| 2015-16 | 96% |
| 2016-17 | 96% |

APPENDIX B: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

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

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS

Absolute Measure

In 2016-17, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.

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

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

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency According to Number of Years Enrolled | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | One | | Two | | Three | | Four or More | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 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 2016-17; the other presents annual aggregate results over time.

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY TABLES

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

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient on the State Exam by Grade | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|----------|---------------|----------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | Charter School | | School 1 | School 2 | School 3 | | | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| 2014-15 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2015-16 | | | | | | | | | |
| 2016-17 | | | | | | | | | |

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 2015-16 and 2016-17. It includes students who repeated the grade. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students who took the exam in both years.

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

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY TABLES

RESULTS

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

| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50 | | | Target Achieved |
|-------|-------------|--|--------|---------|-----------------|
| | | 2015-16 | Target | 2016-17 | |
| A | | | | | 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? |
|-------------|--------------------|
| 2014-15 | |
| 2015-16 | |
| 2016-17 | |

Cohort Performance on XXX Test by School Year

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

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOLS: SCIENCE

2016-17 Science Performance by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

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

