Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC*

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 15, 2021

By Michael Pantano



Success Academy Charter Schools - NYC is comprised of the following charters:

- Success Academy Charter School --- Harlem 1
- Success Academy Charter School --- Harlem 2
- Success Academy Charter School --- Harlem 3
- Success Academy Charter School --- Harlem 4
- Success Academy Charter School --- Harlem 5
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bronx 1
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bronx 2
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bed Stuy 1
- Success Academy Charter School --- Upper West
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bed Stuy 2
- Success Academy Charter School --- Cobble Hill
- Success Academy Charter School --- Williamsburg
- Success Academy Charter School --- Fort Greene
- Success Academy Charter School --- Prospect Heights
- Success Academy Charter School --- Crown Heights
- Success Academy Charter School --- Union Square
- Success Academy Charter School --- Hell's Kitchen
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bronx 3
- Success Academy Charter School --- Washington Heights
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bronx 4
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bensonhurst
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bergen Beach
- Success Academy Charter School --- Rosedale
- Success Academy Charter School --- Springfield Gardens
- Success Academy Charter School -- Far Rockaway
- Success Academy Charter School --- Flatbush
- Success Academy Charter School -- Bed Stuy 3
- Success Academy Charter School --- Bushwick
- Success Academy Charter School -- South Jamaica
- Success Academy Charter School -- Hudson Yards
- Success Academy Charter School -- Harlem 6

Michael Pantano, Legal Counsel, prepared this 2020-21 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

	Board Posit	ion		
Trustee's Name	Office (e.g. chair, treasurer, secretary)	committees (e.g. finance,		
		executive)		
Lorenzo Smith III	Chair (Executive)	Executive, Finance		
Darrell Bradford				
Edwin Cespedes				
Sam Cole		Executive, Finance		
Scott Freidman	Chair (Finance); Treasurer (Executive)	Executive, Finance		
Aaron Kinnari				
Kamilah Mitchell-Thomas				
Suleman Lunat	Secretary (Executive)	Executive, Finance		
Robin Pzena				
Cate Shainker (non-voting Emitrus)				
Lizette St Hilaire				

See Appendix A, Tab 1 for a list of School Principals in the 2020-21 school year.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

The mission of Success Academy Charter Schools – NYC ("SA") is to provide students in New York City with an exceptionally high-quality education that gives them the knowledge, skills, character, and disposition to meet and exceed New York State Common Core Learning Standards and the resources to lead and succeed in school, college, and a competitive global economy.

All SA schools were fully remote during the 2020-21 school year in response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

In response to the tremendous challenges posed by the COVID-19 pandemic, SA put in place the social, mental, and emotional health supports as part of SA's Remote 2.0 plan.

SA invested in ensuring all scholars achieved academic mastery, and regularly assessed scholar learning to identify and support any scholars who were struggling. Zoom's small break-out groups allowed teachers to utilize small-group learning in guided reading lessons and to provide additional support for scholars who needed it.

SA employed a school psychologist and/or social emotional learning specialist to partner with school leadership in supporting our scholars at all schools. Further, SA utilized key supports such as counseling, morning meetings and advisory blocks, and virtual community circles. Our scholars' social emotional wellbeing remained a priority.

ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

See Appendix A, Tab 2 for each school's 2020-21 BEDS Day enrollment.

GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing, and comprehending the English language.

BACKGROUND

Believing that all students can succeed, SA goes above and beyond Common Core standards. SA uses THINK Literacy, a comprehensive balanced literacy program, in all grades. THINK Literacy was developed in-house by the Instructional Management team at Success Academy Charter Schools, the charter management organization. There are many components of THINK, including Shared Text, Guided Reading, Read Aloud with Discussion, Reading Workshop, and Writing Workshop. During Shared Text, the teacher displays a text and the whole class reads and analyzes it together, giving students practice interpreting brief, engaging texts. During Guided Reading, the teacher works with a small group of students to read and comprehend a book that is one level above what they can read and understand independently. During Read Aloud with Discussion, the teacher

models the internal thinking that excellent readers exhibit, and students discuss their ideas about the book with their classmates. During Reading Workshop and Writing Workshop, students internalize key aspects of great reading and writing, through direct instruction, independent work, and partner work. All THINK components press students to read, write, think, and speak with clarity and precision.

In kindergarten and first grade, students also receive extensive phonics instruction. This early literacy curriculum is modeled on an enhanced version of Success For All (SFA), which has a proven track record in urban schools and has been implemented in 1,300 schools around the United States.

Students are assessed in reading regularly. They progress to the next instructional reading level when ready. Thus, children are assigned to appropriate reading levels based on reading performance, not age or grade.

SA enforces specific protocols for how it collects, distributes, and analyzes data. These protocols work to help teachers and school leaders freely access information in real-time. In a fast-paced and constantly changing school environment, having ready access to academic data empowers the staff to better decide how to expend time and resources so as to maximize student achievement.

SA views its teachers as Olympic athletes who must constantly train and improve their skills. Professional development is a regular part of their professional responsibilities as it develops skills, provides content area knowledge, and improves pedagogical techniques so that the teachers are prepared to "win the race" that is educating children. Further information is available in the school's charter.

Particularly during the pandemic, SA invested in ensuring all scholars achieved academic mastery, and regularly assessed scholar learning to identify and support any scholars who were struggling.

METHOD

During 2020-21, the school(s) primarily used the following exam to assess student growth and achievement in ELA: The Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment Systems, 3rd Edition (the "F&P") administered to students regularly throughout the year.

See Appendix A, Tab 3 for a summary of SA students' performance on the F&P in December 2020 and again in May 2021. Students were deemed to have met or exceeded expectations if they achieved the reading levels below, adapted from the New York State Education Department's self-assessment template:

Grade	Minimum F&P Reading Level to Meet or Exceed Expectations
K	С

1	I
2	М
3	Р
4	S
5	V
6	Υ
7	Z
8	Z

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

See Appendix A, Tab 3. SA students overwhelmingly demonstrated a strong mastery of ELA in their respective grades, all grade levels exceeding or meeting prescribed benchmarks.

In a year upended by Covid-19, SA students still made significant progress. As shown in Tab 3, nearly 70% of students met the F&P benchmark in December 2020. Moreover, the vast majority of SA students, approximately 91% of scholars, were able to meet that benchmark by May 2021. In addition, most students demonstrated significant growth in grade levels between the months of December 2020 and May 2021, on average increasing about two levels from December 2020 to May 2021. In assessing the percentage of students meeting the benchmarks in December 2020 and May 2021 as well as the average number of levels grown from December 2020 to May 2021, SA students are showing significant academic growth.

In addition to the strong network-wide results of all students, English language learners also showed significant progress of approximately 1.75 levels on average from December 2020 to May 2021. Over 85% of SA's English language learners met the December benchmark in May of 2021, which evidences significant growth, as 51.2% of SA's English language learner scholars met that same benchmark in December of 2020.

Additional Evidence

SA has consistently exceeded its Accountability Plan goals in this area in years past.

ELA Goal: Additional Measure

METHOD: SA administered an internal examination based on the United States History and Government Regents Examination in June 2021. This examination was designed to replicate the Regents examination that would have taken place in June 2021 absent the Covid-19 pandemic. Student scores on this internally administered Regents exam were comparable to scores from recent years.

While this examination does not explicitly test ELA mastery, ELA mastery is key to passing rigorous social studies examinations.

See Appendix A, Tab 4 for a summary of SA students' performance on this examination.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION: See Appendix A, Tab 4. 92.6% of SA 8th graders surpassed expectations by passing a high school level examination.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE: SA has consistently met its Accountability Plan goals in this area in years past.

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

SA consistently meets its Accountability Plan goals in this area year after year. This year, we have highlighted the examinations above to help demonstrate that SA continues to meet its academic goals.

ACTION PLAN

In order to continue improving in English language arts, SA will make the following improvements to its literacy program:

- More effectively use shared text to enhance student discussions around literature that are truly student-driven and less directed by the teacher.
- Provide students with more opportunities to respond to literature in writing.
- Promote genre variety in the classroom by giving students short excerpts of non-fiction, realistic fiction, folktales, interviews, plays, pamphlets, advertisements, etc.
- Help students identify the main idea of what they read in order to better understand an author's purpose and connect details to a cohesive narrative.
- Deepen class discussions around literature to transcend the literal and have students infer character traits, feelings and other aspects of literature not explicitly written.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics- Students will show competency in their understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

BACKGROUND

SA uses Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) and the Investigations math program. Some of its key elements are described below:

- Problem Solving CGI offers students a chance to solve real world, contextualized
 mathematical problems using conceptual understanding. Students learn the basics of
 problem solving strategies by solving daily word problems that require critical thinking and
 both written and verbal expression of mathematical reasoning. Students work individually
 to solve a problem and then share their strategies with their peers. The teacher leads a
 discussion based on student strategies that leads to understanding of mathematical
 properties.
- Assessment SA administers Math Interim Assessments and weekly quizzes to determine
 the progress of students with respect to the Common Core standards. Teachers use the
 data to inform future instruction.
- Common Core State Standard Alignment SA has mapped the scope and sequence of CGI and the Investigations math program to closely align with the Common Core. This scope and sequence closely follows the state and national requirements of what students should know and be able to do at each administration of the state math assessments. By aligning closely with the Common Core and assessments, teachers will have a much better sense of where their students stand in SA's goal of preparing all students for college-track level mathematics in middle and high school.
- Conceptual Understanding Investigations math places an emphasis on open-ended exploration and interactive learning components to each lesson to let students make sense of mathematics by building on ideas and observations from previous experiences. By learning mathematical ideas and procedures that are grounded in meaning, students are able to apply their thinking to new situations and unfamiliar problems. CGI uses daily world problems to give students meaning, understanding, and application to the math they learn.
- Computational Fluency SA also provides students with regular math facts practice because
 it recognizes the importance of computational fluency. Math facts quizzes emphasize both
 accuracy and speed.

METHOD

SA administered an internal examination based on the Algebra I Regents Examination in June 2021. This examination was designed to replicate the Regents examination that would have taken place in June 2021 absent the Covid-19 pandemic. Student scores on this internally administered Regents exam were comparable to scores from recent years.

See Appendix A, Tab 5 for a summary of SA students' performance on this examination.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

See Appendix A, Tab 5. 81.4% of SA 8th graders surpassed expectations by passing a high school level examination.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

SA has consistently met its Accountability Plan goals in this area in years past.

SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL MATHEMATICS GOAL

SA consistently meets its Accountability Plan goals in this area year after year. This year, the Covid-19 pandemic caused state examinations to be cancelled and thus SA was unable to register its usual high achievements in math (99% of SA students taking the state math exam passed it in 2019 and 98% of SA students taking the state math exam passed it in 2018). SA also did not administer external, normed, math exams to its Kindergarten through 7th grade students in 2020-21. However, SA's 8th graders took the more rigorous, high school level Regents-based Algebra I exam in June 2021 and 81.4% passed. SA undeniably continues to educate its students in math at the highest level.

ACTION PLAN

Despite impressive state math test results, SA is looking to make the following improvements to the math program:

- More effectively guide students to move away from invented strategies for solving problems, which can sometimes be laborious, towards more efficient strategies that improve accuracy;
- Improve the pacing calendar for math instruction so that teachers have time to teach oftoverlooked skills like fractions.

GOAL 3: SCIENCE

ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will understand and apply scientific principles at a proficient level.

BACKGROUND

The school's curriculum is unique in its attention to science, including unprecedented daily instruction. The school uses a discovery-based, experiential approach to science, guided by the most influential authorities on elementary science education today, the American Association for the Advancement of Science Benchmarks and the National Resource Council National Science Education Standards. Taught by specialized science teachers, students have hands-on experience with objects, materials, and organisms to understand the natural world. The curriculum provides students with a solid foundation in discovery-based science to ensure that they can excel in middle and high school science classes.

METHOD

SA administered the Living Environment Regents Examination to its 8th grade students in January 2021.

See Appendix A, Tab 6 for a summary of SA students' performance on this examination.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

See Appendix A, Tab 6. 96.4% of SA 8th graders surpassed expectations by passing a high school level examination.

ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

SA has consistently met its Accountability Plan goals in this area in years past.

SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL SCIENCE GOAL

SA consistently meets its Accountability Plan goals in this area year after year. This year, the Covid-19 pandemic caused state examinations to be cancelled and thus SA was unable to register its usual 4th grade and 8th grade high scores in science (with pass rates at or near 100%). However, SA's 8th graders took the more rigorous, high school level Living Environment Regents examination in January 2021 and 96.4% passed. SA undeniably continues to educate its students in science at the highest level.

ACTION PLAN

SA will continue offering discovery-based science to all students five days a week. Results from state science tests show that SA's focus on science is paying considerable dividends.

GOAL 4: ESSA

Due to COVID-19 and the subsequent changes to the state's testing, accountability, and federal reporting requirements, the 2020-21 school accountability statuses are the same as those assigned for the 2019-20 school year. The 2019-20 accountability statuses were based on 2018-19 exam results. Assigned accountability designations and further context can be found https://english.com/html/english statuses were based on 2018-19 exam results.

Goal 7: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school's status under the state accountability system.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Each SA charter was in "Good Standing" under ESSA for 2020-21.

Accountability Status by Year

Year	Status
2018-19	Good Standing
2019-20	Good Standing
2020-21	Good Standing

SA 2020-21 Principals

School2020-21 PrincipalBed-Stuy 1Ariana VlachosBed-Stuy 2Alisha NeptuneBensonhurstKerri LynchBergen BeachKathryn Fabian

Bronx 1 Jacqueline DiBenedetto

Bronx 2 Angela Inslee
Bronx 3 Kimberley Schacht
Bronx 4 Samantha Cheslow

Kelly Grimes **Bushwick** Cobble Hill Alissa Bishop Crown Heights Hannah Chapman Far Rockaway Jose Rosario Flatbush Wintanna Abai Fort Greene Victoria Brienza Harlem 1 Sheila Palmer Harlem 2 Katie Huntington Harlem 3 Tara Stant

Harlem 4 Francesca Vanin Harlem 5 Molly Cohen Harlem 6 **Emily Reilly** Hell's Kitchen William Abbott **Hudson Yards** Will Loskoch **Prospect Heights** Darielle Petrucci Rosedale Elizabeth Miller South Jamaica Victoria Brienza Springfield Gardens Ashley Kubly Union Square Annie Suliga **Upper West** Jen Haynes Washington Heights Kelsey DePalo Williamsburg Alison Levy

				SA S	chool En	rollment,	2020-21	- BEDS 2	020					
School	K	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	Grand Total
Bed-Stuy 1	73	67	80	78	72	132	97	80	73					752
Bed-Stuy 2	54	58	50	64	62									288
Bed Stuy 3						79	42	37						158
Bensonhurst	104	142	139	126	132									643
Bergen Beach	122	135	135	114	111	196	85	56						954
Bronx 1	125	119	133	128	130									635
Bronx 2	139	103	130	129	126	163	104	83	49					1,026
Bronx 3	102	136	139	119	136	166	128	165	96					1,187
Bronx 4	132	139	133	105	99									608
Bushwick	104	134	118	86	82									524
Cobble Hill	104	88	85	79	86									442
Crown Heights	96	95	81	96	90	144	80	97	72					851
Far Rockaway	112	123	131	79	93	65								603
Flatbush	137	118	131	109	100									595
Fort Greene	38	35	52	48	54									227
Harlem 1	107	98	102	126	110	127	99	66	66	270	234	223	149	1,777
Harlem 2	109	79	100	101	129	38	66	45	26					693
Harlem 3	59	66	82	78	94	141	104	108	90					822
Harlem 4	57	71	85	90	93									396
Harlem 5	65	91	98	98	93	130	105	84	76					840
Harlem 6	67	88	83	85	53									376
Hell's Kitchen	94	82	81	88	92									437
Hudson Yards	67	87	93	93	78									418
Prospect Heights	94	74	67	70	84	78	41	60	52					620
Rosedale	137	145	137	115	130	100								764
South Jamaica	105	73	66	103	99									446
Springfield Gardens	111	110	110	137	102	110	159	93						932
Union Square	125	106	91	119	117	134	115	93	78					978
Upper West	95	87	91	85	99	138	115	117	79					906
Washington Heights	120	121	134	134	125									634
Williamsburg	89	75	86	78	85									413
Total	2,943	2,945	3,043	2,960	2,956	1,941	1,340	1,184	757	270	234	223	149	20,945

2020-21 Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment Systems, 3rd Edition

					Network-Wide	Results (All Studen	ts)				English Language Learners							
SA Charter Bed-Stuy 1	Grade 1 2	Expectations	rk Benchmar in Expectations	Scholars Sin Tested in December 20 27 37	Expectations in December 2020 59.7% 52.6%	Expectations in May 2021 62 71	Total Number of Scholars Enrolled in May 2021 69 76	the December Benchmark in May 2021 #NAME? #NAME?	Average Number of Levels Grown from December 2020 to May 2021	SA Charter Bed-Stuy 1	Grade 1 2	ELLS Who Did ELLS Who Met Benchmark Expectations in December 2020 2 2	Total Number of ELL Scholars Tested in	Benchmark Expectations in December 2020 4 50.0% 4 50.0%	ELLS Who Met December Benchmark	Total Number of ELLS Scholars Tested in May	December Benchmark Expectations in May #NAME? #NAME?	Levels Grown from December 2020 to May 2021 for ELL Scholars 2.00 2.00
	3 4 5 6 7 8 K	1	34 40 13 58 80 73 25	17 38 0 0	77 44.2% 73 54.8% 130 86.9% 96 60.4% 80 100.0% 73 100.0% 69 36.2%	68 111 85 79 73	75 72 125 94 79 73 65	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?			3 4 5 6 7 8 K	1 0 0 0 0 0 0	4	5 20.0% 0 1 0.0% 1 0 0 0 5 20.0%	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	5 #NAME? 1 #NAME? 5 #NAME?	N/A N/A 0.00 N/A N/A N/A 3.00
Bed-Stuy 1 Total Bed-Stuy 2	1 2 3 4 K		04 29 30 39 44	26 18 26 17	743 67.8% 55 52.7% 48 62.5% 65 60.0% 61 72.1% 56 85.7%	673 47 44	728 55 47 63 61 56	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.55 1.83 1.35 2.05 2.36		1 2 3 4	6 13 0 0 1 0 3	20 2 2 3	30.0% 2 0.0% 2 0.0% 1 100.0% 0 3 100.0%	16 1 1	19 2	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	0.00 N/A N/A N/A 2.00
Bed-Stuy 2 Total Bed-Stuy 3	5 6		90 69 20		80 86.3% 41 48.8%	254 69	282 78 40	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.26 0.83	Bed-Stuy 2 Total Bed-Stuy 3	5 6	4 4 0 0 0 0	; 8	50.0% 50.0% 0	5	7	7 #NAME?	N/A N/A
Bed-Stuy 3 Total Bensonhurst	1	12	31 20 16	38 1 25	37 83.8% 158 75.9% 141 82.3%	144 139	37 155 141	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.39	Bed-Stuy 3 Total	7	0 0 40 1) (4 5	,,	0 53			N/A 2.86
	2 3 4 K		87 83 95 87	41 37 3	136 64.0% 124 66.9% 132 72.0% 103 84.5%		134 122 128 98	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.99 1.98 1.93 2.9		2 3 4 K	9 1 8 1 9 1 40 1	5 2· 5 2· 0 1· 2 5·	3 34.8% 9 47.4%	18 17 10 47	24 23 10 19 27 52	3 #NAME? 9 #NAME?	2.67 3.28 3.00 2.82
Bensonhurst Total Bergen Beach	1 2	40		168 6 8	73.6% 73.6% 132 48.5% 61.5%	587	623 127 129	# NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	3.13 2.08	Bensonhurst Total Bergen Beach	1 2	106 66 4 0			145 7 4			N/A N/A
	3 4 5 6 7	1	58 76 47 45 56	26 49	114 50.9% 102 74.5% 196 75.0% 85 52.9% 56 100.0%	97 97 160 68 56	111 99 193 84 56	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.2 2.42 1.25 0.65		3 4 5 6 7	1 1 0 0	1 : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	2 50.0% 1 100.0% 0 0	1		2 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	N/A N/A N/A N/A N/A
Bergen Beach Total Bronx 1	1 1		81 07 :	326 9	118 68.6% 933 65.1% 120 61.7%	109 825 107	114 913 117	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.69	Bergen Beach Total Bronx 1	1 1	10 12	5 1	5 66.7%	6 20 14	. 15	5 #NAME?	3.57
	2 3 4		53 90 38 52	39 : 7	117 45.3% 129 69.8% 45 84.4% 115 45.2%	75 124 42 103	112 126 42	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.32 2.09 1.71 2.77		2 3 4 k	2 8 3	9 1 7 1 2 .		6 13 4	1° 1° 15° 15° 15° 15° 15° 15° 15° 15° 15	// // // // // // // // // // // // //	2.00 4.25 2.50
Bronx 1 Total Bronx 2	1 2	30		219 5	526 58.4% 98 77.6% 126 46.0%	451	112 509 94 119	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.95 2.52	Bronx 1 Total Bronx 2	1 2	25 29 13 10 1	3 1	4 46.3% 6 81.3%	45 16 18	16	# NAME? 6 #NAME?	2.00 2.40
	3 4 5		99 .02 .13	26 23 23	125 79.2% 125 81.6% 158 71.5%	124 121 122	124 121 153	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.2 2.16 1.44		3 4 5	7 14 1	5 1, 5 1,	2 58.3%	12 23	. 12	2 #NAME?	2.66 2.00 N/A
	6 7 8		30 75 49	7 0	103 29.1% 82 91.5% 49 100.0%	82 49	102 82 49	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?			6 7 8	0 0 0) (0 0 0	24	21	2 #NAN452	N/A N/A N/A
Bronx 2 Total Bronx 3	1 1 2		.02 04 2 81	295 9 53	133 76.7% 999 70.5% 134 60.4% 138 42.0%	896	130 974 131 133	#NAME? # NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.56 2.13 1.49	Bronx 2 Total Bronx 3	1 2	24 69 3 3 13 8 1	9 3. 102 7 2: 1 1:	2 67.6% 0 65.0%	31 100 16		#NAME? 0 #NAME?	2.50 6.00 N/A
	3 4 5 6	1	54 68 32 69	62 59 525 525 525 525 525 525 525 525 525	116 46.6% 127 53.5% 157 84.1% 126 54.8%	79 99 119 107	113 121 148 124	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.54 1.92 1.05 0.78		3 4 5 6	3 4 0	7 1 1 5 1 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 30.0%	5 8 2	10 10	0 #NAME?	6.00 N/A N/A N/A
Bronx 3 Total	7 8 K		.55 94 55 66	0 44	164 94.5% 94 100.0% 99 55.6% 155 66.3%	91	162 91 97	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	0.07	Bronx 3 Total	7 8 K	0 0 4 1			12 58			N/A N/A 2.80
Bronx 4	1 2 3		93 91 74	42 40	155 66.3% 135 68.9% 131 69.5% 104 71.2%	128 120 93	1,120 134 129 101	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.51 1.38 1.25	Bronx 4	1 2 3	32 43 5 4 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	5 75 5 1 1		9 7	75) 10 . 2		2.00 N/A N/A
Bronx 4 Total	4 K	3:	61 80 99	36 40	97 62.9% 120 66.7% 587 68.0%	83 112 536	94 116 574	#NAME? #NAME? # NAME?	2.07		4 K	2 4 15 25	7 1 3 40	7 28.6% 1 36.4%	5 10 35) 1: 40	7 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	8.00 2.80
Bushwick	1 2 3		74 85 73	30 : 11	128 57.8% 115 73.9% 84 86.9%	118 107 83	129 113 84	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	3.24 1.92 2.21		1 2 3	22 2 10 1 7	1 4. 5 2. 3 1.	5 40.0% 0 70.0%	39 21 10	25 10 10	5 #NAME? 0 #NAME?	3.22 3.88 3.50
Bushwick Total Cobble Hill	K K		67 80 79 :	132 5	80 83.8% 104 76.9% 511 74.2% 87 65.5%	98 484 81	100 505 83	#NAME? #NAME? # NAME? #NAME?	2.23 2.74 2.65		4 K	20 61 45	5 2 106		23 95	23 102	2 #NAME? 3 #NAME? 2 #NAME? 9 #NAME?	N/A 2.36 3.00
	2 3 4		55 65 71	29 14 13	84 65.5% 79 82.3% 84 84.5%	82 78 78	82 79 83	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.25 1.57 1.76	0000011111	2 3 4	3 5 2	3 2	6 50.0% 7 71.4% 3 66.7%	5 7 3	; ;	5 #NAME? 7 #NAME? 3 #NAME?	2.00 2.00 N/A
Cobble Hill Total Crown Heights	1 1		80 28 67		101 79.2% 435 75.4% 91 73.6%	415	97 424 89	#NAME? # NAME? #NAME?	3.42 2.54	Cobble Hill Total	1 1	20 12 3	3 2	7 57.1% 2 62.5% 5 60.0%	7 30 5	31 5	5 #NAME?	2.50
	2 3 4 5	1	44 66 77	36 30 12 23	80 55.0% 96 68.8% 89 86.5% 144 84.0%	76 88 85 104	80 94 86 140	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.79 1.45 1.7 1.06		2 3 4	0 1 1	3 1	3 0.0% 4 25.0% 2 50.0% 2 100.0%	3 3 1) ;	3 #NAME? 4 #NAME? 1 #NAME? 2 #NAME?	2.00 2.00 0.00 0.00
	6 7 8		40 78 71	38 18 0	78 51.3% 96 81.3% 71 100.0%	67 95 71	78 96 71	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	0.81 0.21		6 7 8	0 0 0)))	0 0 0 0		•	Z #IVAIVIL:	N/A N/A N/A
Crown Heights Total Far Rockaway	1 1	64	36	191 8	95 89.5% 840 77.3% 113 31.9%	88 760 95	90 824 111	#NAME? # NAME? #NAME?	2.33 3.55	Crown Heights Total Far Rockaway	1	5 12 1) 21 3	5 100.0% 1 57.1% 4 25.0%			4 #NAME?	N/A 6.00
	2 3 4 5		15 21 52	109 52 34 34	124 12.1% 73 28.8% 86 60.5% 60 43.3%		121 66 85 55	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.73 2.18 1.72 2.69		2 3 4	0 0 4	2 : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	2 0.0% 5 0.0% 0 40.0%	2	<u> </u>	2 #NAME? 4 #NAME?	0.00 3.00 N/A N/A
Far Rockaway Total Flatbush	K 1		68 18 3	42 2 348 5	110 61.8% 566 38.5% 118 55.9%		102 540 118	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.73	Far Rockaway Total Flatbush	K 1	0 5 16	5 5 2 1	0 1 23.8% 6 33.3%	5 10 6		5 #NAME? 6 #NAME?	N/A N/A 3.00
	2 3 4		62 63 60	44 36	128 48.4% 107 58.9% 96 62.5%	105 93 87	128 102 96	#NAME?	1.9 2.62 2.51		2 3 4	1 1 0	3 4 1	4 25.0% 5 20.0% 1 0.0%	1 4 1		4 #NAME? 4 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	4.75 0.00 0.00
Flatbush Total Fort Greene	1 1 2		81 32 24		136 59.6% 585 56.8% 35 68.6% 51 82.4%	115 510 30	131 575 35 50	#NAME? # NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.12 2.63 1.74	Flatbush Total Fort Greene	1 1 2	4 8 1 1	5 25 7 25	9 44.4% 5 32.0% 1 100.0% 5 60.0%	9 21 1	24	9 #NAME? 1 #NAME? 1 #NAME? 5 #NAME?	2.67 0.00 2.00
	3 4 K		39 44 28	9 9	48 81.3% 53 83.0% 37 75.7%	44 45 44 32	46 52 36	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.74 1.24 2.19 1.69		3 4 K	0 1 1	2	1 0.0% 3 33.3% 1 100.0%	1 2	· !	1 #NAME? 3 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	2.00 N/A N/A N/A
Fort Greene Total Harlem 1	1 2		77 46 59	52	98 46.9% 101 58.4%	93 86	219 96 101	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	3.29 1.91	Fort Greene Total Harlem 1	1 2	6 ± 5 6	5 11 7	1 54.5% 9 22.2% 9 66.7%	8 6	11		3.60 0.00
	3 4 5		75 66 81	42	123 61.0% 108 61.1% 127 63.8%	105 86 99	118 108 119	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.78 1.71 1.39		3 4 5	1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1	1 9.1% 4 0.0% 0	5	5	9 #NAME? 4 #NAME?	0.00 0.00 N/A
	6 7 8 K		32 51 66 68	66 13 0 32	98 32.7% 64 79.7% 66 100.0% 100 68.0%	60 55 66 94	94 61 66 99	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	0.9 0.64 - 3.59		6 7 8 8	0 0 0		0 0 0 6 66.7%	6		6 #NAME?	N/A N/A N/A N/A
Harlem 1 Total Harlem 2	1 2			341 8 34	79 57.0% 102 34.3%	744	862 78 100	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.35 1.29	Harlem 1 Total Harlem 2	1 2	13 26 8 1	39 9 1	9 33.3%	25 15 3	37 5 17	7 #NAME?	3.00 2.00
	3 4 5		53 75 18	47 53 5 19	100 53.0% 128 58.6% 37 48.6%	74 103 22	96 124 37	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.53 1.51 0.7		3 4 5	2 3 0	3 1 3 1	5 40.0% 1 27.3% 0	3 5	i 2	4 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	N/A N/A N/A
	6 7 8 K		11 43 20		64 17.2% 45 95.6% 20 100.0%	44 20	63 45 20	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?			6 7 8	0 0		0 0 0			0 #NAN453	N/A N/A N/A
Harlem 2 Total Harlem 3	1 2	3	75 75 43 41		106 70.8% 581 55.1% 62 69.4% 80 51.3%	92 518 59 67	99 662 63 76	#NAME? # NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.14 2.05 1.91	Harlem 2 Total Harlem 3	1 2	19 34 12 2	5 1 53 2 1		35 14 2		#NAME?	4.50 4.00 0.00
	3 4 5	1	43 69 02	31 22	74 58.1% 91 75.8% 139 73.4%	115	74 91 138	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.97 2.06 1.33		3 4 5	1 3 0	7 2	8 12.5% 5 60.0% 1 0.0%	7 5	, (s	9 #NAME? 5 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	4.00 2.00 0.00
	6 7 8	1	41 .04 83	2 0	104 39.4% 106 98.1% 83 100.0%	100 105 83	103 106 83	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.15 0.02		6 7 8	0 0 0		0 0 0			0 #NAN453	N/A N/A N/A
Harlem 3 Total Harlem 4	1 2		72		56 82.1% 795 71.9% 69 62.3% 81 45.7%	52 739 64 71	53 787 69 80	#NAME? # NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	3.05 2.72 2.4	Harlem 3 Total Harlem 4	1 2	25 16 5 0	2 5 41 4	9 77.8% 1 61.0% 9 55.6% 4 0.0%	37 8 2	42	9 #NAME? 2 #NAME? 9 #NAME? 4 #NAME?	6.00 3.00
	3 4 K		54 66 27	32 26 29	86 62.8% 92 71.7% 56 48.2%	80 83 53	84 92 56	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.51 1.96 2.6		3 4 K	2 0 3	5	8 25.0% 0 8 37.5%	8	\$ \$	8 #NAME? 8 #NAME?	3.33 N/A 2.33
Harlem 4 Total Harlem 5	1 2		27 65 52 40	22 42	59.1% 87 74.7% 94 55.3% 96 41.7%	351 84 87	381 85 93	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.9 2.56 1.67		1 2	10 19 8 6	5 1 4 1	3 61.5% 0 60.0%	24 12 10		3 #NAME? 0 #NAME?	3.00 2.00 2.00
	3 4 5 6	1	40 65 11 61		96 41.7% 90 72.2% 131 84.7% 104 58.7%	70 84 108 91	94 89 130 103	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.67 2.04 1.24 0.66		4 5 6	5 1 1 0	7 1 9 1 0 5		9 7 1	, 1°, (1 #NAME? 9 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	2.00 2.00 N/A N/A
	7 8 K		80 72 36	1 0 24	81 98.8% 72 100.0% 60 60.0%	81 70 53	81 70 56	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	0.01		7 8 K	0 0 4)) 4	0 0 0 8 50.0%	8	}	8 #NAME?	N/A N/A N/A 3.00
Harlem 5 Total Harlem 6	1 2		82 53 59		815 71.4% 85 62.4% 79 74.7%	728 77 76	801 83 79	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.73 2.08	Harlem 5 Total Harlem 6	1 2	25 29 13 2	54 5 1 3	4 46.3% 8 72.2% 5 40.0%	47 17 4		#NAME? 8 #NAME? 5 #NAME?	N/A N/A
Harlem 6 Total	3 4 K		67 44 60 83		83 80.7% 51 86.3% 65 92.3% 363 78.0%		83 51 62 358	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.73 2.16 3.05		3 4 K	2 7 0 24 13	2	4 50.0% 0 70.0% 1 0.0% 8 63.2%	ł		4 #NAME? 9 #NAME? 6 #NAME?	N/A N/A 3.00
Hell's Kitchen	1 2 3		54 49 52	27 32 35	81 66.7% 81 60.5% 87 59.8%	79 74 79	79 81 83	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.9 2.1 2.2	Hell's Kitchen	1 2 3	12 0 2	3 2 4 .	0 60.0% 4 0.0% 2 100.0%	19 2 2		9 #NAME? 3 #NAME? 2 #NAME?	2.40 2.00 0.00
Hell's Kitchen Total	4 K			15 33 142 4	91 83.5% 93 64.5% 433 67.2%	84 89 405	90 92 425	#NAME? #NAME? # NAME?	1.54 3.09	Hell's Kitchen Total	4 K	1 1 16 18		4 25.0% 4 25.0% 4 47.1%	3		#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.00
Hudson Yards	1 2 3		62 54 45 51	24 38 44 22	86 72.1% 92 58.7% 89 50.6% 73 69.9%	78 88 80 67	83 92 88 73	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	3.17 2.12 1.88 1.95		1 2 3	4 4 1	7 1 2 5	1 36.4% 6 66.7% 6 16.7% 1 0.0%	9 5 5	10 10	0 #NAME? 6 #NAME? 6 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	N/A N/A 4.00 0.00
Hudson Yards Total Prospect Heights	K 1	2.	51 44 56 :	22	69.9% 66 66.7% 406 63.1% 71 45.1%	59 372	63 399 68	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	2.84 2.82	Hudson Yards Total	K 1	0 3 12 17	2 2 29	5 60.0%	4 23 2		5 #NAME?	2 8.00
	3 4		36 36 60	30 32 23	66 54.5% 68 52.9% 83 72.3%	60 65 79	66 69 82	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.71 1.81 1.88		2 3 4	1 1 1	1	2 50.0% 1 100.0% 1 100.0%		2	2 #NAME? 1 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	N/A N/A N/A
	5 6 7		72 25 60 52	6 11 1	78 92.3% 36 69.4% 61 98.4% 52 100.0%	60	76 39 60 52	#NAME? #NAME? #NAME? #NAME?	1.26 0.39 0.02		5 6 7	0 0 0		0 0 0				N/A N/A N/A
Prospect Heights Total Rosedale	K 1	44	52 69 42 :	22 164 6	52 100.0% 91 75.8% 606 72.9% 136 81.6%	547	52 86 598 132	#NAME? #NAME? # NAME? #NAME?	2.07 2.41	Prospect Heights Total	8 K al 1	0 2 5 0	5 5 8 8 1	0 2 100.0% 8 62.5% 1 0.0%	2 8	8	2 #NAME? 3 #NAME? 1 #NAME?	N/A 2 N/A
. tooouald	1	1			81.6%	132	132	#NAME?	2.41	I NOSCUAIC	1	U	_	0.0%	I 1	. '	#NAME?	N/A

	l	87	47	124	C4 00/	122	121	#NIAN4E2	1 01		l o	0	1	1	0.00/				N/A
	2	8/	47	134	64.9%	122	131	#NAME?	1.81		2	0	1	1	0.0%				N/A
	3	75	28	109	68.8%	100	108	#NAME?	2.29 1.54		3	0	0	0			1	#NAME?	N/A N/A
	4	101	28 24	129 99	78.3%	120	125 94	#NAME? #NAME?	1.54		4	U	U	U			1	#INAIVIE!	•
) V	106			75.8%	85			2.88		V	0	0	0					N/A N/A
Rosedale Total	r.	106 555	32	138	76.8% 74.5%	128 687	131 721	#NAME? # NAME?	2.00	Rosedale Total	I N	0	2	3	0.0%	1	2	#NAME?	IN/A
South Jamaica	1	49	190 22	745	69.0%	63	69	#NAME?	2.39	South Jamaica	1	4	2	7	0.0% 57.1%	6	7	#NAME?	0.00
Souli Jamaica	2	49	26	62		55	60	#NAME?	1.95	South Jamaica	1 2	4	ა ე	,		2	2	#NAME?	0.00
	2	50	20	105	58.1% 65.7%	06 06	104	#NAME?	1.71		2		2	0	33.3% 62.5%	7	9	#NAME?	2.00 0.00
	3	69	23	105	74.7%	90	91	#NAME?	1.71		3	ວ າ	3 1	0		2	0	#NAME?	0.00
	4 V	67	23 35	102	65.7%	92	96		3.28		4 V	4	1	3	66.7% 57.1%	2	6	#NAME?	3.33
South Jamaica Total	r.	200		102				#NAME? # NAME?	3.20	South Jamaica Total	I N	16	3	28		24	37	#NAME?	5.55
Springfield Gardens	1	289 83	142 26	431 109	67.1% 76.1%	388 101	420 105	#NAME?	2.39	Springfield Gardens	1	70	12	28	57.1% 50.0%	24	1	#NAME?	4.00
Springrield Garderis	2	o5 50	51	110	53.6%	93	107	#NAME?	1.82	Springheid Gardens	2	1	1	2	50.0%	2	2	#NAME?	4.00
	2	90	45	134	66.4%	125	132	#NAME?	2.29		2	1	1	2	50.0%	1	2	#NAME?	2.00
	3	09 71	45 21	102	69.6%	96	101	#NAME?	2.29		3	0	0	2	50.0%	ı	2	#INAIVIE!	N/A
	5	71	17	102	84.4%	90	109	#NAME?			5	0	0	0					N/A
	6	32 57	103	160	35.6%	111	159	#NAME?	1.21 0.74		6	0	0	0					N/A N/A
	7	5/ 02	102	93	100.0%	93	93	#NAME? #NAME?	0.74		7	0	0	0					,
	, k	93 98	U 7	105	93.3%	93 104	93 104	#NAME? #NAME?	2.41		, K	υ 2	0	0	100.0%	2	2	#NAME?	N/A 0.00
Springfield Gardens Total	rx .	642	280	922	69.6%	820	910	#NAME?	2.41	Springfield Gardens		7	4	11	63.6%	10	11	#NAME?	0.00
Union Square	1	93	12	105	88.6%	100	103	#NAME?	2.38	Union Square	1 1	, 6	1	7	85.7%	5	6	#NAME?	3.25
Official Square	2	53	37	90	58.9%	81	86	#NAME?	1.89	Officit Square	2	1	1	5	20.0%	1	4	#NAME?	2.00
	3	90	30	118	67.8%	103	113	#NAME?	1.97		3	5	4	9	55.6%	7	8	#NAME?	3.00
	1	80 81	32	113	71.7%	103	111	#NAME?	1.97		1	2	2	5	60.0%	1	5	#NAME?	0.00
	5	117	32 17	134	87.3%	120	132	#NAME?	1.14		5	0	0	0	00.076	4	J	#INAIVIL:	N/A
	6	117	71	113	37.2%	97	110	#NAME?	1.17		6	0	0	0					N/A
	7	97	1	01	95.6%	89	90	#NAME?	0.08		7	0	0	0					N/A
	8	77	0	77	100.0%	76	76	#NAME? -	0.08		8	0	0	0					N/A
	K	80	37	117	68.4%	111	111	#NAME?	3.53		, k	5	6	11	45.5%	10	10	#NAME?	11/1
Union Square Total	IX.	710	248	958	74.1%	879	932	#NAME?	3.33	Union Square Total	IX.	20	17	37	54.1%	30	33	#NAME?	3
Upper West	1	54	29	83	65.1%	74	80	#NAME?	2.72	Upper West	1	Δ	2	5,	66.7%	5	5	#NAME?	N/A
Opper West	2	50	38	88	56.8%	73	81	#NAME?	2.05	Оррсі УУСЗІ	2	2	2	4	50.0%	2	3	#NAME?	N/A
	3	54	31	85	63.5%	80	83	#NAME?	2.12		3	0	6	6	0.0%	4	6	#NAME?	N/A
	4	76	22	98	77.6%	93	94	#NAME?	2.04		4	2	2	4	50.0%	2	3	#NAME?	N/A
	5	116	21	137	84.7%	102	134	#NAME?	1.2		5	<u>2</u>	0	0	30.070	2	9	πιναινίε;	N/A
	6	40	74	114	35.1%	82	113	#NAME?	1.02		6	0	0	0					N/A
	7	90	25	115	78.3%	110	115	#NAME?	0.36		7	0	0	0					N/A
	8	76	2	78	97.4%	78	78	#NAME?	0.04		8	0	0	0					N/A
	K	64	27	91	70.3%	84	86	#NAME?	2.7		ĸ	4	2	6	66.7%	Δ	4	#NAME?	3
Upper West Total		620	269	889	69.7%	776	864	#NAME?	2.7	Upper West Total	- 1	12	14	26	46.2%	17	21	#NAME?	J
Washington Heights	1	47	73	120	39.2%	97	117	#NAME?	2.47	Washington Heights	1	0	8	8	0.0%	2	7	#NAME?	0.00
vvaoriii igtori i rolgilio	2	93	42	135	68.9%	115	133	#NAME?	1.56	Tracimigram roigne	2	14	9	23	60.9%	22	24	#NAME?	2.00
	3	93	39	132	70.5%	103	129	#NAME?	1.12		3	10	9	19	52.6%	13	19	#NAME?	3.50
	4	92	29	121	76.0%	102	120	#NAME?	1.36		4	7	6	13	53.8%	8	12	#NAME?	0.00
	K	89	26	115	77.4%	111	112	#NAME?	3.1		K	7	4	11	63.6%	10	10	#NAME?	2
Washington Heights Total		414	209	623	66.5%	528	611	#NAME?		Washington Heights	Total	38	36	74	51.4%	55	72	#NAME?	
Williamsburg	1	61	13	74	82.4%	66	72	#NAME?	1.83	Williamsburg	1	3	2	5	60.0%	4	5	#NAME?	0.00
3	2	49	36	85	57.6%	76	85	#NAME?	2	J	2	2	6	8	25.0%	6	8	#NAME?	4.00
	3	59	19	78	75.6%	76	76	#NAME?	1.57		3	3	1	4	75.0%	4	4	#NAME?	2.00
	4	67	17	84	79.8%	78	83	#NAME?	1.6		4	1	2	3	33.3%	2	3	#NAME?	0.00
	K	58	30	88	65.9%	84	85	#NAME?	2.49		K	3	2	5	60.0%	4	5	#NAME?	4.00
Williamsburg Total		294	115	409	71.9%	380	401	#NAME?		Williamsburg Total		12	13	25	48.0%	20	25	#NAME?	
Network Total	•	13244	6284	19528	67.80%	17371	19097	#NAME?		Network Total		633	602	1237	51.2%	1,027	1202	#NAME?	
												-				•			

June 2021 Regents-Based Internal Exam* United States History and Government

SA Charter	Grade	Did not pass	Passed	Total	% Passing
Bed-Stuy 1	8	8	65	73	89.0%
Bronx 2	8	4	45	49	91.8%
Bronx 3	8	6	85	91	93.4%
Crown Heights	8	3	68	71	95.8%
Harlem 1	8	13	52	65	80.0%
Harlem 2	8	3	23	26	88.5%
Harlem 3	8		83	83	100.0%
Harlem 5	8	3	67	70	95.7%
Union Square	8	6	70	76	92.1%
Upper West	8	5	73	78	93.6%
Prospect Heights	8	3	49	52	94.2%
Grand Total		54	680	734	92.6%

June 2021 Regents-Based Internal Exam* Algebra I

SA Charter	Grade	Did not pass	Passed	Total	% Passing
Bed-Stuy 1	8	13	60	73	82.2%
Bronx 2	8	6	42	48	87.5%
Bronx 3	8	13	78	91	85.7%
Crown Heights	8	12	59	71	83.1%
Harlem 1	8	28	38	66	57.6%
Harlem 2	8	7	19	26	73.1%
Harlem 3	8	7	74	81	91.4%
Harlem 5	8	15	55	70	78.6%
Union Square	8	10	65	75	86.7%
Upper West	8	14	64	78	82.1%
Prospect Heights	8	11	41	52	78.8%
Grand Total		136	595	731	81.4%

January 2021 Regents Exam Living Environment

SA Charter	Grade	Did not pass	Passed	Total	% Passing
Bed-Stuy 1	8	3	70	73	95.89%
Bronx 2	8	1	48	49	97.96%
Bronx 3	8	3	90	93	96.77%
Crown Heights	8	0	71	71	100.00%
Harlem 3	8	0	81	81	100.00%
Harlem 5	8	1	70	71	98.59%
Harlem 2	8	1	25	26	96.15%
Harlem 1	8	5	49	54	90.74%
Union Square	8	3	73	76	96.05%
Upper West	8	9	69	78	88.46%
Prospect Heights	8	0	52	52	100.00%
Grand Total		26	698	724	96.4%