Academic Leadership Charter School

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 23, 2019, 2019

By Leena Varghese__

677 East 141st Street, Bronx NY, 10454

718-585-4215

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

Trustee's Name	Board Position
James Sander	Chair
Christopher Brignola	Vice Chair
Lucas Doe	Treasurer
Stephen Wasserman	Secretary
Fatoumata Camara	Member

Norma Hurwitsz has served has the Founder/Executive Director since 2009. Leena Varghese has served as the school leader(Principal) since 2012.

"With the leadership of the School Board, its administration, teachers and support staff, Academic Leadership Charter School's mission is to develop in students the ability to exceed NYS performance standards in all major academic areas in a safe and nurturing environment. In partnership with parents and the community, our students will be empowered to become leaders and take an active role in their learning while exhibiting good character."

Academic Leadership Charter School has set very high academic performance goals for our students and has striven to meet those goals by providing a strong and differentiated instructional program. Our main goal and focus is to provide our students with a quality educational program that helps them to develop and demonstrate College and Career Readiness by meeting or exceeding NYS Common Core Standards through a strong curriculum.

It is our belief that all students can achieve academic success in a nurturing and academically rigorous environment. Our students have outperformed schools in CSD 7, our peer schools, and students city-wide[1]. During our initial charter period, we also saw an improvement for individual students from year to year. Our instructional program focuses on Literacy across the content areas in all grades and this has proven to be successful for all of our students, including our struggling population.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year														
School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2014-15														
2015-16														
2016-17														
2017-18	55	50	51	55	47	58	49	49	83	0	0	0	0	549
2018-19	88	76	55	57	55	49	53	40	39	0	0	0	0	521

GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at Academic Leadership Charter School will become proficient in English Language Arts

BACKGROUND

Our Literacy program is designed to help students become fluent readers and critical thinkers. We follow an interdisciplinary approach that is content based and allows for

language development and vocabulary expansion. Every day, students read and analyze stories and other rich texts, such as magazine articles and poetry. Fiction and non-fiction stories are analyzed by students based on weekly themes and story genres which enable mastery of that particular weekly topic; character study, mysteries, plays, multicultural stories, myths, fables, legends and novels.

We offer four periods of Literacy instruction daily, employing a balanced literacy program offering a mini lesson followed by a workshop period when the classroom teacher and the associate teacher initially work with at-risk, Special education, or ELL students. Once these students have demonstrated mastery, they proceed to work independently. The classroom teacher then reviews work with the group of on or above level students. Each of the aforementioned groups participate in small group workshop sessions with the classroom teacher, associate, or one of the instructional support teachers for 15-20 minutes sessions daily during the activity portion of the lesson.

The first two periods consist of our core reading program, SRA Imagine It! for grades K-6 which allows students to read a variety of texts and build necessary reading comprehension skills. For grades 7- 8, we use novels and Pearson's Literature reading anthologies. The third period is devoted to supplemental fiction texts that are teacher selected and theme based. The fourth period focuses on writing and responding to literature.

It is important that our students have a love for reading by providing meaningful topical material tailored to students' social and cognitive developmental and interest level, engaging texts, and the opportunity for all students to be active participants in every lesson, regardless of their ability level. To assist with providing best differentiated lessons in ELA, each classroom has created an ELA chart that outlines each comprehension skill, strategy, and elements of figurative language. This system of tracking identifies each student's strengths where students are provided more challenging activities, and weaknesses which requires re-teaching. The ELA chart is updated within each six-week period to support most updated differentiated groups.

In addition to rich fiction texts, we use have a variety of non-fiction texts incorporated in our curriculum. From their early years, ALCS students receive a content rich curriculum with social studies and science being taught daily and one period a day devoted to each of those subjects. In addition, during our literacy block, content is reinforced. Teachers have students read and discuss newspaper articles to remain aware of current events. Students examine articles from various newspapers on the same topic, to analyze how each has a point of view and bias and each journalist chooses to write what he or she wants readers to walk away with.

Each lesson is highly interactive and teachers facilitate rich discussions, analysis, and application of what is learned. Instead of teachers simply monitoring and ensuring that each student is on task during independent activities, our teachers use this time to re-teach and provide greater scaffolding to students who need it most.

Every Monday, we hold professional development sessions to help teachers become well versed with our ELA curriculum. School administrators also co-teach with teachers to provide additional support. We assess students every six-weeks using a Mock assessment, modeled after the state's ELA exam, to track student mastery and progress.

> **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 3rd through 8th grade in April 2019. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested						
Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[2]				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	56	6	6	0	0	56
4	53	5	0	0	0	53
5	47	0	0	0	0	47
6	50	8	0	0	0	50
7	40	0	0	0	0	40
8	38	6	0	0	0	38
All	284	25	6	0	0	284

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

For The 2018-2019 school year, we met our goal of 75% of or more of our students being proficient in ELA. 84% of our students were proficient. Our continued efforts in the classroom and the professional development provided to teachers has led to this success.

---

[2] 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.

Performance on 2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year				
Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	84%	56	93%	40
4	72%	53	73%	44
5	74%	47	85%	34
6	88%	50	86%	42
7	95%	40	97%	38
8	95%	38	95%	38
All	84%	284	87%	238

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Our students ELA proficiency rate increased from 72% to 84%, a gain of 12%.

ELA Performance by Grade Level and Year						
Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3			88%	51	84%	56
4			69%	45	72%	53
5			67%	55	74%	47
6			57%	46	88%	50
7			62%	45	95%	40
8			80%	83	95%	38
All			72%	325	84%	284

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of

students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2018-19 English language arts MIP for all students of 105. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure by comparing the PI to this year's MIP. 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.

Number in Cohort	English Language Arts 2018-19 Performance Index			
	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	[?]	[?]	[?]	[?]

$$PI = [?] + [?] + [?] = [?]$$
$$[?] + [?] = [?]$$
$$+ (.5)*[?] = [?]$$
$$PI = [?]$$

> **Goal 1: Comparative Measure**
>
> Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[3]

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Academic Leadership Charter School significantly outperformed the local district in ELA.

---

[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.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level</td></tr>
</table>

Grade	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	93%	40	43%	1181
4	73%	44	36%	1234
5	85%	34	22%	1179
6	86%	42	28%	1131
7	97%	38	22%	1058
8	95%	38	31%	1183
All	87%	238	31%	6966

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school's performance in comparison to the local district in previous years. In addition, the school can use a supplemental table for this section on a comparison of the charter school to selected local schools. The table shell appears on page 31 in the Appendix.

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7">English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year</td></tr>
</table>

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to District Students					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3			89%	39%	93%	43%
4			79%	30%	73%	36%
5			65%	23%	85%	22%
6			54%	17%	86%	28%
7			63%	15%	97%	22%
8			80%	14%	95%	31%
All			84%	23%	87%	31%

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful

degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

METHOD

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

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our school population is over 93% free and reduced lunch. Therefore, data for this subgroup is not disaggregated as the majority of the population qualifies for free and reduced price lunch.

2017-18 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						
6						
7						
8						
All						

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance of this comparative measure, including trends over time.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2015-16						
2016-17						
2017-18						

Goal 1: Growth Measure[4]

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.

METHOD

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

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[5]

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

2017-18 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level		
Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All		50.0

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

---

[4] See Guidelines for **Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan** for an explanation.

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

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

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

Goal 1: Optional Measure

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

METHOD:

RESULTS AND EVALUATION:

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Our school met all of its goals for the 2018-2019 school year.

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.	Goal Met
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Goal Met
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Goal Met
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2017-18 results.)	Goal Met

Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50. (Using 2017-18 results.)	Goal Met

ACTION PLAN

In order to continue to make gains, we will continue to focus on our instructional and professional development programs.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All students at Academic Leadership Charter School will become proficient in Mathematics.

BACKGROUND

Our mathematics program is designed to help students master basic numerical skills while allowing them to think more critically, solve word problems, and gain necessary skills for their future. We have a spiraled approach to Mathematics, with each lesson beginning with a ten-minute warm-up activity to review arithmetic operations and fundamentals for each algorithm. Each period contains two mini lessons which focus on different math strands. During each lesson, based on how well students have mastered the day's concepts, they either receive further review or participate in an independent activity offering greater challenge. Mathematics is taught for two 45-minute periods daily, allowing ample time for students to master their grade's curriculum while being exposed to concepts of the next grade. Math charts which display each mathematics strand and common core standard will be aligned to each student identifying mastery and needs of improvement which will guide teachers to best differentiate instruction.

For grades K-5, ALCS employs the TERC Investigations in Number, Data and Space. For grades 6-8, we use Connected Mathematics Project. For all grades, in addition to our core Mathematics programs, We also purchase supplemental workbooks from Coach, Test Ready, Progress NY, and Finish Line to enhance our Mathematics curriculum. Having as many resources as possible will allow teachers to teach topics in a variety of ways.

Teachers create math binders which combine all resources, organized by topic. . This makes lesson planning more manageable and allows for more strategic planning as activities at various levels are easily available to differentiate instruction. Each classroom has a math center with worksheets organized by topic, manipulatives, and computers for student use.

This allows students to reinforce topics where students need additional support after each lesson. If a student finishes an activity early, they go to the math center to work at applying understanding or tackling an area where further practice is warranted. Teachers maintain math charts that track progress by strands/skills and show where students need additional support. Students are made aware of their progress as they have their individual math charts in their notebooks and teachers hold conversations with them. This enables students to become active participants in their learning. They know what topics they need to work on and can go to the math center and practice those topics further.

> **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 3rd through 8th grade in April 2019. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[6]				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	55	6	6	0	0	55
4	53	5	0	0	0	53
5	46	0	0	0	1	47
6	50	8	0	0	0	50
7	40	0	0	0	0	40
8	37	6	0	0	0	37
All	281	25	6	0	1	282

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

[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.

RESULTS AND EVALUATIO

For The 2018-2019 school year, we met our goal of 755% of or more of our students being proficient in Mathematics. 78% of our students were proficient and 80% of students in their second year were proficient. Our continued efforts in the classroom and the professional development provided to teachers has led to this success.

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	80%	55	85%	39
4	75%	53	82%	44
5	72%	46	82%	33
6	76%	50	70%	43
7	78%	40	89%	38
8	86%	37	86%	37
All	78%	281	80%	234

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

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE5

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

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3			89%	45	85%	39
4			79%	33	82%	44
5			65%	49	82%	33
6			54%	41	70%	43
7			63%	38	89%	38
8			80%	83	86%	37
All			84%	242	80%	234

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2018-19 mathematics MIP for all students of 107. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Mathematics 2017-18 Performance Level Index (PI)

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

$$PI = [?] + [?] + [?] = [?]$$
$$[?] + [?] = [?]$$
$$+ (.5)*[?] = [?]$$
$$PI = [?]$$

> **Goal 2: Comparative Measure**
>
> Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[7]

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Academic Leadership Charter School students significantly outperformed students in the local district.

	2018-19 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level			
	Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency			
Grade	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	85%	39	35%	1224
4	82%	44	29%	1266
5	82%	33	27%	1212
6	70%	43	26%	1136
7	89%	38	21%	1097
8	86%	37	17%	1148
All	80%	234	26%	7083

---

[7] 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.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3			88%	51	85%	35%
4			69%	45	82%	29%
5			67%	55	82%	27%
6			57%	46	70%	26%
7			62%	45	89%	21%
8			80%	83	86%	17%
All			72%	325	80%	26%

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

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

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

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our school population is over 93% free and reduced lunch. Therefore, data for this subgroup is not disaggregated as the majority of the population qualifies for free and reduced price lunch.

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						
7						
8						
All						

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
[Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here]

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2015-16						
2016-17						
2017-18						

Goal 2: Growth Measure[8]

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50.

METHOD

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

---

[8] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

for a school to meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[9]

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

2017-18 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

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

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

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

Goal 2: Optional Measure

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

METHOD:

RESULTS AND EVALUATION:

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:

---

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

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

For the 2018-2019 school year, our school met all of its goals.

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.	Goal met
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.	Goal Met
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Goal Met
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2017-18 results.)	Goal met
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50. (Using the 2017-18 results.)	Goal met

ACTION PLAN

Our goal for this school year is to ensure that we continue to train our teachers on grade level Mathematics content while differentiating instruction for all students to reach mastery.

GOAL 3: SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

All students at Academic Leadership Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

BACKGROUND

Our instructional program, which offers Science daily from Kindergarten through 8th grade, has allowed our children to develop strong skills and collect a body of knowledge. We focus on a variety of units each school year and students are accessed every six-weeks. We combined literacy and hands-on experiments within our science program.

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2019. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Our school significantly exceeded our goal with 99% of students passing the state Science exam.

Charter School Performance on 2018-19 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year		
Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency of Students in At Least 2nd Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	98%	53
8	100%	36
All	99%	89

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Performance on a Regents Science Exam Of 8th Grade All Students by Year				
Grade	Year	Regents Exam	Percent Passing with a 65	Number Tested
8	2016-17			
8	2017-18			
8	2018-19			

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year						
Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2016-17		2017-18		2018-19	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4			100%	44	98%	44
8			89%	83	100%	36
All			93%	127	99%	89

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the school district of comparison. Given the timing of the state's release of district science data, the 2018-19 comparative data may not yet be available. If not, schools should report comparison to the district's **2017-18** data.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION

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

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency | | | |
| | Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | | All District Students[10] | |
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	98%	44		
8	100%	36		
All	99%	89		

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

---

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

Goal 3: Optional Measure

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

METHOD:

RESULTS AND EVALUATION:

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE:

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State examination.	Goal Met
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.	Goal Met
	[Write in optional measure here]	

ACTION PLAN

GOAL 4: ESSA

Goal 4: ESSA

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.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

METHOD

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

Academic Leadership Charter School has been deemed in good standing.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Academic Leadership Charter School has consistently been deemed in good standing.

Accountability Status by Year	
Year	Status
2016-17	Good Standing
2017-18	Good Standing
2018-19	Good Standing

APPENDIX A: OPTIONAL GOALS