

The State Education Department
The University of the State of New York

Office of Instructional Support and Development
Public School Choice Programs
462 EBA
Albany, New York 12234
518-474-1762

Charter School Annual Report
2008-2009

Charter School Information and Cover Page

Name of Charter School: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Address: 630 Brooks Avenue
Rochester, NY 14619

Telephone: 585-436-8629 Fax: 585-436-5985

BEDS#: 261600860906

District/CSD of Location: Rochester City School District

Charter Entity: SUNY Charter Schools Institute

Head of School (Contact Person): Stacey Shells
(print name)

E-mail address of contact person: sshells@rochesterprep.org

President, Board of Trustees: James Gleason
(print name)


E-mail address and Phone Number of Board President: 

Table of Contents

	<u>Tab</u>
State Assessment Results.....	1
Other Standardized Assessment Results Charts.....	2
Accountability Plan.....	3
Accountability Plan Progress Report.....	4
Student and Teacher Attrition Data.....	5
Report of Fiscal Performance.....	6
Trustee Disclosure Forms.....	7
Statement of Assurance.....	8
School Calendar for 2008-2009.....	9
School Calendar for 2009-2010.....	10
Modifications to the School's Educational Program and Governance Structure.....	11
Student Performance Data Excel Workbook.....	12
Teacher Experience and Certification Roster.....	13

EXHIBIT 1

EXHIBIT 2

Other Student Assessment Data
2008-09

Name of Charter School: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Name of Test: TerraNova

Subtest: Reading – Form C (Level 15)

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade*	Score (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE)	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*	Other ***
5	9/9/08	83	0	0	0	83	38.9 NCE	NA	NA
5	6/17/09	81	0	0	0	81	51.6 NCE	NA	NA

* This number should equal the number of students enrolled on the day of the test, minus the number absent and the number exempted by either their IEP or their ELL status.

**If the assessment provides qualitative levels of achievement, e.g., “with honors,” indicate the applicable levels and the percent of students who took the test in each grade who attained each level. If not applicable, enter “NA.”

*** For any other evaluative data that describe the performance of your students on the assessments given. If not applicable, enter “NA.”

Other Student Assessment Data
2008-09

Name of Charter School: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Name of Test: TerraNova

Subtest: Language – Form C (Level 15)

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade*	Score (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE)	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining**	Other ***
5	9/9/08	83	0	0	0	83	36.2 NCE	NA	NA
5	6/17/09	81	0	0	0	81	52.6 NCE	NA	NA

* This number should equal the number of students enrolled on the day of the test, minus the number absent and the number exempted by either their IEP or their ELL status.

**If the assessment provides qualitative levels of achievement, e.g., "with honors," indicate the applicable levels and the percent of students who took the test in each grade who attained each level. If not applicable, enter "NA."

*** For any other evaluative data that describe the performance of your students on the assessments given. If not applicable, enter "NA."

Other Student Assessment Data
2008-09

Name of Charter School: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Name of Test: TerraNova

Subtest: Math – Form C (Level 15)

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade*	Score (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE)	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining**	Other ***
5	9/10/08	83	0	0	0	83	33.7 NCE	NA	NA
5	6/18/09	81	0	0	0	81	49.1 NCE	NA	NA

* This number should equal the number of students enrolled on the day of the test, minus the number absent and the number exempted by either their IEP or their ELL status.

**If the assessment provides qualitative levels of achievement, e.g., “with honors,” indicate the applicable levels and the percent of students who took the test in each grade who attained each level. If not applicable, enter “NA.”


*** For any other evaluative data that describe the performance of your students on the assessments given. If not applicable, enter “NA.”

EXHIBIT 3



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

May 14, 2007



VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL

Mr. James S. Gleason
Chair, Board of Trustees
True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School
1000 University Avenue, PO Box 22970
Rochester, New York 14692-2970

Re: Accountability Plan

Dear Mr. Gleason:

I write to inform you that the Accountability Plan (the "Plan") submitted by the True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School (the "School"), in the form attached hereto, has been accepted by the Institute as final pursuant to paragraph 2.6 of the charter agreement (the "Charter") between the School and the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York.

Please keep in mind the following points and understandings as well as their place in the charter and the renewal process.

1. The purpose of the Accountability Plan is to define with specificity the student outcome measures to which your School will be held accountable throughout the life of its charter. To report on those measures, the School is required to submit to the Institute by August 1 each year an Accountability Plan Progress Report. These reports will document the School's progress in meeting each of the outcome measures included in the Accountability Plan. As Accountability Plan Progress Reports are probably the single most important source of information about the school (and are the primary building blocks for a school's case for renewal), we encourage you to approach their preparation with diligence.
2. At the request of the Institute, any data supporting and demonstrating the findings reported in the Accountability Plan Progress Report must be provided to the Institute. Such data include but are not limited to, individual student test scores. The Institute reserves the right to validate and/or re-calculate reported progress of students based on these original data. Should the Institute's results differ from those reported by a school, the Institute reserves the right to include results as calculated by it in public reports. The Institute also reserves the right to use such results in reviewing a school's application for

Mr. James S. Gleason
May 14, 2007
Page 2 of 3

renewal. Where the Institute's calculations and the school's differ, the Institute will inform the school of such differences and provide the basis for its calculations.

3. Please remember that it is the School's responsibility to present valid and objective data demonstrating its academic performance. The failure of a school to present valid data (whether through inadvertence, e.g., loss of test scores, or otherwise, e.g., not administering the assessments agreed to) will materially affect the ability of the school to make an effective case for renewal. In other words, while teaching and learning are without doubt the most important things a school undertakes, a school will not be in a position to retain its charter unless it provides valid and objective evidence of student achievement.
4. A school's progress in achieving the goals in the Accountability Plan will play a critical role in the renewal process. You may wish to consult the Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees, which delineate how meeting the goals set in the Accountability Plan factor into the University Trustees' renewal decision. In general, the successful achievement of all or substantially all of the academic goals, especially in English language arts and mathematics set forth in the Accountability Plan will likely result in a finding that the school is educationally sound and able to continue to improve student learning and achievement. Of course, in order for a school's charter to be renewed, the State University Trustees must also review and find satisfactory other aspects of the school's operation, e.g., fiscal soundness, organizational viability and legal compliance. The Practices and Policies are available on the Institute's website, <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/>.
5. Your School leaders developed the Accountability Plan in consultation with the Institute. It represents the set of student performance measures to which you will be held accountable. As such, we urge you and the other members of the Board of Trustees to use the Accountability Plan as a tool for measuring the success of the school in meeting the terms of the charter to improve student learning and achievement. As you are aware, the responsibility of board members includes monitoring the development and progress of the academic program. Since the measures contained in the Accountability Plan represent the outcome of these efforts, they should be a focus of your assessment of the School throughout the charter period.


While the Accountability Plan will remain in effect for the duration of the School's charter, it may be amended upon a request by the School and permission of the Institute. Such changes may require that the Charter be revised (requiring in turn approval by the State University Trustees and the review and comment of the Board of Regents).

Please review and sign both copies of this letter, keep one copy for your files, and return the second copy to the Institute within ten (10) business days. In this way the Accountability Plan will be formally incorporated into the School's Charter (as envisioned by paragraph 2.6) and become binding on the School.

Mr. James S. Gleason
May 14, 2007
Page 3 of 3

In closing, please accept my continued thanks for your work on behalf of the children in your community. I look forward to continuing to work with you as you bring them the first-rate education they deserve.

Sincerely,




Jennifer G. Sneed, Ph.D.
Senior Vice President

Enclosure

c: Ms. Stacey Shells, Principal

ACKNOWLEDGED AND AGREED:

By:

 Date: 5/17/07

Title:

Chair, Board of Trustees

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN FOR THE CHARTER PERIOD 2006-2010

Academic Goals

English Language Arts

Goal: Students will achieve mastery of English Language Arts skills in Reading and Writing.

Absolute Proficiency

Required outcome measures

Each year, 75 percent of 5th-8th graders who are enrolled in at least their second year¹ will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State ELA exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

Comparative Proficiency

Required outcome measures

Each year, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year at Rochester Prep who perform at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the Rochester City School District.

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State ELA exam by at least a small Effect Size (equal to or greater than .3) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The Effect Size used in this measure will be an average of the individual Effect Sizes for the ELA assessment at each grade level, weighted according to the number of students tested in each grade.

Value Added to Student Learning

Required outcome measure

Each year, every grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

Mathematics

¹ For the purposes of this document, students will be considered to be in at least their second year at the school if they have been continuously enrolled since the BEDS enrollment day in October of the school year previous.

Goal: Students will achieve mastery of skills in Mathematics.

Absolute Proficiency

Required outcome measures

Each year, 75 percent of 5th-8th graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State MATH examination.

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State MATH exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

Comparative Proficiency

Required outcome measures

Each year, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year at Rochester Prep who perform at or above Level 3 on the State MATH exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the Rochester City School District.

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State MATH exam by at least a small Effect Size according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The Effect Size used in this measure will be an average of the individual Effect Sizes for the MATH assessment at each grade level, weighted according to the number of students enrolled at each grade.

Value Added to Student Learning

Required outcome measure

Each year, every grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State MATH exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Math exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

Science

Goal: Students will demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge in Science.

Absolute Proficiency

Required outcome measure

Each year in each tested grade, 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.

Comparative Proficiency

Required outcome measure

Each year in each tested grade, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State Science exam will be greater than that of all students in the respective grades in the local school district.

Social Studies

Goal: Students will demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge in Social Studies.

Absolute Proficiency

Required outcome measure

Each year in each tested grade, 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.

Comparative Proficiency

Required outcome measure

Each year in each tested grade, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State Social Studies exam will be greater than that of all students in the respective grades in the local school district.

Additional Required Academic Measure

Required outcome measure

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

EXHIBIT 4

**TRUE NORTH ROCHESTER
PREPARATORY
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2008-09
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

July 31, 2009

By: Dan Deckman, Chief Operating Officer

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

630 Brooks Avenue

Rochester, NY 14619

Telephone: (585) 436-8629

Fax: (585) 436-5985

Dan Deckman prepared this 2008-09 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Susan Adsit	Development committee chair
James Gleason	Chairman
Jean Howard	Development committee
Bob Howitt	Finance committee
Joseph Klein	Treasurer, Finance committee co-chair
Doug Lemov	Secretary
Geoffrey Rosenberger	Finance committee co-chair

INTRODUCTION

The mission of True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School ("Rochester Prep") is to prepare all students to enter and succeed in college through effort, achievement and the content of their character. All Rochester Prep students will demonstrate excellence in reading, writing, math, science, and history, while consistently exemplifying the virtues of diligence, integrity, responsibility, compassion, perseverance and respect.

Rochester Prep ensures that students develop the skills, knowledge, and character necessary to grant them full access to opportunity and prosperity, including enrollment and success in college. The school features a rigorous academic program that guides students to meet the highest standards and at the same time develops young men and women of character and integrity.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2004-05														
2005-06														
2006-07						73								73
2007-08						77	63							140
2008-09						82	79	50						211

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at the school will become proficient in reading and writing of the English language.

Background

Rochester Prep's ELA program emphasizes both strong reading and strong writing. In reading the program emphasizes four key aspects of literacy: decoding, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. In addition to an hour and fifteen minutes per day of reading instruction we offer reading club for 25 minutes every day. During reading club, students constantly practice decoding and fluency. Students who struggle augment with remedial reading groups based on Wilson Reading. Our reading teachers have made a particularly intentional investment in building vocabulary as a key to literacy- they teach a single vocabulary word each day, using a protocol that draws on the work of Isabel Beck and others to ensure deep meaning of words. The writing program at Rochester Prep is not limited to writing class but within writing class emphasizes a balance between composition and mechanics.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English Language Arts examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English Language Arts assessment to students in 5th through 7th grade in January 2009. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

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 been enrolled for less than one year.

**2008-09 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5	83	0	0	0	83
6	80	0	0	0	80
7	51	0	0	0	51
8					
All	214	0	0	0	214

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.

Results

All 214 Rochester Prep students enrolled in January 2009 took the New York State ELA assessment as scheduled. No students were exempted.

The 5th grade class at Rochester Prep is only in its first year at the school, so the stated measure is therefore not yet applicable. However, we do wish to discuss their interim results here. 88% of Rochester Prep 5th grade students scored proficient on the 2009 NYS ELA exam. The 5th grade class at Rochester Prep has already reached the stated absolute goal of 75% proficiency in their first year.

Students in the 6th grade at Rochester Prep were returning for their second year at the school, and therefore are eligible for measurement in accordance with the stated measure. Ninety-four percent of all Rochester Prep 6th grade students and 95% of 6th grade students in at least their second year scored proficient on the 2009 NYS ELA exam. Rochester Prep’s 6th grade class exceeded the absolute goal for ELA in 2009 and showed exceptional gains from 2008.

Students in the 7th grade were returning for their third year at Rochester Prep as the founding cohort of students. They posted scores of 100% proficiency on the 2009 NYS ELA exam, surpassing the absolute goals for ELA.

**Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
5	All Students	0	12	78.3	9.6	87.9	83
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	All Students	0	6.3	92.5	1.3	93.8	80
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	5.5	93.2	1.4	94.6	73
7	All Students	0	0	80.4	19.6	100	51
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	80.4	19.6	100	51
All	All Students	0	7	84.1	8.9	93	214
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	3.2	87.9	8.9	96.8	124

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded all measures in the performance of its ELA program in 2009.

At the 5th grade level, with the 2009 ELA assessment given just four months after their arrival at Rochester Prep, 88% of students scored proficient on the state ELA test. Just 64% of Rochester City School District students were proficient on the same (grade 5) test. This marks not only a significant gap between Rochester Prep 5th graders and the host district, but also a large jump in performance levels for students in their first year of 5th grade at Rochester Prep. While the absolute measure is not yet applicable for Rochester Prep’s 5th graders in their first year, students still managed to exceed the stated goal ahead of schedule.

Additionally, it is worth noting that not a single 5th grade student scored at Level 1 on the 2009 ELA test. If students were truly making accelerated progress towards long-term proficiency, one would expect to see them moving out of Level 1 even before they began arriving at Level 3 and Level 4. That is, even if we might not expect students to reach Level 4 in ELA by January of the first year, we might expect to see a minimal number of Level 1 scores. By this measure, Rochester Prep's excellent progress is visible.

Rochester Prep's 6th grade students in their second year at the school outperformed the absolute performance measure with 95% scoring proficient. Seventy percent (70%) of Rochester City School District students were proficient on the same (grade 6) test. This marks not only a significant jump from a solid performance on the 2008 ELA exam, where the same cohort of students scored 77% proficient on the 5th grade exam, but also a healthy outscoring of the stated absolute performance measure by 18 percentage points. In addition, out of all 6th grade students in their second year at Rochester Prep, no student scored a Level 1, and only 4 students scored a Level 2. This is a leap from 22 students scoring a Level 2 the previous year. In addition, a large number of students who scored at Level 2 in 2008 moved to Level 3 in 2009. Both data points indicate continued growth in ELA even beyond the fulfillment of absolute measure goals for Rochester Prep.

The founding class of Rochester Prep students was 100% proficient in the 2009 Grade 7 ELA test, outperforming the absolute performance measure by 25 percentage points. Not a single student received a Level 1 or Level 2. These results placed True North Rochester Prep as the top-performing public school in Monroe County on the English Language Arts exam in 2009. This is in comparison to the Rochester City School District whose seventh graders scored only 53% proficient. In addition, 20% of Rochester Prep's seventh graders scored a Level 4, placing Rochester Prep third in advanced performance among all Monroe County school districts.

While Rochester Prep exceeded all measures in the performance of its ELA program in 2009, we still believe there is much work to do before our students are fully prepared for college. We believe our intentional approach to vocabulary and fluency coupled with the school's commitment to classic literature is a key driver of our success and that the impact of these programs will compound going forward. We have continued to focus on making writing rigorous and demanding across the curriculum as the lever of future growth and a predictor of college success.

Additional Evidence

As Rochester Prep expands its program to additional grade levels, indicators suggest that the school's academic performance is strengthening with growth. As shown in the table below, there are significant trends of higher ELA achievement among students attending TNRP for at least their second year. The percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 is 6.7 percentage points higher for students in their second year compared with those in their first year at the school, and 12.2 percentage points higher for those in their third year compared with those in their first year. The correlation between increased ELA performance and number of years enrolled in the school point directly to a tangible value added by Rochester Prep's academic program.

**2008-09 English Language Arts Performance
by Grade Level and Years Attending the School**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	88	83						
6	85.7	7	94.5	73				
7					100	51		
All	87.8	90	94.5	73	100	51		

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6							85	62	94.5	73
7									100	51
All							85	62	96.8	124

A final indication that Rochester Prep’s ELA scores will continue to rise under the current program can be gleaned from an analysis of the Terra Nova Reading and Language batteries given to first-year 5th grade students. A same-student cohort of Rochester Prep students gained 12.7 NCE in Reading and 16.4 NCE in Language, respectively. These are outstanding value-added gains by any standard and suggest that 1) the strong results in Rochester Prep’s third year were not a result of a selection effect but rather the growth of previously low performing students and 2) students are making rapid progress in comparison to their peers on an assessment strongly correlated to, if admittedly different from, the state assessment.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) 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 all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state’s learning standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s English Language Arts AMO, which for 2008-09 is 144. The PI 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 PI is 200.

Results

Calculation of 2008-09 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
5-7	0	7	84	9	214

$$\begin{array}{rccccccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & 7 & + & 84 & + & 9 & = & 99 \\
 & & & & + & 84 & + & 9 & = & 93 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{192}
 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

Rochester Prep’s AMO target for ELA in 2008-2009 was 144. It achieved an ELA PI score of 192 in 2009, exceeding the goal by 48 points.

Additional Evidence

Rochester Prep’s PI for ELA in the 2008-2009 academic year was 192 compared to 180 for the 2007-2008 school year and 160 for the 2006-2007 school year. This 12 point increase from the prior year and 32 point increase from 2 years ago is attributed directly to the strength and impact of Rochester Prep’s ELA program. The resulting shift in performance on the NYS ELA exams translated into an 11 percentage point drop in students scoring at Level 2, a 4 percentage point increase in students scoring at Level 3, and an 8 percentage point increase in students scoring at Level 4. Additionally, not one student in the entire school scored at Level 1 on the 2009 ELA tests.

English Language Arts Performance Index (PI) and Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) by School Year

Year	Grades ²	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2005-06							122	
2006-07	5	77	1	38	60	1	160	
2007-08	5-6	140	1	18	80	1	180	
2008-09	5-7	214	0	7	84	9	192	

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state English Language Arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which

² Beginning in 2005-06 the state administered tests in grades 3-8 and a single AMO was set for the aggregate PI of all tested students in those grades.

the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the local school district, as well as between the total result of students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.

Results

Rochester Prep students in at least their second year outscored the Rochester City School District by 35 percentage points (97% vs 62%) on the 2008 grade 6 and 7 ELA exams.

2008-09 State English Language Arts Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6	94.5	73	69.7	2228
7	100	51	53.1	2135
All	96.8	124	61.6	4363

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded the measure of comparative District proficiency in ELA during the 2008-2009 school year. Rochester Prep students in at least their second year outscored the Rochester City School District by 35 percentage points (97% vs 62%) overall. Rochester Prep outperformed the District by 25 percentage points (95% vs 70%) on the grade 6 ELA exam and by 47 percentage points (100% vs 53%) on the 2009 grade 7 ELA exam.

Rochester Prep's sixth graders in their second year outscored 34 of the district 38 schools that enroll sixth graders on the grade 6 ELA assessment. On the grade 7 ELA exam, Rochester Prep's seventh graders outscored all 15 of the district's 15 schools that enroll seventh graders, thus placing Rochester Prep in the top 7% of the district's schools serving 6th graders and in the top 1% of the district's public schools serving 7th graders.

Rochester Prep also exceeded the district's performance among students who have not yet been enrolled at the school for two years. While the measure is not yet applicable, Rochester Prep's 5th grade students at the school outscored the Rochester City School District by 24 percentage points (88% vs 64%) on the 2009 grade 5 ELA exam. The seven first year sixth graders also outperformed the district by 16 percentage points (86% vs. 70%) on the 2009 grade 6 ELA exam.

Additional Evidence

The tables below illustrate the high levels of performance for Rochester Prep students in their second year compared to the local District as a whole, as well as the three Rochester City School District schools closest in proximity to Rochester Prep. In all cases, Rochester Prep students in at least their second year outperformed the local District cohorts.

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

Grade	Percent of Rochester Prep Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-2005		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Rochester Prep	Local District	Rochester Prep	Local District	Rochester Prep	Local District	Rochester Prep	Local District	Rochester Prep	Local District
6							85	56	94.5	69.7
7									100	53.1
All							85	56	96.8	61.6

**2008-09 English Language Arts Performance of
Charter School and Comparison Schools, Sixth Grade**

Grade	Percent of Rochester Prep Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient							
	TNRP Charter School		RCSD 16		RCSD 44		RCSD 29	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6	94.5	73	72.1	61	69.6	46	46.3	54
All	94.5	73	72.1	61	69.6	46	46.3	54

**2008-09 English Language Arts Performance of
Charter School and Comparison Schools, Seventh Grade**

Grade	Percent of Rochester Prep Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient							
	TNRP Charter School		Joseph C Wilson Magnet Foundation Academy		School 3 Nathaniel Rochester		Thomas Jefferson High School	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
7	100	51	67.4	285	50.7	75	31.9	138
All	100	51	67.4	285	50.7	75	31.9	138

In the long run, though, we believe that it's not just students in Rochester against whom our students will compete for seats in college. A comparison of our 6th grade results to every district in Monroe County (most of them serving populations of significantly lower need) shows that Rochester Prep managed to outscore several highly regarded suburban districts such as Webster, Churchville-Chili, and Fairport. Our 7th grade results show that Rochester Prep outscored even the historically top-ranked suburban districts in Monroe County – Pittsford, Brighton and Penfield. Several of these districts have poverty rates below 10% and are exactly the districts to which privileged families move to ensure effective educational options for their children.

Proficiency Rates - 2009 Grade 6 NYS ELA - Monroe County					
District	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3	% Level 4	% Proficient
Brighton Central School District	0	1.4	80.7	17.9	98.6
Pittsford Central School District	0	3.6	76.1	20.3	96.4
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	4.8	83.3	11.8	95.1
West Irondequoit Central School District	0	5	72.5	22.5	95
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	5.5	85.5	9.1	94.6
Penfield Central School District	0	5.8	77.7	16.5	94.2
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	6.3	92.5	1.3	93.8
Fairport Central School District	0	7.9	78.4	13.7	92.1
Webster Central School District	0	8.2	80.9	10.9	91.8
Brockport Central School District	0	8.7	80.3	11	91.3
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0	9.5	86	4.4	90.4
Hilton Central School District	0	10.2	77.6	12.2	89.8
Spencerport Central School District	0	10.8	76.1	13.1	89.2
Eugenio Maria De Hostos Charter School	0	14.3	83.3	2.4	85.7
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	0.2	14.1	78.2	7.5	85.7
Greece Central School District	0	14.4	78.1	7.5	85.6
Monroe County Average					84.6
Gates-Chili Central School District	0	16.1	77	6.8	83.8
Genesee Community Charter School	0	16.7	79.2	4.2	83.4
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	18.8	79.7	1.4	81.1
East Irondequoit Central School District	0	20.6	71.8	7.6	79.4
Rochester City School District	0.2	30.2	67.9	1.8	69.7
Urban Choice Charter School	0	36.7	59.2	4.1	63.3

Proficiency Rates - 2009 Grade 7 NYS ELA - Monroe County					
District	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3	% Level 4	% Proficient
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	0	80.4	19.6	100
Pittsford Central School District	0	2.2	72.5	25.4	97.9
Brighton Central School District	0	3.7	72.5	23.8	96.3
Penfield Central School District	0	4.2	77.7	18.1	95.8
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	4.5	82.5	13	95.5
Fairport Central School District	0	6	82.3	11.7	94
Webster Central School District	0	6	79.7	14.3	94
Spencerport Central School District	0	6.9	86.2	6.9	93.1
West Irondequoit Central School District	0	7	76.3	16.7	93
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0	7.3	80.2	12.5	92.7
Hilton Central School District	0.3	8.2	85.6	5.9	91.5
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	9.5	83.3	7.1	90.4
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	10.3	72.4	17.2	89.6
East Irondequoit Central School District	0.4	10.9	83	5.7	88.7
Greece Central School District	0.2	12.5	82.8	4.5	87.3
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	0.2	12.6	80.3	6.9	87.2
Gates-Chili Central School District	0	13.2	82.5	4.4	86.9
Brockport Central School District	0.6	12.9	82.7	3.8	86.5
Monroe County Average					81.6
Urban Choice Charter School	0	36.1	61.1	2.8	63.9
Rochester Academy Charter	3.4	34.5	62.1	0	62.1
Rochester City School District	1.5	45.4	52.3	0.8	53.1

We also believe that proficiency is not an indicator of college preparedness, but that advanced proficiency is. Students need to score *advanced*, not just proficient, to enroll and succeed at top colleges. In fact, because Level 4 scores are so important, we ranked Rochester Prep compared to schools in Monroe County according to a College Prep Index, which calculates a score for each school or district by doubling the percent of students scoring at level 4 and adding to that the percent of students scoring at level 3- a more rigorous version of the state's Performance Index (PI). On the College Prep Index for the sixth graders, Rochester Prep outscores 10 of Monroe County's school districts.

College Prep Performance Index - 2009 NYS GRADE 6 ELA - Monroe County						
District	% L 1	% L 2	% L 3	% L 4	% Proficient	College Prep Index (2x Level 4 + Level 3)
West Irondequoit Central School District	0	5	72.5	22.5	95	1.18
Pittsford Central School District	0	3.6	76.1	20.3	96.4	1.17
Brighton Central School District	0	1.4	80.7	17.9	98.6	1.17
Penfield Central School District	0	5.8	77.7	16.5	94.2	1.11
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	4.8	83.3	11.8	95.1	1.07
Fairport Central School District	0	7.9	78.4	13.7	92.1	1.06
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	5.5	85.5	9.1	94.6	1.04
Webster Central School District	0	8.2	80.9	10.9	91.8	1.03
Brockport Central School District	0	8.7	80.3	11	91.3	1.02
Spencerport Central School District	0	10.8	76.1	13.1	89.2	1.02
Hilton Central School District	0	10.2	77.6	12.2	89.8	1.02
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	6.3	92.5	1.3	93.8	0.95
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0	9.5	86	4.4	90.4	0.95
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	0.2	14.1	78.2	7.5	85.7	0.93
Greece Central School District	0	14.4	78.1	7.5	85.6	0.93
Gates-Chili Central School District	0	16.1	77	6.8	83.8	0.91
Eugenio Maria De Hostos Charter School	0	14.3	83.3	2.4	85.7	0.88
Genesee Community Charter School	0	16.7	79.2	4.2	83.4	0.88
East Irondequoit Central School District	0	20.6	71.8	7.6	79.4	0.87
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	18.8	79.7	1.4	81.1	0.83
Rochester City School District	0.2	30.2	67.9	1.8	69.7	0.72
Urban Choice Charter School	0	36.7	59.2	4.1	63.3	0.67

In addition, the Rochester Prep seventh graders outperform all but 2 of the Monroe County School Districts in college preparedness, according to the College Prep Index. It should be noted that many of the outperformed districts have a poverty rate of less than 10% and are the districts to which affluent families move to access high quality education for their children.

College Prep Performance Index - 2009 NYS GRADE 7 ELA - Monroe County						
District	% L 1	% L 2	% L 3	% L 4	% Proficient	College Prep Index (2x Level 4 + Level 3)
Pittsford Central School District	0	2.2	72.5	25.4	97.9	1.23
Brighton Central School District	0	3.7	72.5	23.8	96.3	1.20
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	0	80.4	19.6	100	1.20
Penfield Central School District	0	4.2	77.7	18.1	95.8	1.14
West Irondequoit Central School District	0	7	76.3	16.7	93	1.10
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	4.5	82.5	13	95.5	1.09
Webster Central School District	0	6	79.7	14.3	94	1.08
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	10.3	72.4	17.2	89.6	1.07
Fairport Central School District	0	6	82.3	11.7	94	1.06
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0	7.3	80.2	12.5	92.7	1.05
Spencerport Central School District	0	6.9	86.2	6.9	93.1	1.00
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	9.5	83.3	7.1	90.4	0.98
Hilton Central School District	0.3	8.2	85.6	5.9	91.5	0.97
East Irondequoit Central School District	0.4	10.9	83	5.7	88.7	0.94
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	0.2	12.6	80.3	6.9	87.2	0.94
Greece Central School District	0.2	12.5	82.8	4.5	87.3	0.92
Gates-Chili Central School District	0	13.2	82.5	4.4	86.9	0.91
Brockport Central School District	0.6	12.9	82.7	3.8	86.5	0.90
Urban Choice Charter School	0	36.1	61.1	2.8	63.9	0.67
Rochester Academy Charter	3.4	34.5	62.1	0	62.1	0.62
Rochester City School District	1.5	45.4	52.3	0.8	53.1	0.54

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English Language Arts exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school's actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and

predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2008-09 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2007-08 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

2007-08 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5		76	77.6	68.45	9.15	0.70
6		64	84.4	52.14	32.26	2.04
7						
8						
All	67.12%	140	80.71	60.99	19.72	1.32

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:
Higher than expected to a large degree

Evaluation

The currently available comparative performance effect size data for 2007-2008 is considerably out of date, particularly in the area of ELA. Rochester Prep met the comparative performance measure in 2007-2008 by exceeding the effect size of 0.3 by a large degree on the grade 5 and 6 2008 NYS ELA exam.

Based on our own preliminary analysis of similar 2009 ELA data, Rochester Prep expects to dramatically exceed the Effect Size in ELA again in grades 5, 6 and 7.

Additional Evidence

Since 2007-2008 was the second year of Rochester Prep’s operation this is the first time we can make an official year to year comparison between the Effect Sizes for the first time.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06						
2006-07	5	67%	77	61	55.8	0.37
2007-08	5,6	67%	140	80.71	60.99	1.32
2008-09						

Goal 1: Growth Measure

Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state English Language Arts exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year’s state English Language Arts exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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 towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2008-09 and also have a state exam score in 2007-08. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2007-08 and 75 percent proficient in 2008-09. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2007-08, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Since Rochester Prep is in its third year of operation, there are two grade level cohorts to which this measure applies. Rochester Prep’s 6th and 7th grade cohorts achieved their growth measure target for the 2009 ELA by a significant margin and therefore, the school met its overall performance target as well.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2007-08 to 2008-2009

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
6	80	77	>77	94	YES
7	51	85	>85	100	YES
All	131	80	NA	96	YES

Evaluation

In 2008-2009, Rochester Prep’s 6th and 7th grade cohorts far exceeded their growth measure goals for ELA. Measuring the percentage of students at levels 3 and 4, the 6th grade cohort at Rochester Prep improved 17 percentage points from the 2008 exam to the 2009 exam and the 7th grade cohort improved 15 percentage points from the 2008 exam to the 2009 exam. The 6th grade cohort scored 77% proficient in 2007-08 and 94% proficient in 2008-09. The 7th grade cohort scored 85%

proficient in 2007-08 and 100% proficient in 2008-09. As the students started out above the absolute goal of 75% in 2007-2008, the goal of “at least an increase” in 2008-2009 was far exceeded.

**Cohort Performance on State English Language Arts Exam
Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year**

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target
2006-07	NA	NA	NA
2007-08	6	1	1
2008-09	6, 7	2	2

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School not only achieved, but exceeded by a significant degree every ELA target measure outlined in the Accountability Plan.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved
Growth	Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s State exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year’s State exam.	Achieved

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will achieve mastery of skills in Mathematics.

Background

Rochester Prep’s Mathematics program emphasizes both strong computational procedures and problem solving skills. In addition to an hour and fifteen minutes per day of math procedural instruction we offer another hour for the development of practical math problem solving skills. Students who struggle with mathematical concepts augment the daily two hours and fifteen minutes of classroom instruction with remedial tutoring groups based on interim assessment data. Our math teachers have made a particularly intentional investment in building a systematic approach toward understanding. The math program at Rochester Prep takes arithmetic concepts and breaks them down to concrete, step-by-step approaches toward solving problems. At Rochester Prep, math instruction incorporates a rigorous balance between mechanics and problem solving.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State mathematics examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program Mathematics assessment to students in 5th through 7th grade in March 2009. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

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 been enrolled for less than one year.

**2008-09 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ³			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
5	82	0	0	0	82
6	79	0	0	0	79
7	50	0	0	0	50
All	211	0	0	0	211

Results

³ 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

All 211 Rochester Prep students enrolled in March 2009 took the New York State Math assessment as scheduled. No students were exempted.

The 5th grade class at Rochester Prep is only in its first year at the school, so the stated measure is therefore not yet applicable. However, we do wish to discuss their overall interim results here. Ninety-two percent (92%) of Rochester Prep 5th grade students scored proficient on the 2009 NYS Math exam. The 5th grade class at Rochester Prep has already reached the stated absolute goal in their first year at the school.

One hundred percent of all Rochester Prep 6th grade students and 100% of 6th grade students in at least their second year scored proficient on the 2009 NYS Math exam. Rochester Prep's 6th grade class exceeded the absolute goal for Math in 2009 and showed exceptional gains from the 2008 performance.

Returning for their second or third year at the school, students in the 7th grade at Rochester Prep also scored 100% proficient on the 2009 NYS Math exam. These results exceed the absolute goal of 75% proficient in Math in 2009.

**Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
5	All Students	1.2	7.3	68.3	23.2	91.5	82
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	All Students	0	0	68.4	31.6	100	79
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	68.5	31.5	100	73
7	All Students	0	0	52	48	100	50
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	52	48	100	50
All	All Students	0.5	2.8	64.5	32.2	96.7	211
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	61.8	38.2	100	123

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded all measures in the performance of its Math program in 2009.

At the 5th grade level, 92% of all students scored proficient on the state Math test in their first year of enrollment at Rochester Prep. Just 68% of Rochester City School District students were proficient on the same (grade 5) test. This marks a significant gap of 24 percentage points between all of Rochester Prep 5th graders and the host District. While the absolute measure is not yet applicable for Rochester Prep's 5th graders, students still managed to far exceed the stated absolute goal ahead of schedule. Additionally, it is worth noting that only one 5th grade student scored at Level 1 on the 2009 Math test.

Rochester Prep's 6th grade students in their second year at the school outperformed the absolute performance measure for Math with 100% scoring proficient. Just 65% of Rochester City School District students were proficient on the same (grade 6) test, marking a gap of 35 percentage points between the host District and Rochester Prep. The 100% proficiency marks not only an increase

from a solid performance on the 2008 Math exam, where the same cohort of students scored 90% proficient, but also an exceptional outscoring of the stated absolute performance measure by 25 percentage points. Out of all 6th grade students in their second year at Rochester Prep, no student scored at a Level 1 or 2. In addition, a significant number of students who scored at Level 2 in 2008 moved to Level 3 in 2009. Both data points indicate continued growth in Math at Rochester Prep even beyond the fulfillment of absolute measure goals.

At the 7th grade level, 100% of students in at least their second year at the school scored 100% proficient, outperforming the absolute measure for Math. Just 59% of Rochester City School District students scored proficient on the same grade 7 NYS Math exam - a gap of 41 percentage points between the host District and Rochester Prep. The proficiency rate of 100% marks an outscoring of the absolute performance measure by 25 percentage points. Out of all 7th grade students in at least their second year at Rochester Prep, no student scored at a Level 1 or 2.

Additional Evidence

As Rochester Prep expands its program to additional grade levels, indicators suggest that the school’s academic performance is strengthening with growth. As shown in the table below, there are significant trends of higher Math achievement among students attending TNRP for at least two years as opposed to those in just their first year. The percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 is 8 percentage points higher for students enrolled in at least their second year compared with those enrolled in their first year (100% vs. 92%). The correlation between increased ELA performance and number of years enrolled in the school point directly to a tangible value added by Rochester Prep’s academic program.

**2008-09 Math Performance
by Grade Level and Years Attending the School**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	91.5	82						
6	100	6	100	73				
7					100	50		
All	92	88	100	73	100	50		

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-2009	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6							99	61	100	73
7									100	50
All							99	61	100	123

A final indication that Rochester Prep’s Math scores will continue to rise under the current program can be gleaned from an analysis of the Terra Nova Mathematics battery given to first-year 5th grade

students. A same-student cohort of Rochester Prep students gained 15.4 NCE in Math. This is an outstanding value-added gain by any standard and suggests that 1) the strong results in Rochester Prep's first year were not a result of a selection effect but rather the growth of previously low performing students and 2) students are making rapid progress in comparison to their peers on an assessment strongly correlated to, if admittedly different from, the state assessment.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) 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 all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state's learning standards in Mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year's Math AMO, which for 2008-09 is 119. The PI 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 PI is 200.

Results

Calculation of 2008-09 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
5-7	0	3	64	32	211

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 3 & + & 64 & + & 32 & = & 99 \\
 & & & + & 64 & + & 32 & = & 96 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{195}
 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

Rochester Prep's AMO target for Math in 2008-2009 was 119. It achieved a Math PI score of 195 in 2009, exceeding the goal by 76 points.

Additional Evidence

Rochester Prep's PI for Math in the 2008-2009 academic year was 195, compared to 195 for 2007-2008, and 186 for the 2006-2007 school year. This consistently strong showing is attributed directly to the strength and impact of Rochester Prep's Math program. The resulting growth in performance on the NYS Math exam translated into a 5 percentage point increase in students scoring at Level 4 from 2008 to 2009. Additionally, only 1 student in the entire school scored at Level 1 on the 2009 Math tests.

**Mathematics Performance Index (PI) and
Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) by School Year**

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2005-06								
2006-07	5	77	3	10	55	33	186	86
2007-08	5-6	139	2	5	68	27	195	102
2008-09	5-7	211	0	3	64	32	195	119

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state Mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

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

Results

Rochester Prep students in at least their second year outscored the Rochester City School District by 38 percentage points (100% vs. 62%) overall on the 2009 Math exams.

**2008-09 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Rochester Prep Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6	100	73	64.6	2276
7	100	50	58.5	2180
All	100	123	61.6	4456

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded the measure of comparative District proficiency in Math during the 2008-2009 school year. The sixth graders in at least their second year outperformed the district sixth

graders by 35 percentage points (100% vs. 65%) and the seventh graders in at least their second year outperformed the district by 41 percentage points (100% vs. 59%) on the 2009 grade 7 Math exam.

The sixth graders outscored 35 of 38 district schools that enroll sixth graders, tying the top 3 district schools. On the seventh grade Math exam, Rochester Prep students outscored all 15 of the district schools that enroll seventh graders. These scores place Rochester Prep among the top 5% of district schools serving grade 6, and among the top 1% of district schools serving grade 7.

In addition, Rochester Prep exceeded the district's performance among students who have not yet been enrolled at the school for two years. For the first year sixth graders, Rochester Prep students outperformed the district students by 35 percentage points (100% vs. 65%). While the measure is not yet applicable, 5th grade students who at Rochester Prep outscored the Rochester City School District by 24 percentage points (92% vs. 68%) on the 2009 grade 5 Math exam. Rochester Prep also outscored 36 of the district's 38 schools that enroll fifth graders on the grade 5 Math assessment, thus placing Rochester Prep in the top 5% of a ranking of district schools that serve 5th graders.

Additional Evidence

The tables below illustrate the high levels of Math performance for Rochester Prep students in their second year compared to the local district as a whole, as well as the three Rochester City School District schools closest in proximity to Rochester Prep. In all cases, Rochester Prep's 6th and 7th grade students in at least their second year have vastly outperformed the local District cohorts.

This is the second year Rochester Prep has had a grade level of students in at least their second year.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
6							99	56	100	64.6
7									100	58.5
All							99	56	100	61.6

**2008-09 Mathematics Performance of
Charter School and Comparison Schools, Sixth Grade**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient			
		TNRP Charter	RCSD 16	RCSD 44

	School		Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
	Percent	Number Tested						
6	100	79	68	44	67	46	58	55
All	100	79	68	44	67	46	58	55

**2008-09 Mathematics Performance of
Charter School and Comparison Schools, Seventh Grade**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring Proficient							
	TNRP Charter School		Joseph C Wilson Magnet Foundation Academy		School 3 Nathaniel Rochester		Thomas Jefferson High School	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
7	100	50	68	289	65	72	36	163
All	100	50	68	289	65	72	36	163

In the long run, though, we believe that it's not just students in Rochester against whom our students will compete for seats in college. A comparison of our 6th and 7th grade Math results shows that Rochester Prep managed to outscore every single school district in Monroe County (most of them serving populations of significantly lower need), including such widely hailed suburban districts as Pittsford and Brighton. Several of these districts have poverty rates below 10% and are exactly the districts to which privileged families move to ensure effective educational options for their children.

Proficiency Rates - 2009 Grade 6 NYS Math - Monroe County					
District	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3	% Level 4	% Proficient
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	0	68.4	31.6	100
Pittsford Central School District	0.4	1.1	45.9	52.6	98.5

Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	1.8	52.7	45.5	98.2
Eugenio Maria De Hostos Charter School	0	2.4	54.8	42.9	97.7
Penfield Central School District	0.6	2.3	48.3	48.8	97.1
Genesee Community Charter School	0	4.2	62.5	33.3	95.8
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0.3	4.7	50.3	44.6	94.9
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	5.4	55.4	39.2	94.6
West Irondequoit Central School District	0.7	5	41.1	53.3	94.4
Spencerport Central School District	0	6.4	60.2	33.4	93.6
Brighton Central School District	0	6.5	64.8	28.7	93.5
Brockport Central School District	1.6	6.5	44.7	47.2	91.9
Webster Central School District	0.9	7.8	52.9	38.5	91.4
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	8.7	59.4	31.9	91.3
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	2.4	6.7	53.6	37.4	91
Greece Central School District	2.2	8	57.6	32.2	89.8
Hilton Central School District	2.1	9.4	57.5	31.1	88.6
Urban Choice Charter School	4.1	10.2	67.3	18.4	85.7
Monroe County Average					84
Gates-Chili Central School District	1.6	14.6	66.4	17.4	83.8
East Irondequoit Central School District	3.8	19.4	49.4	27.4	76.8
Rochester City School District	7.1	28.4	57.2	7.4	64.6

Proficiency Rates - 2009 Grade 7 NYS Math - Monroe County					
District	% Level 1	% Level 2	% Level 3	% Level 4	% Proficient
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	0	52	48	100
Pittsford Central School District	0	0.9	35.1	64	99.1

Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	1.1	46.1	52.8	98.9
Hilton Central School District	0.3	1.1	47.9	50.7	98.6
Spencerport Central School District	0	2.2	48.7	49.1	97.8
Penfield Central School District	0.3	1.9	53.2	44.6	97.8
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0	2.5	52.8	44.8	97.6
Brighton Central School District	0.4	2.9	52.6	44.2	96.8
Webster Central School District	0	3.3	46	50.7	96.7
Fairport Central School District	0	3.4	49.4	47.2	96.6
West Irondequoit Central School District	0	3.9	54	42.1	96.1
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	5.3	66.7	28.1	94.8
Greece Central School District	0.2	5.7	59.6	34.4	94
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	0.9	5.6	68.7	24.8	93.5
East Irondequoit Central School District	0.9	6.5	53.9	38.8	92.7
Brockport Central School District	1.3	6.6	60.4	31.6	92
Gates-Chili Central School District	1.2	6.9	63.3	28.6	91.9
Urban Choice Charter School	0	11.1	77.8	11.1	88.9
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	11.9	53.6	34.5	88.1
Monroe County Average					86
Rochester Academy Prep Charter	3.2	14.3	76.2	6.3	82.5
Rochester City School District	7	34.5	54.6	3.9	58.5

We also believe that the danger of proficiency is its insufficiency in the long run. Students need to score *advanced*, not just proficient, to enroll and succeed at top colleges. In fact, because Level 4 scores are so important, we ranked Rochester Prep compared to schools in Monroe County according to a College Prep Index, which calculates a score for each school or district by doubling the percent of students scoring at level 4 and adding to that the percent of students scoring at level 3- a more rigorous version of the state's Performance Index (PI). On the College Prep Index for the sixth graders, Rochester Prep outscores 12 of Monroe County's school districts.

College Prep Performance Index - 2009 NYS GRADE 6 MATH - Monroe County

District	% L 1	% L 2	% L 3	% L 4	% Proficient	College Prep Index (2x Level 4 + Level 3)
Pittsford Central School District	0.4	1.1	45.9	52.6	98.5	1.51
West Irondequoit Central School District	0.7	5	41.1	53.3	94.4	1.48
Penfield Central School District	0.6	2.3	48.3	48.8	97.1	1.46
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	1.8	52.7	45.5	98.2	1.44
Eugenio Maria De Hostos Charter School	0	2.4	54.8	42.9	97.7	1.41
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0.3	4.7	50.3	44.6	94.9	1.40
Brockport Central School District	1.6	6.5	44.7	47.2	91.9	1.39
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	5.4	55.4	39.2	94.6	1.34
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	0	68.4	31.6	100	1.32
Webster Central School District	0.9	7.8	52.9	38.5	91.4	1.30
Genesee Community Charter School	0	4.2	62.5	33.3	95.8	1.29
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	2.4	6.7	53.6	37.4	91	1.28
Spencerport Central School District	0	6.4	60.2	33.4	93.6	1.27
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	8.7	59.4	31.9	91.3	1.23
Brighton Central School District	0	6.5	64.8	28.7	93.5	1.22
Greece Central School District	2.2	8	57.6	32.2	89.8	1.22
Hilton Central School District	2.1	9.4	57.5	31.1	88.6	1.20
East Irondequoit Central School District	3.8	19.4	49.4	27.4	76.8	1.04
Urban Choice Charter School	4.1	10.2	67.3	18.4	85.7	1.04
Gates-Chili Central School District	1.6	14.6	66.4	17.4	83.8	1.01
Rochester City School District	7.1	28.4	57.2	7.4	64.6	0.72

On the Grade 7 NYS Math exam in 2009, only 3 elite suburban districts out-performed Rochester Prep on the College Prep Index.

College Prep Performance Index - 2009 NYS GRADE 7 MATH - Monroe County						
District	% L 1	% L 2	% L 3	% L 4	% Proficient	College Prep Index (2x Level 4 + Level 3)
Pittsford Central School District	0	0.9	35.1	64	99.1	1.63
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	0	1.1	46.1	52.8	98.9	1.52
Hilton Central School District	0.3	1.1	47.9	50.7	98.6	1.49
True North Rochester Preparatory CS	0	0	52	48	100	1.48
Webster Central School District	0	3.3	46	50.7	96.7	1.47
Spencerport Central School District	0	2.2	48.7	49.1	97.8	1.47
Fairport Central School District	0	3.4	49.4	47.2	96.6	1.44
Penfield Central School District	0.3	1.9	53.2	44.6	97.8	1.42
Churchville-Chili Central School District	0	2.5	52.8	44.8	97.6	1.42
Brighton Central School District	0.4	2.9	52.6	44.2	96.8	1.41
West Irondequoit Central School District	0	3.9	54	42.1	96.1	1.38
East Irondequoit Central School District	0.9	6.5	53.9	38.8	92.7	1.32
Greece Central School District	0.2	5.7	59.6	34.4	94	1.28
Brockport Central School District	1.3	6.6	60.4	31.6	92	1.24
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	0	5.3	66.7	28.1	94.8	1.23
East Rochester Union Free School District	0	11.9	53.6	34.5	88.1	1.23
Gates-Chili Central School District	1.2	6.9	63.3	28.6	91.9	1.21
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	0.9	5.6	68.7	24.8	93.5	1.18
Urban Choice Charter School	0	11.1	77.8	11.1	88.9	1.00
Rochester Academy Prep Charter	3.2	14.3	76.2	6.3	82.5	0.89
Rochester City School District	7	34.5	54.6	3.9	58.5	0.62

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school's actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect

Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2008-09 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2007-08 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

2007-08 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5		76	89.4	75.9	13.5	0.90
6		63	98.4	68.57	29.83	1.78
7						
8						
All	67.12%	139	93.48	72.58	20.90	1.30

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:
Higher than expected to a large degree

Evaluation

The currently available comparative performance effect size data for 2007-2008 is considerably out of date for Math. Rochester Prep met the comparative performance measure in 2007-2008 by exceeding the Effect Size of 0.3 on the grade 5 2008 NYS Math exam.

Based on our own preliminary analysis of similar 2009 Math data, Rochester Prep expects to dramatically exceed the Effect Size in Math again for 5th, 6th, and 7th grades.

Additional Evidence

Since 2007-2008 was the second year of Rochester Prep’s operation this is the first time we can make an official year to year comparison between the Effect Sizes for the first time.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06						
2006-07	5	67%	77	87	66.7	1.13
2007-08	5,6	67%	139	93.48	72.58	1.30
2008-09						

Goal 2: Growth Measure

Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state Mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year’s state Mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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 towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2008-09 and also have a state exam score in 2007-08. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2007-08 and 75 percent proficient in 2008-09. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2007-08, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Since Rochester Prep is in its third year of operation, there are two grade level cohorts to which this measure applies. Rochester Prep’s 6th and 7th grade cohorts achieved their growth measure target for 2009 Math and therefore, the school met its overall performance target.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2007-08 to 2008-09

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
6	79	90	>90	100	YES
7	50	99	>99	100	YES
All	129	93	NA	100	YES

Evaluation

In 2008-2009, Rochester Prep’s 6th grade cohort exceeded its growth measure goal for Math. In fact, this cohort of students had already achieved the 75% proficiency goal in the 2007-2008 school year and therefore was required to show at least continued positive gains in 2008-2009. However, the 6th grade Rochester Prep cohort continued to make significant strides with a 9 percentage point leap in Math from 2007-2008. The 6th grade cohort of 79 students at Rochester Prep scored 90% proficient

in 2007-2008 as 5th graders and jumped to 100% proficient in 2008-2009. This one year gain demonstrates not only significant cohort growth, but also a remarkable achievement of 100% proficiency.

The 7th grade cohort also exceeded its growth measure goal for Math, having already achieved 99% proficiency in 2007-2008. The cohort of 50 students only had a 1 percentage point gain possible to reach 100% proficiency. This goal was achieved.

Additional Evidence

**Cohort Performance on Mathematics Exam
Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year**

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2006-07	NA	NA	NA
2007-08	6	1	1
2008-09	6, 7	2	2

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School not only achieved, but exceeded by a significant degree every Math target measure outlined in the Accountability Plan.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved
Growth	Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	Achieved

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge in Science.

Rochester Prep does not yet take the Grade 8 New York State Science Examination.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 4: Social Studies

Students will demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge in Social Studies.

Background

Rochester Prep's Social Studies curriculum takes a comprehensive instructional look at United States history and global social science standards over the course of 5th, 6th and 7th grades. The Social Studies program will expand in scope and depth as the school grows into 8th grade in the coming school year. Rochester Prep has utilized periodic diagnostic assessments as a means for ensuring key standards are covered as part of the Social Studies curriculum. The Social Studies program emphasizes elements of the writing curriculum through the course of instruction as well.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State social studies examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in 5th grade in November 2008. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

Rochester Prep does not yet take the Grade 8 New York State Social Studies Examination. Since it enrolls students in 5th grade, results of the Grade 5 New York State Social Studies Examination, given just two months into their tenure at Rochester Prep, do not apply to this measure. However, we do wish to discuss their interim results here.

**2008-09 Social Studies 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
5	82	83	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

The 5th grade class at Rochester Prep was only two months into its first year at the school when the Social Studies exam was administered, so the stated measure is not yet applicable. However, despite the short window for instruction, a remarkable 82 percent of Rochester Prep 5th grade students scored at Levels 3 or 4. This means that the 5th grade class at Rochester Prep has already reached the stated absolute goal in their first year.

Evaluation

Results of the Grade 5 New York State Social Studies Examination, given just two months into their tenure at Rochester Prep, do not apply to this measure.

Additional Evidence

Results of the Grade 5 New York State Social Studies Examination, given just two months into their tenure at Rochester Prep, do not apply to this measure.

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State social studies exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Results of the Grade 5 New York State Social Studies Examination, given just two months into their tenure at Rochester Prep, do not apply to this measure.

Summary

Results of the Grade 5 New York State Social Studies Examination, given just two months into their tenure at Rochester Prep, do not apply to this measure.

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

Method

Since *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards which indicate each school’s status under the state’s NCLB accountability system. For a school’s status to be “Good Standing” it must not have failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years.

Results

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, Rochester Prep was deemed to be in “Good Standing.”

Additional Evidence

Rochester Prep has been deemed to be in “Good Standing” under NCLB for every year it has been in operation.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2003-04	NA
2004-05	NA
2005-06	NA
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	Good Standing

EXHIBIT 5

**True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School Student Attrition Rates
2008-09**

	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06
Number of students leaving for lack of transportation	0	0	1	
Number of students leaving for geographic reasons (e.g., out of state/district relocation)	3	1	1	
Number of students leaving for more restrictive special education setting	1	0	0	
Number of students leaving due to parental choice (e.g., school transfer closer to residence, local elementary school, parent convenience)	6	6	6	
Number leaving for other reasons (undetermined)	3	1	1	
Total number of students leaving.	13	8	9	
Highest Number Enrolled <i>(July 1 – June 30)</i>	218	148	82	
Total Percent Attrition	6%	5.4%	11.0%	

**True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School Teacher Attrition Rates
2008-09**

	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06
Number of Classroom Teachers	18	13	7	
Number of Special Area Teachers	3	2	1	
Total Number of Teachers	21	15	8	
Total Number of Teachers Leaving	2	1	0	
Total Percent Attrition	9.5%	6.7%	0%	

EXHIBIT 6

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
 THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
 OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE,
 SECONDARY AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
 PROGRAMS
 ROOM 462, EDUCATION BUILDING ANNEX
 ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

CHARTER SCHOOL ANNUAL
 REPORT OF FISCAL PERFORMANCE
 FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR ENDED 6/30/09

Charter School Code:

2	6	1	6	0	0	8	6	0	9	0	6
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Charter School Name: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School	Phone: 585-436-8629
Contact Person: Dan Deckman	

	<u>REVENUES</u>	<u>SALARIES</u>	<u>OTHER</u>	<u>EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
A. STATE SOURCES	349,680	431,873	396,765	828,638	
B. FEDERAL SOURCES	196,089	823,837		823,837	
C. PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS			248,950	248,950	
1. BASIC OPERATING REVENUES	2,284,468	3,234	4,000	7,234	
2. STATE AID-PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES	66,674	134,450		134,450	
3. FED. AID-PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES	14,626		14,000	14,000	
4. OTHER REV FROM PUB SCH DISTRICTS			661	661	
D. ALL OTHER REVENUES	68,241		193,152	193,152	
E. TOTAL REVENUES FROM ALL SOURCES	<u>2,979,778</u>			299,435	
S. ENROLLMENT	211				
T. EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL	13,297			12,499	
	(R/S)			242,791	
				<u>2,805,647</u>	
				N. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	
				O. DEBT SERVICE	
				P. SCHOOL LUNCH	
				Q. CAPITAL EXPENSE	
				R. GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES	

COMPLETED FORM MUST BE RETURNED
 NO LATER THAN AUGUST 3, 2009

Signature:  _____ Date: 7/31/09

Chief School Officer

EXHIBIT 7

Section V

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee
Annual Report 2008-09

Name (print) Bob Howitt

Name of Charter School Rochester Prep

Charter Entity Uncommon Schools/True North

Home Address _____

Business Address _____

Daytime Phone _____

E-Mail Address _____



1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative):
Finance AND PROGRAM
COMMITTEES

2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? ___ Yes No

3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

4. Is the trustee an employee or agent of the management company? ___ Yes ___ No BOARD MEMBER

5. Is the trustee an employee or agent of any institutional partner of the School? ___ Yes No

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write **none**. Please note that if you answered **yes** to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

Date(s)	Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction	Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)	Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself
	<p style="text-align: center;">no financial interest, including no compensation as board member of Uncommon Schools or Rochester Reg</p>		

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School **and** in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write **none**.

Organization Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
<p>BOARD MEMBER OF NON-PROFIT UNCOMMON SCHOOLS, WHICH HAS A CONTRACT TO MANAGE ROCHESTER PREP</p>			

Signature

[Handwritten Signature]

Date

7/31/09

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 31st day of July, 2009.

[Handwritten Signature]
Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 01DE6053536
Qualified in Queens County
Certificate Filed in New York County
Commission Expires January 16, 2011

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee
Annual Report 2008-09


Name (print) Susan Adsit


Name of Charter School True North Rochester Preparatory

Charter Entity Uncommon Schools

Home Address 

Business Address 

Daytime Phone 

E-Mail Address 

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative):
Chair - Development Committee

2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? Yes No

3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

4. Is the trustee an employee or agent of the management company? Yes No


5. Is the trustee an employee or agent of any institutional partner of the School? Yes No

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of you immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction write **none**. Please note that if you answered **yes** to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

Date(s)	Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction	Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)	Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself
	<i>none</i>		

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School **and** in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write **none**.

Organization Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
	NONE		


Signature

8/1/09
Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of Aug, 2009.


Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 01DE6053536
Qualified in Queens County
Certificate Filed in New York County
Commission Expires January 16, 2011

Section V

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT


Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee
Annual Report 2008-09


Name (print) G. Jean Howard


Name of Charter School True North Prep

Charter Entity Uncommon Schools

Home Address 

Business Address 

Daytime Phone 

E-Mail Address 

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative): Serve on 2 Committees: Programs and Development


2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? ___ Yes No

3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.


4. Is the trustee an employee or agent of the management company? ___ Yes No


5. Is the trustee an employee or agent of any institutional partner of the School? ___ Yes No

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write **none**. Please note that if you answered **yes** to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

Date(s)	Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction	Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)	Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself
			


Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School **and** in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write **none**.

Organization Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
			


 Signature

7/31/09
 Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 31st day of July, 2009.


 Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
 Notary Public, State of New York
 No. 01DE6053536
 Qualified in Queens County
 Certificate Filed in New York County
 Commission Expires January 16, 2011

Section V

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee
Annual Report 2008-09

Name (print) Doug Lemov

Name of Charter School True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Charter Entity SUNY Charter Schools Institute

Home Address [REDACTED]

Business Address _____

Daytime Phone _____

E-Mail Address [REDACTED]

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative):
Secretary

2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? ___ Yes X No

3. If you checked **Yes**, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

I am not an employee of the school; I am an employee of the management company hired by the Board.

4. Is the trustee an employee or agent of the management company? X Yes ___ No


5. Is the trustee an employee or agent of any institutional partner of the School? ___ Yes ___ No

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write **none**. Please note that if you answered **yes** to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

Date(s)	Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction	Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)	Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself
2008-2009	Employee of management company	Disclosure with Board	Self

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School **and** in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write **none**.

Organization Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest




Signature

7/30/09

Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of July, 2009.



 Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
 Notary Public, State of New York
 No. 01DE6053536
 Qualified in Queens County
 Certificate Filed in New York County
 Commission Expires January 16, 2011

Section V

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

**Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee
Annual Report 2008-09**

Name (print) James Gleason

Name of Charter School True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Charter Entity SUNY Charter Schools Institute

Home Address [REDACTED]

Business Address [REDACTED]

Daytime Phone _____

E-Mail Address [REDACTED]

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative):
Chairman


2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? ___ **Yes** **X** **No**

3. If you checked **Yes**, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

4. Is the trustee an employee or agent of the management company? ___ **Yes** **X** **No**

5. Is the trustee an employee or agent of any institutional partner of the School? ___ **Yes** **X** **No**

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write **none**. Please note that if you answered **yes** to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

Date(s)	Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction	Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)	Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself
			

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School **and** in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write **none**.

Organization Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
/			

James Gleason
Signature

7/30/09
Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30th day of July, 2009.

D.B. Deckman
 Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
 Notary Public, State of New York
 No. 01DE6053536
 Qualified in Queens County
 Certificate Filed in New York County
 Commission Expires January 16, 2011

Section V

NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

**Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee
Annual Report 2008-09**

Name (print) Joe Klein

Name of Charter School True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Charter Entity SUNY Charter Schools Institute

Home Address [REDACTED]

Business Address _____

Daytime Phone [REDACTED]

E-Mail Address [REDACTED]

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative):
Treasurer

2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? ___ **Yes** **No**

3. If you checked **Yes**, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

4. Is the trustee an employee or agent of the management company? ___ **Yes** **No**

5. Is the trustee an employee or agent of any institutional partner of the School? ___ **Yes** **No**

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write **none**. Please note that if you answered **yes** to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

Date(s)	Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction	Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)	Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself
/	None	/	/

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School **and** in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write **none**.

Organization Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest

Joseph Klein

 Signature

7/29/09

 Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of July, 2009

Daniel B. Deckman

 Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
 Notary Public, State of New York
 No. 01DE6053536
 Qualified in Queens County
 Certificate Filed in New York County
 Commission Expires January 16, 2011

Section V


NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee
Annual Report 2008-09

Name (print) Geoffrey Rosenberger


Name of Charter School True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Charter Entity SUNY Charter Schools Institute

Home Address 

Business Address _____

Daytime Phone 

E-Mail Address 

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative): Finance
Committee co-
chair

2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? ___ Yes X No

3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

4. Is the trustee an employee or agent of the management company? ___ Yes X No

5. Is the trustee an employee or agent of any institutional partner of the School? ___ Yes X No

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School **and** in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write **none**.

Organization Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest

Geoffrey Rosenblum
Signature

7/29/09
Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of July, 2009

Daniel B. Deckman
 Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
 Notary Public, State of New York
 No. 01DE6053536
 Qualified in Queens County
 Certificate Filed in New York County
 Commission Expires January 16, 2011

EXHIBIT 8

Statement of Assurances

Our signatures below attest that all of the information contained herein is truthful and accurate, and that this charter school is in compliance with all aspects of its charter, and with all pertinent Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and rules. We understand that if any information in any part of this report is found to have been deliberately misrepresented, that will constitute grounds for the revocation of our charter.

Stacey Shells
Print Name, Head of Charter School


 7/29/09
Signature and Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of July, 2009.



Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 01DE6053536
Qualified in Queens County
Certificate Filed in New York County
Commission Expires January 16, 2011

James Gleason
Print Name, President, Board of Trustees

 7/29/09
Signature and Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 29th day of July, 2009.


Notary Public

DANIEL B. DECKMAN
Notary Public, State of New York
No. 01DE6053536
Qualified in Queens County
Certificate Filed in New York County
Commission Expires January 16, 2011

EXHIBIT 9



ROCHESTER PREP

Charter School

2008-2009 SCHOOL CALENDAR

JULY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5
7	8	9	10	11	12
14	15	16	17	18	19
21	22	23	24	25	26
28	29	30	31		

AUGUST

M	T	W	TH	F	S
				1	2
4	5	6	7	8	9
11	12	13	14	15	16
18	19	20	21	22	23
25	26	27	28	29	30

SEPTEMBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6
8	9	10	11	12	13
15	16	17	18	19	20
22	23	24	25	26	27
29	30				

OCTOBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
		1	2	3	4
6	7	8	9	10	11
13	14	15	16	17	18
20	21	22	23	24	25
27	28	29	30	31	

NOVEMBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
					1
3	4	5	6	7	8
10	11	12	13	14	15
17	18	19	20	21	22
24	25	26	27	28	29

DECEMBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6
8	9	10	11	12	13
15	16	17	18	19	20
22	23	24	25	26	27
29	30	31			

JANUARY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
			1	2	3
5	6	7	8	9	10
12	13	14	15	16	17
19	20	21	22	23	24
26	27	28	29	30	31

FEBRUARY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
2	3	4	5	6	7
9	10	11	12	13	14
16	17	18	19	20	21
23	24	25	26	27	28

MARCH

M	T	W	TH	F	S
2	3	4	5	6	7
9	10	11	12	13	14
16	17	18	19	20	21
23	24	25	26	27	28
30	31				

APRIL

M	T	W	TH	F	S
		1	2	3	4
6	7	8	9	10	11
13	14	15	16	17	18
20	21	22	23	24	25
27	28	29	30		






MAY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
				1	2
4	5	6	7	8	9
11	12	13	14	15	16
18	19	20	21	22	23
25	26	27	28	29	30

JUNE

M	T	W	TH	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6
8	9	10	11	12	13
15	16	17	18	19	20
22	23	24	25	26	27
29	30	1			

Key:

-  No school
-  Saturday school
-  Interim assessments
-  New trimester begins
-  New family orientation

First day of school = August 26
 Last day of school = July 1

EXHIBIT 10

ROCHESTER PREP

Charter School

2009-2010 SCHOOL CALENDAR

JULY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5
7	8	9	10	11	12
14	15	16	17	18	19
21	22	23	24	25	26
28	29	30	31		

AUGUST

M	T	W	TH	F	S
					1
3	4	5	6	7	8
10	11	12	13	14	15
17	18	19	20	21	22
24	25	26	27	28	29
31					

SEPTEMBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5
7	8	9	10	11	12
14	15	16	17	18	19
21	22	23	24	25	26
28	29	30			

OCTOBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
			1	2	3
5	6	7	8	9	10
12	13	14	15	16	17
19	20	21	22	23	24
26	27	28	29	30	31

NOVEMBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
2	3	4	5	6	7
9	10	11	12	13	14
16	17	18	19	20	21
23	24	25	26	27	28
30					

DECEMBER

M	T	W	TH	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5
7	8	9	10	11	12
14	15	16	17	18	19
21	22	23	24	25	26
28	29	30	31		

JANUARY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
				1	2
4	5	6	7	8	9
11	12	13	14	15	16
18	19	20	21	22	23
25	26	27	28	29	30

FEBRUARY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6
8	9	10	11	12	13
15	16	17	18	19	20
22	23	24	25	26	27

MARCH

M	T	W	TH	F	S
1	2	3	4	5	6
8	9	10	11	12	13
15	16	17	18	19	20
22	23	24	25	26	27
29	30	31			

APRIL

M	T	W	TH	F	S
			1	2	3
5	6	7	8	9	10
12	13	14	15	16	17
19	20	21	22	23	24
26	27	28	29	30	

MAY

M	T	W	TH	F	S
					1
3	4	5	6	7	8
10	11	12	13	14	15
17	18	19	20	21	22
24	25	26	27	28	29
31					

JUNE

M	T	W	TH	F	S
	1	2	3	4	5
7	8	9	10	11	12
14	15	16	17	18	19
21	22	23	24	25	26
28	29	30	1		

Key:

	No school
	Saturday school
	Interim assessments
	New trimester begins
	New family orientation

First day of school = August 26

Last day of school = July 1

EXHIBIT 11

Modifications to the School's Educational Program and Governance Structure

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School has no modifications to either the school's educational program or governance structure to report.

Exhibit 12

(Please see digital version)

Exhibit 13

