2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

COVER PAGE

Name of Charter School True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

Address 630 Brooks Ave.

Rochester, NY 14619

Telephone 585-436-8629 **Fax** 585-436-5985

BEDS# 261600860906

District/CSD of Location Rochester City School District

Head of School (Contact Person) David McBride
(print name)

E-mail address of contact person dmcbride@rochesterprep.org

President, Board of Trustees James Gleason
(print name)

E-mail address and Phone Number of Board President [redacted]

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[1]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

1. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

2. Trustee's name (print): Bob Howitt

3. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Program Committee and Development Committee

4. Home address: [redacted]

5. Business Address: _____

6. Daytime phone: [redacted]

7. E-mail: [redacted]

8. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

9. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

[1] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.			

10. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None*."

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
Please write "None" if applicable.			Board member of non-profit Uncommon Schools, which has a contract to manage Rochester Prep. *Do not leave this space blank.*	

Signature 7/28/10 ***Date***

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[2]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

11. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

12. Trustee's name (print): Susan Adsit

13. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Development Committee Chair

14. Home address: [redacted]

15. Business Address: _____

16. Daytime phone: [redacted]

17. E-mail: [redacted]

18. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

19. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

---

[2] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.*		

20. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None.*"

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable.*		*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

Susan Robin 7/27/10

Signature ***Date***

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[3]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

21. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

22. Trustee's name (print): G. Jean Howard

23. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Development Committee

24. Home address: [redacted]

25. Business Address: _____

26. Daytime phone: [redacted]

27. E-mail: [redacted]

28. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

29. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

---

[3] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.*		

30. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None.*"

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable.*		*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

M. Jean Howard — 7/27/10

Signature ***Date***

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[4]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

31. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

32. Trustee's name (print): Doug Lemov

33. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Secretary

34. Home address: [redacted]

35. Business Address: _____

36. Daytime phone: [redacted]

37. E-mail: [redacted]

38. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

39. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

---

[4] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
2009-10	Employee of management organization	Disclosure with Board	Self

40. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None*."

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
Please	NONE *write "None"*	*if applicable.*	*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

Signature _____ ***Date*** 7/27/10

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[5]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

41. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

42. Trustee's name (print): James Gleason

43. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Chairman

44. Home address: [redacted]

45. Business Address: _____

46. Daytime phone: _____

47. E-mail: [redacted]

48. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

49. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

[5] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.*		

50. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write "None."*

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable.*		*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

James C Lewis

Signature

7/10/10

Date

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[6]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

51. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

52. Trustee's name (print): Joe Klein

53. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Treasurer

54. Home address: [redacted]

55. Business Address: _____

56. Daytime phone: [redacted]

57. E-mail: [redacted]

58. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

59. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

---

[6] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.*		

60. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None*."

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable.*		*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

Dyan Klein
Signature

7/6/2010
Date

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[7]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

61. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

62. Trustee's name (print): Geoffrey Rosenberger

63. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Finance Committee

64. Home address: [redacted]

65. Business Address: _____

66. Daytime phone: [redacted]

67. E-mail: [redacted]

68. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

69. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

---

[7] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.*		

70. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None*."

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
Please	NONE *write "None" if applicable.*		*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

Geoffrey Rosenberger
Signature

7/20/10
Date

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[8]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

71. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

72. Trustee's name (print): Rebecca Sumner

73. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Development Committee

74. Home address: [redacted]

75. Business Address: _____

76. Daytime phone: _____

77. E-mail: [redacted]

78. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

79. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

---

[8] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.*		

80. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None*."

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable.*		*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

Signature 7/27/10 *Date*

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

DISCLOSURE OF FINANCIAL INTEREST BY A CHARTER SCHOOL TRUSTEE[9]

Note: Please make a copy of this two page form for each Trustee

81. Name of charter school: True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

82. Trustee's name (print): Hugh Scott

83. Position(s) on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, committee chair, etc.): Development Committee

84. Home address: [redacted]

85. Business Address: _____

86. Daytime phone: [redacted]

87. E-mail: [redacted]

88. Is Trustee an employee of the school? ____Yes. _x__No. If you checked yes, please provide a description of the position you hold, your salary and your start date.

_____

89. In the box below, identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members have held or engaged in with the charter school during the prior school year. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, please *write "None."* Please note that if you answered yes to Question 8, you

[9] *Form Revised May 24, 2006*

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)	Identity of Person Holding Interest or Engaging in Transaction (e.g., you and/or immediate family member (name)
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable. Do not leave this space blank.*		

90. In the box below, 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 charter school *and* in which such entity, during the preceding school year, you and/or your immediate family member(s) 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 entity and the school that is pursuant to such agreement; rather, please identify only the name of the entity, your position in the entity as well as the relationship between such entity and the charter school. If there was no financial interest, please *write* "*None.*"

Entity Conducting Business with the School	Nature of Business Conducted	Approximate Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee and/or Immediate Family Holding an Interest in the Entity Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest	Steps Taken to Avoid Conflict of Interest
	NONE *Please write "None" if applicable.*		*Do not leave this space*	*blank.*

Signature _____ Date 7/20/2010

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

MODIFICATIONS TO THE SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM AND GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Describe any significant changes to the school's educational program as well as its governance structure. If there are no changes, please indicate N/A.

N/A

2009-10 Annual Report
August 1, 2010

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School

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.

David McBride
Print Name, Head of Charter School

7/27/10
Signature and Date

James Gleason
Print Name, President, Board of Trustees

James S Gleason 7/27/10
Signature and Date

True North Rochester Prep Budget / Operating Plan 2009-10		True North Rochester Prep Budget / Operating Plan 2009-10
Total Revenue		**3,406,597**
Total Expenses		**3,306,909**
Net Income		**99,688**
Actual Student Enrollment		**261**
Total Paid Student Enrollment		-
*** Enrollment, Revenue and Expediture Data IN the 'Total and Variance Analysis' Section is Based on LAST ACTUAL Quarter Completed**		**TOTALS AND VARIANCE ANALYSIS**
		Actual
REVENUE		
REVENUES FROM STATE SOURCES		
Per Pupil Revenue	CY Per Pupil Rate	
Rochester	10,859	2,868,247
School District 2 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 3 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 4 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 5 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 6 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 7 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 8 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 9 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 10 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 11 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 12 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 13 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 14 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District 15 (Enter Name)	-	-
School District - ALL OTHER	-	-
TOTAL Per Pupil Revenue (Average Districts Per Pupil Funding)	10,859	2,868,247
Special Education Revenue		115,835
Grants		
Stimulus		-
DYCD (Department of Youth and Community Developmt.)		-
Other		-
Other		-
TOTAL REVENUE FROM STATE SOURCES		2,984,082
REVENUE FROM FEDERAL FUNDING		
IDEA Special Needs		32,946
Title I		159,984
Title Funding - Other		65,125
School Food Service (Free Lunch)		-
Grants		
Charter School Program (CSP) Planning & Implementation		-
Other		-
Other		-
TOTAL REVENUE FROM FEDERAL SOURCES		258,055
LOCAL and OTHER REVENUE		
Contributions and Donations		124,454
Fundraising		-
Erate Reimbursement		38,728
Earnings on Investments		-
Interest Income		1,278
Food Service (Income from meals)		-
Text Book		-
OTHER		-
TOTAL REVENUE FROM LOCAL and OTHER SOURCES		164,460
TOTAL REVENUE		**3,406,597**

True North Rochester Prep Budget / Operating Plan 2009-10		True North Rochester Prep Budget / Operating Plan 2009-10
Total Revenue		**3,406,597**
Total Expenses		**3,306,909**
Net Income		**99,688**
Actual Student Enrollment		**261**
Total Paid Student Enrollment		-
*** Enrollment, Revenue and Expediture Data IN the 'Total and Variance Analysis' Section is Based on LAST ACTUAL Quarter Completed**		**TOTALS AND VARIANCE ANALYSIS**
		Actual
EXPENSES		
ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF PERSONNEL COSTS	No. of Positions	
Head(s) of School	1	88,875
Principal(s)	1	89,250
Assisant Principal(s)	3	246,836
CFO / Director of Finance	-	-
Operation / Business Manager	-	-
Administrative Staff	2	117,694
TOTAL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF	7	542,655
INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL COSTS		
Teachers - Regular	21	972,765
Teachers - SPED	2	84,056
Substitute Teachers	-	-
Teaching Assistants	-	7,427
Specialty Teachers	2	100,150
Aides	-	-
Therapists & Counselors	-	-
Other	-	-
TOTAL INSTRUCTIONAL	25	1,164,398
NON-INSTRUCTIONAL PERSONNEL COSTS		
Nurse	1	14,474
Librarian	-	-
Custodian	-	-
Security	-	-
Other	1	53,076
TOTAL NON-INSTRUCTIONAL	2	67,550
SUBTOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICE COSTS	34	1,774,603
PAYROLL TAXES AND BENEFITS		
Payroll Taxes		165,399
Fringe / Employee Benefits		164,982
Retirement / Pension		31,311
TOTAL PAYROLL TAXES AND BENEFITS		361,692
TOTAL PERSONNEL SERVICE COSTS	34	2,136,295
CONTRACTED SERVICES		
Accounting / Audit		13,205
Legal		260
Management Company Fee		308,003
Nurse Services		2,797
Food Service / School Lunch		32,183
Payroll Services		5,635
Special Ed Services		-
Titlement Services (i.e. Title I)		-
Other Purchased / Professional / Consulting		-
TOTAL CONTRACTED SERVICES		362,083
SCHOOL OPERATIONS		
Board Expenses		114
Classroom / Teaching Supplies & Materials		26,523
Special Ed Supplies & Materials		20
Textbooks / Workbooks		4,715
Supplies & Materials other		12,496
Equipment / Furniture		16,967
Telephone		4,568
Technology		49,808
Student Testing & Assessment		40,465
Field Trips		36,181
Transportation (student)		54,014
Student Services - other		8,942
Office Expense		163,683
Staff Development		50,937
Staff Recruitment		21,634
Student Recruitment / Marketing		3,010
School Meals / Lunch		-
Travel (Staff)		20,422
Fundraising		-
Other		37,735
TOTAL SCHOOL OPERATIONS		552,234
FACILITY OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		
Insurance		30,637
Janitorial		52,773
Building and Land Rent / Lease		67,977
Repairs & Maintenance		81,151
Equipment / Furniture		-
Security		-
Utilities		23,759
TOTAL FACILITY OPERATION & MAINTENANCE		256,297
DEPRECIATION & AMORTIZATION		-
RESERVES / CONTIGENCY		-
TOTAL EXPENSES		**3,306,909**
NET INCOME		**99,688**

True North Rochester Prep Budget / Operating Plan 2009-10	True North Rochester Prep Budget / Operating Plan 2009-10
Total Revenue	**3,406,597**
Total Expenses	**3,306,909**
Net Income	**99,688**
Actual Student Enrollment	**261**
Total Paid Student Enrollment	-
*** Enrollment, Revenue and Expediture Data IN the 'Total and Variance Analysis' Section is Based on LAST ACTUAL Quarter Completed**	**TOTALS AND VARIANCE ANALYSIS**
	Actual
ENROLLMENT - *School Districts Are Linked To Above Entries*	*** Enrollment Data Based on Last Actual Quarter Completed**
Rochester	261
School District 2 (Enter Name)	-
School District 3 (Enter Name)	-
School District 4 (Enter Name)	-
School District 5 (Enter Name)	-
School District 6 (Enter Name)	-
School District 7 (Enter Name)	-
School District 8 (Enter Name)	-
School District 9 (Enter Name)	-
School District 10 (Enter Name)	-
School District 11 (Enter Name)	-
School District 12 (Enter Name)	-
School District 13 (Enter Name)	-
School District 14 (Enter Name)	-
School District 15 (Enter Name)	-
School District - ALL OTHER	-
TOTAL ENROLLMENT	**261**
REVENUE PER PUPIL	**13,052**
EXPENSES PER PUPIL	**12,670**

Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2009-10 School Year

Reader's Guide

SUNY Authorized Charter Schools

As set forth in the *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees*, the single most important factor that the Charter Schools Institute and the SUNY Board of Trustees consider in making renewal determinations is the school's record in generating successful student achievement outcomes. In order to determine whether a school has met that high standard, **each charter school that the SUNY Board of Trustees authorizes is required to enter into an accountability agreement, known as an Accountability Plan**, which ultimately becomes part of its charter.

The Charter Schools Institute closely monitors each school's progress toward achieving the goals outlined in its Accountability Plan.

In addition, as part of its annual reporting requirements, **each SUNY authorized charter school must submit an Accountability Plan Progress Report which, from its vantage point, addresses each of the goals and outcome measures contained in its Accountability Plan**. The information presented in these Progress Reports constitutes important evidence that a school is keeping its promises to its students, parents and community, and is critical to making its case for renewal at the end of its charter period. The most important parts of Progress Reports are student achievement results on state exams and other assessments. However, not all schools will have tested grade levels for a particular state exam. Each year, the state administers English language arts and mathematics tests to 3rd through 8th grade, science tests to the 4th and 8th grades, and, up through 2009-10, social studies tests to the 5th and 8th grades.

Important Note: **The Accountability Plan Progress Report is authored by the charter school.** In reporting school progress toward meeting the outcome measures set forth in the Accountability Plan, schools are encouraged to build a case for the effectiveness of their program, and to lay the groundwork for writing a Renewal Application and ultimately for charter renewal. **The school's evaluation of its own progress does not necessarily reflect the conclusions of the Institute.** Further, the Institute does not affirm the completeness or accuracy of the report's data and may not endorse the school's characterization of the progress it has made toward achieving its Accountability Plan goals. Throughout the life of the school's charter, the Institute will visit each school, generating Institute School Visit Reports and, at the end of each charter period, a Renewal Report (select the <back> button in your browser to return to the school profile to see any/all available reports). These reports include detailed summaries of the Institute's observations of the school, as well as its evaluation of student performance and progress toward meeting the academic subject goals in its Accountability Plan.

TRUE NORTH ROCHESTER PREPARATORY CHARTER SCHOOL

2009-10 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 3, 2010

By: Marya Murray-Diaz, Director of Operations

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School
630 Brooks Avenue
Rochester, NY 14619
Telephone: (585) 436-8629
Fax: (585) 436-5985

Marya Murray-Diaz prepared this 2009-10 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
Hugh Scott	Trustee
Rebecca Sumner	Trustee

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
2005-06														
2006-07						73								73
2007-08						77	63							140
2008-09						82	79	50						211
2009-10						76	69	65	45					255

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 through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State English language arts examination.

New York State has undergone cut score increases this year. This has increased standards in New York State and has made attaining a Level 3 far more difficult than in years past. Following the Charter School Institute's guidelines, we have updated the absolute measure accordingly, from scoring a 3 or 4 on the exam to a scaled score of 650 or more.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English Language Arts assessment to students in 5th through 8th grade in April 2010. 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 a 650 scaled score.

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.

2009-10 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	76	0	0	0	76
6	69	0	0	0	69
7	65	0	0	0	65
8	45				45
All	255	0	0	0	255

Results

All 255 Rochester Prep students enrolled in April 2010 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. Ninety percent (90.2) of Rochester Prep 5th grade students scored at a 650 scaled score or above on the 2010 NYS ELA exam. The 5th grade class at Rochester Prep has already reached the stated absolute goal of 75% at 650 scaled score in their first year.

Ninety-four percent (94.2) of Rochester Prep 6th grade students in at least their second year at the school scored at a 650 scaled score on the 2010 NYS ELA exam. Rochester Prep's 6th grade class exceeded the absolute goal for ELA in 2010

Eighty-six percent (86.2%) of Rochester Prep 7th graders in at least their second year at the school scored at a scaled score of 650 or above on the 2010 NYS ELA exam, surpassing the absolute goals for ELA.

Students in the 8th grade were returning for their third year at Rochester Prep as the founding cohort of students. They posted scores of 100% at a scaled score of 650 or above on the 2010 NYS ELA exam, surpassing the absolute goals for ELA.

[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.

Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or Above 650	Number Tested
5	All Students	90.8	76
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0	0
6	All Students	94.2	69
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	94	67
7	All Students	86.2	65
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	86.2	65
8	All Students	100	45
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	100	45
All	All Students	92.2	255
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	92.7	177

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded all measures (75% or more at a scaled score of 650 or more) in the performance of its ELA program in 2010.

At the 5th grade level, with the 2010 ELA assessment given in their first year at the school, 90.8% of students scored at a scaled score of 650 or above on the state ELA 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. The average scaled score for the students in grade 5 was 670 as compared to the Rochester City School District with an average of 657, a 13 point difference. 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.

Rochester Prep's 6th grade students in at least their second year at the school outperformed the absolute performance measure with 94% scoring a scaled score of 650 or more. This marks not only a continuation of high performance on the 2009 ELA exam, where the same cohort of students scored 88% proficient (measured last year as a score of 3 or 4) on the 5th grade exam, but also a healthy outscoring of the stated absolute performance measure by 19 percentage points. Sixth graders in the city of Rochester scored an average of 654, compared to our average of 671, a difference of 15 points. In addition, out of all 6th grade students in their second year at Rochester Prep, no student scored a Level 1.

The 7th grade students in at least their second year at Rochester Prep outperformed the absolute performance measure with 86.2% of the students scoring a scaled score of 650 or more. The seventh graders surpassed the absolute measure by 11 percentage points. However, there was a substantial drop in the percentage of students who received a 3 or 4 in grade 7, 49.2% as compared to the same

cohort in 2009 when 93.8% received a 3 or 4 on the exam. Rochester Prep students scored, on average, a scaled score of 663 as compared to the students in the city of Rochester who scored an average of 650, a difference of 13 points.

The founding class of Rochester Prep students was 100% proficient (attaining a scaled score of 650 or more) on the 2010 Grade 8 ELA test, outperforming the absolute performance measure by 25 percentage points. Not a single student received a Level 1. These results placed True North Rochester Prep among the top-performing public schools in Monroe County on the English Language Arts exam in 2010. On average, Rochester Prep students scored a scaled score of 678 as compared to students in the city of Rochester who averaged 639, a difference of 39 points.

While Rochester Prep exceeded all measures in the performance of its ELA program in 2010, 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 expanded its program to full size in 2009-2010, including four grade levels, indicators suggest that the school's academic performance has remained strong over the years.

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 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6			85	62	94.5	73	94.2	69
7					100	51	86.2	65
8							100	45
All			85	62	96.8	124	92.7	177

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 2009-10 is 155. 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 2009-10 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
5-8	2.7	32.5	55.7	9	255

PI	=	32.5	+	55.7	+	9	=	97.2
			+	55.7	+	9	=	64.7
						PI	=	**161.9**

Evaluation

Rochester Prep's AMO target for ELA in 2009-2010 was 155. It achieved an ELA PI score of 162 in 2010, exceeding the goal by 7 points.

Additional Evidence

Rochester Prep's PI for ELA in the 2009-2010 academic year was 162 compared to 192 for the 2008-2009 school year and 180 for the 2007-2008 school year. This drop is due to the recalibration of the cut scores that determine the performance levels 1 through 4.

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	122
2007-08	5-6	140	1	18	80	1	180	133
2008-09	5-7	214	0	7	84	9	192	144
2009-10	5-8	255	3	33	56	9	162	155

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 the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the local school district, as

[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.

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 45.7 percentage points (70% vs 24.3%) on the 2010 grade 6, 7, and 8 ELA exams.

2009-10 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 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6	71.6	67	31.9	2186
7	49.2	65	19.7	2231
8	97.8	45	21.1	2062
All	**70.0**	177	**24.3**	6479

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded the measure of comparative District proficiency in ELA during the 2009-2010 school year. Rochester Prep students in at least their second year outscored the Rochester City School District by 45.7 percentage points (70% vs 24.3%) overall. Rochester Prep outperformed the District by 40 percentage points (72% vs 32%) on the grade 6 ELA exam, by 29 percentage points (49% vs 20%) on the 2010 grade 7 ELA exam, and by 77 percentage points (98% vs. 21%) on the grade 8 ELA exam. Rochester Prep's 5th grade students were only in their first year at the school.

Additional Evidence

The tables below illustrate the high levels of performance for Rochester Prep students in at least 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.

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6	71.6	67	31.9	2186
7	49.2	65	19.7	2231
8	97.8	45	21.1	2062
All	**70.0**	177	**24.3**	6479

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									
	2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	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	71.6	31.9
7							100	53.1	49.2	19.7
									97.8	21.1
All					85	56	96.8	61.6	70	24.3

2009-10 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	71.6	67	39.7	68	25.8	31	8.8	57
All	**71.6**	67	39.7	68	25.8	31	8.8	57

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	49.2	65	15.6	268	20.6	97	10.9	138
8	97.8	45	26.3	289	20.2	84	10.6	141
All	69.0	110	21.2	557	20.4	181	10.7	279

Comparison Between True North Rochester Prep and Schools in the City of Rochester, Grade 8 2010 ELA Exam

School/District	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Proficient
True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School (The)	0	2.3	81.4	16.3	97.7
School Without Walls	0	36	57.3	6.7	64
School Of The Arts	7.9	48.2	36.6	7.3	43.9
Urban Choice Charter School	5.6	55.6	38.9	0	38.9
Dr Freddie Thomas High School	9.3	59	31.7	0	31.7
Joseph C Wilson Foundation Academy	24.2	49.5	26	0.3	26.3
Rochester City School District	27.9	51	19.8	1.3	21.1
School 3-Nathaniel Rochester	17.9	61.9	20.2	0	20.2
Northwest College Preparatory High School	22.5	57.7	19.7	0	19.7
International Finance & Economic Development Hs At Franklin	32.3	48.4	19.4	0	19.4
East High School	31.3	53.8	13.9	1	14.9
John Marshall High School	26.9	60.4	12.7	0	12.7
Charlotte High School	41	46.8	12.2	0	12.2
Thomas Jefferson High School	51.1	36.9	10.6	1.4	12
James Monroe High School	43.1	45.7	10.3	0.9	11.2
Bioscience & Health Career Hs At Franklin	49.3	41.8	7.5	1.5	9
Northeast College Preparatory High School	30.9	61.7	7.4	0	7.4
Global Media Arts Hs At Franklin	28.6	64.3	7.1	0	7.1
Rochester Academy Charter School	32.1	62.5	5.4	0	5.4
Out of district placement	77.8	22.2	0	0	0

We also believe that proficiency in comparison to the students in the Rochester City School District is not the only point of comparison we need to make to ensure our students can compete with students for seats at top colleges. In fact, we ranked Rochester Prep compared to schools in Monroe County. Many of these suburban districts, including Brighton, Pittsford, and Penfield, consistently send their students to top colleges in the country. Rochester Prep ranks at the top in absolute proficiency, and #5 in Monroe County in the percent of students receiving a level 4 on the Grade 8 2010 NYS ELA exam.

Comparison Between True North Rochester Prep and Schools in the County of Monroe, Grade 8 2010 ELA Exam

School/District	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Proficient
True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School (The)	0	2.3	81.4	16.3	97.7
Pittsford Central School District	0.8	14.7	59.2	25.3	84.5
Penfield Central School District	0.3	19.6	66.5	13.7	80.2
Brighton Central School District	1.5	24	53.5	21.1	74.6
West Irondequoit Central School District	1.8	23.7	54.7	19.8	74.5
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	1.1	25.3	55.5	18.1	73.6
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	1.7	25	56.7	16.7	73.4
Webster Central School District	2.4	27.8	55.7	14.2	69.9
Spencerport Central School District	2.5	30.7	58.9	7.8	66.7
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	3.3	32.9	55	8.8	63.8
Fairport Central School District	1.1	35.2	51.9	11.8	63.7
Hilton Central School District	2.6	37	49.3	11.1	60.4
Gates-Chili Central School District	4.1	37.9	49.9	8.2	58.1
East Irondequoit Central School District	5.6	38.2	49.4	6.9	56.3
Churchville-Chili Central School District	4	41.5	46.8	7.7	54.5
Monroe County	9.3	37.1	44.6	9.0	53.6
Greece Central School District	5.4	41.3	48	5.3	53.3
Brockport Central School District	6.4	43.1	45	5.4	50.4
East Rochester Union Free School District	5.6	46.7	45.6	2.2	47.8
Urban Choice Charter School	5.6	55.6	38.9	0	38.9
Rochester City School District	27.9	51	19.8	1.3	21.1
Rochester Academy Charter School	32.1	62.5	5.4	0	5.4

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 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

2008-09 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		**83**	**87.9**	**77.5**	**10.4**	**1.00**
6		**80**	**93.8**	**74.9**	**18.9**	**1.65**
7		**51**	**100.0**	**72.8**	**27.2**	**2.11**
8						
All	**58%**	**214**	**93.0**	**75.4**	**17.6**	**1.51**

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

Evaluation

The currently available comparative performance effect size data for 2008-2009 is considerably out of date. Rochester Prep met the comparative performance measure in 2008-2009 by exceeding the effect size of 0.3 by a large degree on the grade 5 - 7 2009 New York State 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, 7, and 8 in 2010.

Additional Evidence

Since 2008-2009 was the third year of Rochester Prep's operation this is the second time we can make an official year to year comparison between the Effect Sizes.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size

		Free Lunch				
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	5, 6, 7	58%	214	93.0	75.4	1.51

Goal 1: Growth Measure
Each year through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-09, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. 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

Two out of three cohorts achieved their growth measure target.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
6	69	88.0	>88.0	94.0	YES
7	65	94.9	>94.9	86.2	NO
8	45	98.1	>98.1	100	YES
All	177	93.0	>93.0	92.7	NO

Since Rochester Prep is in its fourth year of operation, there are three grade level cohorts to which this measure applies. Rochester Prep's 6th and 8th grade cohorts achieved their growth measure target for the 2010 ELA. The 7th grade cohort far surpassed the 75% measure, however did not meet its growth target from last year. It is worth noting, however, that the 7th grade cohort posted scores that far exceed the norm.

Additional Evidence
In 2009-2010, Rochester Prep's 6th and 8th grade cohorts exceeded their growth measure goals for ELA. Measuring the percentage of students who achieved a scaled score of 650 or above, the 6th grade cohort at Rochester Prep improved 5 percentage points (88% to 94%) from the 2009 exam to the 2010 exam and the 8th grade cohort improved 1.9 percentage points (98.1% to 100%) from the

2009 exam to the 2010 exam. The percentage of the 7th grade cohort that achieved a scaled score of 650 or more dropped from 2009 to 2010 by 8.7 percentage points (94.9% to 86.2%), the only cohort that did not meet their growth measure goal. However, 7th grade ELA performance remains strong by every other performance measure.

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 Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2006-07	-	-	-
2007-08	6	1	1
2008-09	6, 7	2	2
2009-10	6, 7, 8	2	3

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School achieved 4 out of 5 of the ELA target measures outlined in the Accountability Plan.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 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 grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	Did Not Achieve*

*All grade level cohorts exceeded 75% at or above a scale score of 650, however one cohort did not make gains.

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 through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State mathematics examination.

As explained for the ELA portion, New York State has undergone cut score increases in Math as well this year. This has increased standards in New York State and has made attaining a Level 3 far more difficult than in years past. Consequently, we have updated the absolute measure accordingly, from scoring a 3 or 4 on the exam to a scaled score of 650 or more.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program Mathematics assessment to students in 5th through 8th grade in May 2010. 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 a scaled score of 650 or more as evidence of proficiency.

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.

2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[3]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
5	76	0	0	0	76
6	69	0	0	0	69
7	65	0	0	0	65
8	45	0	0	0	45
All	255	0	0	0	255

Results

All 255 Rochester Prep students enrolled in May 2010 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-seven percent (97.4%) of Rochester Prep 5th grade students scored at or above the absolute goal on the 2010 NYS Math exam, with a scaled score of 650 or more. The 5th grade class at Rochester Prep has already reached the stated absolute goal in their first year at the school.

Ninety-seven percent (97.1%) of all Rochester Prep 6th grade students in at least their second year at the school scored at or above the absolute goal on the 2010 NYS Math exam. Rochester Prep's 6th grade class exceeded the absolute goal for Math in 2010 and showed exceptional gains from the 2009 performance.

Students in the 7th grade at Rochester Prep in at least their second year at the school also scored 100% proficient on the 2010 NYS Math exam. These results exceed the absolute goal of 75% proficient in Math in 2010 by 25 percentage points.

The founding cohort of students, the eighth graders, in at least their second year at the school, scored 100% proficiency as well. All 45 students received a scaled score of 650 or more on the 2010 NYS Math exam.

[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

Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Population	At or Above Level 650	Number Tested
5	All Students	97.4	76
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0	0
6	All Students	97.1	69
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	97.0	67
7	All Students	100	65
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	100	65
8	All Students	100	45
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	100	45
All	All Students	98.4	255
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	98.9	177

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded all measures in the performance of its Math program in 2010.

At the 5th grade level, 97.4% of all students scored a scaled score of 650 or more on the state Math test in their first year of enrollment at Rochester Prep. True North Rochester Prep's fifth grade students scored, on average, a scaled score of 682 as compared to the fifth graders in the Rochester City School District who scored, on average, a 660 scaled score. That is a difference of 22 percentage points. 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 2010 Math test.

Rochester Prep's 6th grade students in at least their second year at the school outperformed the absolute performance measure for Math with 97.1% scoring at or above a scaled score of 650. The average scaled score for Rochester Prep students was 692 in grade 6, as opposed to 663 in the Rochester City School District. This is a difference of 29 percentage points. Ninety-seven percent of students reaching the absolute goal of 650 or more marks not only an increase from a solid performance on the 2009 Math exam, where the same cohort of students scored 92% proficient, but also an exceptional outscoring of the stated absolute performance measure by 22 percentage points. Out of all 6th grade students in their second year at Rochester Prep, no student scored at a Level 1. In addition, a significant number of students who scored at Level 2 in 2009 moved to Level 3 in 2010. 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 achieved a scaled score of 650 or more, outperforming the absolute measure for Math. In the Rochester City School District the 7th graders achieved a scaled score of 647, as compared to the Rochester Prep students who scored an

average of 682, a difference of 35 percentage points. The rate of 100% hitting the 650 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.

In 8th grade, 100% of Rochester Prep students in at least their second year scored at 650 or more on the 8th grade 2010 Math exam, a solid performance. On average, Rochester Prep 8th graders achieved a scaled score of 698, compared with the city of Rochester's 8th grade scaled score average of 644, a difference of 54 percentage points. In addition, only 3 students scored at a level 2, so even with the recalibration of cut scores in 2010, 93.3% of the 8th graders received a 3 or 4 on the 2010 NYS Math exam.

As is evident above, Rochester City School District scaled scores actually decrease from fifth grade to 8th grade (660 to 644), while True North Rochester Prep's scaled scores increase (from 682 to 698), further evidence of academic value-added.

Additional Evidence

As Rochester Prep expanded its program to full size in 2009-2010, including four grade levels, indicators suggest that the school's academic performance has remained strong over the years.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 b in 2009-10									
	2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-2009		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6					99	61	100	73	97	67
7							100	50	100	65
8									100	45
All					99	61	100	123	98.9	177

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 2009-10 is 135. 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 2009-10 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
5-8	0.4	23.5	52.2	23.9	255

PI	=	23.5	+	52.2	+	23.9	=	99.6
			+	52.2	+	23.9	=	76.1
						PI	=	**175.7**

Evaluation

Rochester Prep's AMO target for Math in 2009-10 was 135. It achieved a Math PI score of 175.7 in 2010, exceeding the goal by 40.7 points.

Additional Evidence

Rochester Prep's PI for Math in the 2009-2010 academic year was 175.7. Even with the cut score change, the students' performance has remained consistently strong. In 2008-2009 the PI was 195, in 2007-2008 it was also 195, and in 2006-2007 the PI was 186. This consistently strong showing is attributed directly to the strength and impact of Rochester Prep's Math program.

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
2009-10	5-8	255	0.4	23.5	52.2	23.9	175.7	135

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 in the percent of students receiving 3s and 4s by 58 percentage points (84.2% vs. 26.2%).

2009-10 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 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6	82.1	67	40.2	2214
7	80	65	23.1	2258
8	93.3	45	14.5	2077
All	**84.2**	177	**26.2**	6549

Evaluation

Rochester Prep exceeded the measure of comparative District proficiency in Math during the 2009-2010 school year. Sixth graders in at least their second year outperformed the Rochester City School District 6th graders by 41.9 percentage points (82.1% vs. 40.2%), seventh graders in at least their second year outperformed the district by 56.9 percentage points (80% vs. 23.1%) on the 2010 grade 7 Math exam, and eighth graders outperformed the district by 78.8 percentage points (93.3% vs. 14.5%) at levels 3 and 4.

As the district's scores dropped from 6th grade to 8th grade (40.2% to 14.5%), True North Rochester Prep's scores increased overall (82.1% in fifth to 93.3% in eighth), clear evidence of the value added by the Rochester Prep Mathematics program.

Additional Evidence

The tables below illustrate the high levels of Math performance for Rochester Prep students in at least 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, 7th, and 8th grade students in at least their second year have vastly outperformed the local District cohorts.

This is the third 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 at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least Second Year Compared to Local District Students									
	2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	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	82.1	40.2
7							100	58.5	80	23.1
8									93.3	14.5
All					99	56	100	61.6	84.2	26.2

2009-10 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 School		RCSD 16		RCSD 44		RCSD 29	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
6	82.1	65	39.7	68	27.7	36	14	57
All	82.1	65	39,7	68	27.7	36	14	57

2009-10 Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Comparison Schools, Seventh and Eighth 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	80	65	12.9	272	28.5	95	10.6	151
8	93.3	45	15.4	286	7.3	82	4.1	148
All	85.4	110	14.2	558	18.7	177	7.4	299

Comparison Between True North Rochester Prep and Schools in the City of Rochester, Grade 8 2010 Math Exam

School/District	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Proficient
True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School (The)	0	7	55.8	37.2	93
Dr Freddie Thomas High School	11.9	50	33.8	4.4	38.2
School Of The Arts	12.5	53.1	32.8	1.6	34.4
Northwest College Preparatory High School	29	52.2	18.8	0	18.8
John Marshall High School	37.8	45.4	15.3	1.5	16.8
Joseph C Wilson Foundation Academy	36.4	48.3	14.7	0.7	15.4
Rochester City School District	37.8	47.7	13.6	0.9	14.5
James Monroe High School	34.1	52.8	12.2	0.8	13
Northeast College Preparatory High School	30	57.5	12.5	0	12.5
Urban Choice Charter School	8.3	83.3	8.3	0	8.3
International Finance & Economic Development Hs At Franklin	46.8	45.2	8.1	0	8.1
East High School	43.4	48.6	7.6	0.3	7.9
Global Media Arts Hs At Franklin	49.2	43.1	7.7	0	7.7
School 3-Nathaniel Rochester	36.6	56.1	7.3	0	7.3
Rochester Academy Charter School	32.8	60.3	6.9	0	6.9
School Without Walls	36	57.3	6.7	0	6.7
Charlotte High School	57.1	37.7	5.2	0	5.2
Thomas Jefferson High School	49.3	46.6	2.7	1.4	4.1
Bioscience & Health Career Hs At Franklin	71.6	28.4	0	0	0

We also believe that proficiency in comparison to the students in the Rochester City School District is not the only point of comparison to ensure can compete with students for seats at top colleges. In fact, we ranked Rochester Prep compared to schools in Monroe County. Many of these suburban districts, including Pittsford, Honeoye Falls-Lima, and West Irondequoit, consistently send their students to top colleges in the country. Rochester Prep ranks at the top in absolute proficiency, and among the top 2 districts in Monroe County in the percent of students receiving a level 4 on the 2010 Grade 8 NYS Math exam.

Comparison Between True North Rochester Prep and Schools in the County of Monroe, Grade 8 2010 Math Exam

School/District	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Proficient
True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School (The)	0	7	55.8	37.2	93
Pittsford Central School District	0.6	12.2	49.4	37.8	87.2
Honeoye Falls-Lima Central School District	1.6	16.4	50.3	31.7	82
Hilton Central School District	0.9	18.6	47.4	33.1	80.5
Churchville-Chili Central School District	5.6	16.3	59.1	19.1	78.2
West Irondequoit Central School District	2.5	20.4	45.5	31.5	77
Spencerport Central School District	1.3	21.7	48.1	28.9	77
Penfield Central School District	2	21.3	57.6	19.1	76.7
Fairport Central School District	2.1	27.8	41.1	29.1	70.2
Webster Central School District	3.5	26.5	47.8	22.3	70.1
Brighton Central School District	3.3	29.1	48	19.6	67.6
Brockport Central School District	7	29.8	48.6	14.6	63.2
Greece Central School District	5.3	33.2	40.3	21.1	61.4
Rush-Henrietta Central School District	4	36.9	46.1	13	59.1
East Irondequoit Central School District	6.8	34.6	42.3	16.2	58.5
Gates-Chili Central School District	6.4	35.9	42	15.7	57.7
Monroe County	12.4	32.1	38.0	17.5	55.5
East Rochester Union Free School District	14.4	33.3	35.6	16.7	52.3
Wheatland-Chili Central School District	5	43.3	41.7	10	51.7
Rochester City School District	37.8	47.7	13.6	0.9	14.5
Urban Choice Charter School	8.3	83.3	8.3	0	8.3
Rochester Academy Charter School	32.8	60.3	6.9	0	6.9

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 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

Results
The effect size of continues to demonstrate that the school's overall comparative performance is higher than expected to a large degree.

2008-09 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		**82**	**91.5**	**84.9**	**6.6**	**0.65**
6		**79**	**100.0**	**77.7**	**22.3**	**1.65**
7		**50**	**100.0**	**81.9**	**18.1**	**1.60**
8						
All	**58%**	**211**	**96.7**	**81.5**	**15.2**	**1.25**

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

Evaluation

The currently available comparative performance effect size data for 2008-2009 is considerably out of date for Math. Rochester Prep met the comparative performance measure in 2008-2009 by exceeding the Effect Size of 0.3 on the grade 5, 6, and 7 2009 New York State Math exam.

Based on our own preliminary analysis of similar 2010 Math data, Rochester Prep expects to dramatically exceed the Effect Size in Math again for 5^{th}, 6^{th}, 7^{th}, and 8^{th} grades.

Additional Evidence

Since 2008-2009 was the third year of Rochester Prep's operation this is the second time we can make an official year to year comparison between the Effect Sizes.

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	5,6,7	58%	211	96.7	81.5	1.25

Goal 2: Growth Measure
Each year through 2008-2009, 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.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-2009, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. 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 fourth year of operation, there are now 3 grade level cohorts to which this measure applies. Rochester Prep's 6th, 7th, and 8th grade cohorts achieved their growth measure target for 2010 Math and therefore, the school met its overall performance target.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
6	69	91.5	>91.5	97.1	YES
7	65	100	100	100	YES
8	45	98.0	>98.0	100	YES
All	177	97.3	>97.3	99.9	YES

Evaluation

In 2009-2010, 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 2008-2009 school year and therefore was required to show at least continued positive gains in 2009-2010. The 6th grade Rochester Prep cohort continued to make significant strides with a 5 percentage point increase in Math from 2008-2009. The 6th grade cohort of 69 students at Rochester Prep scored 91.5% at or above a scale score of 650 in 2008-2009 as 5th graders and increased to 97.1% at or above a scale score of 650 in 2009-2010. This one year gain demonstrates significant cohort growth.

The 7th grade cohort also maintained its growth measure goal for Math, having already achieved 100% performing at or above a scale score of 650 in 2008-2009. The cohort of 65 students maintained 100% for 2009-2010.

The 8th grade cohort achieved 98% at a scale score of 650 or above in 2009-2010. They reached 100% on the 2009-2010 exam, surpassing the goal on this growth measure.

Overall, the strong performance on this growth measure over all 3 cohorts is evidence of the success of Rochester Prep's Math Program, even as the school has grown over the past four years.

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
2009-10	6, 7, 8	3	3

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

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

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 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 grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	Achieved

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
Students will demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge in Science.

Background

Rochester Prep's Science curriculum takes a comprehensive instructional look Science standards over the course of the four grades, 5 through 8. The Science program has expanded in scope and depth as the school grew into 8th grade in 2009-2010. Rochester Prep has utilized periodic diagnostic assessments as a means for ensuring key standards are covered as part of the Science curriculum.

Rochester Prep students took the 9th grade Regents Earth Science exam, an advanced class, in lieu of the 8th grade Science exam. The students scored, on average, 68%, with 67% passing the exam, gaining high school credit in middle school.

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 studies standards over the course of the four years at Rochester Prep. The Social Studies program has expanded in scope and depth as the school grew into four full grades. 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.

The 8th graders took the 8th grade Social Studies exam in 2010. This is the first cohort to do so.

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 2009 and in 8th grade in June 2010. 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

Since Rochester Prep 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, along with the 8th grade Social Studies Examination results.

Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State Social Studies 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	4	9	78	9	87	79
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	All Students	0	9	65	26	91	43
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0	9	65	26	91	43

Evaluation

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 87 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.

The 8th grade class at Rochester Prep was in at least their second year at Rochester Prep, so the stated measure is applicable. Ninety-one percent of the students scored at a level 3 or 4 on the 8th grade NYS Social Studies exam. They exceeded the stated absolute goal.

Additional Evidence

Social Studies Performance
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5					82	83	87	79
8							91	43
All							88	122

Summary

The absolute measure for Social Studies was met by both the 5th and 8th grades.

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

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
2005-06	NA
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	Good Standing
2009-10	Good Standing