



**Success Academy Charter School –  
Bronx 2**

**2015-16 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2016

By Jessica Hinel

450 St. Paul's Place, Floor 5  
Bronx, NY 10456  
(347) 286-7965

Jessica Hinel, Data Coordinator, prepared this 2015-16 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Sam Cole	Chair
Bryan Binder	Vice Chair
Scott Friedman	Treasurer
Greg Sawers	Secretary
Cate Shinker	
Sam Chainani	
Brian Levine	
Isela Bahena	
Derrell Bradford	
Khadijah Patrick-Pickel	<i>Ex-officio</i> Parent Representative
Rich Barrera	
Suleman Lunat	
Graham Officer	
Jarrett Posner	
Lorenzo Smith	
Andy Stone	

**Vanessa Bangser served as the school leader from 2010-2011 until 2015-2016.**

## INTRODUCTION

The mission of Success Academy Charter School – Bronx 2 (“SA”) is to provide students in New York City with an exceptionally high-quality education that gives them the knowledge, skills, character, and disposition to meet and exceed New York State Common Core Learning Standards and the resources to lead and succeed in school, college, and a competitive global economy.

### School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year<sup>1</sup>

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2012-13	74	82	89	97										342
2013-14	119	84	87	90	80									460
2014-15	88	122	90	86	78	76								540
2015-16	83	92	117	91	76	76	72							607

---

<sup>1</sup> Enrollment numbers are current as of April 7, 2016. Per instruction from SUNY, enrollment numbers reflect originating charters.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

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

#### Background

Believing that all students can succeed, SA goes above and beyond Common Core standards. SA uses THINK Literacy, a comprehensive balanced literacy program, in all grades. THINK Literacy was developed in-house by the Instructional Management team at Success Academy Charter Schools, the charter management organization. There are many components of THINK, including Shared Text, Guided Reading, Read Aloud with Discussion, Reading Workshop, and Writing Workshop. During Shared Text, the teacher displays a text and the whole class reads and analyzes it together, giving students practice interpreting brief, engaging texts. During Guided Reading, the teacher works with a small group of students to read and comprehend a book that is one level above what they can read and understand independently. During Read Aloud with Discussion, the teacher models the internal thinking that excellent readers exhibit, and students discuss their ideas about the book with their classmates. During Reading Workshop and Writing Workshop, students internalize key aspects of great reading and writing, through direct instruction, independent work, and partner work. All THINK components press students to read, write, think, and speak with clarity and precision.

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

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

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

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

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

This measure assumes that the general format and structure of the State ELA exam will remain consistent. To the extent that there are significant format and structure changes to the exam, the

school understands that its authorizer will take such changes into account when assessing the school's performance.

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in April 2016. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

**2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>2</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	91				91
4	76				76
5	76				76
6	71			1	72
7					
8					
All	314			1	315

### Results

Based on scores from 2015-16, SA exceeded the absolute measure goal for ELA.

**Performance on 2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	76.92%	91	76.40%	89
4	80.26%	76	80.26%	76
5	64.47%	76	64.47%	76

<sup>2</sup> 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.

6	90.14%	71	90.14%	71
7				
8				
All	77.71%	314	77.56%	312

### Evaluation

SA met the absolute measure goal in 2015-16 for ELA.

### Additional Evidence

SA exceeded this absolute measure goal for ELA. As it continues to improve its ELA program, SA expects to continue to perform well in the future.

#### English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	65.56%	90	58.33%	84	76.40%	89
4	73.75%	80	62.82%	78	80.26%	76
5			69.74%	76	64.47%	76
6					90.14%	71
7						
8						
All	69.41%	170	63.45%	238	77.56%	312

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

### Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index ("PLI") value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 English language arts AMO of 104. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2

through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>3</sup>

**Results**

For 2015-16, SA achieved a PLI of 176. This is significantly greater than the target AMO of 104.

**English Language Arts 2015-16 Performance Level Index (PLI)**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
314	2%	20%	53%	25%

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PLI} & = & 20\% & + & 53\% & + & 25\% & = & 98 \\
 & & & & 53\% & + & 25\% & = & \underline{78} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 176
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

SA met this goal by achieving a PLI of 176.

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>4</sup>

**Results**

SA achieved an overall proficiency rate of 77.56% (for students enrolled in at least their second year), higher than the local district’s proficiency rate.

**2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency	
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	All District Students

<sup>3</sup> In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

<sup>4</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	76.40%	89	21.99%	2,919
4	80.26%	76	24.01%	2,882
5	64.47%	76	18.24%	2,768
6	90.14%	71	16.34%	2,528
7				
8				
All	77.56%	312	20.15%	11,097

### Evaluation

SA met this goal with a proficiency rate that exceeded the local district's proficiency rate.

### Additional Evidence

SA outperformed the local district in the below years.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	65.56%	13%	58.33%	13.80%	76.40%	21.99%
4	73.75%	14%	62.82%	13.30%	80.26%	24.01%
5			69.74%	12.00%	64.47%	18.24%
6					90.14%	16.34%
7						
8						
All	69.41%	13%	63.45%	13.10%	77.56%	20.15%

### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

### Method



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

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

**Results**

For the 2014-15 academic year, SA demonstrated an effect size of 3.63, greatly exceeding the target value of 0.3.

**2014-15 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	<b>87.6</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>42.6</b>	<b>3.20</b>
4	<b>84.8</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>19.8</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>3.17</b>
5	<b>88.5</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>15.6</b>	<b>54.5</b>	<b>4.58</b>
6						
7						
8						
All	<b>87</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>18.3</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>3.63</b>

<b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<b><i>Higher than expected to a large degree</i></b>

**Results**

SA met this goal with an effect size of 3.63. This value is substantially greater than the target effect size of 0.3.

**Additional Evidence**

In every academic year for which data has been provided, SA’s effect size has been rated as “higher than expected to a large degree.” SA believes that it will demonstrate consistently high effect sizes in the years to come.

### English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2012-13	3	84.5	97	77.3	20.2	4.58
2013-14	3-4	84.6	170	69.8	22.0	3.51
2014-15	3-5	87	240	64.9	18.3	3.63

#### Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>5</sup>

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

#### Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2014-15 and also have a state exam score from 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 score are ranked by their 2014-15 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students’ growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school’s mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>6</sup>

#### Results

SA was unable to find this data for 2014-15.

#### 2014-15 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0

<sup>5</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>6</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

8		50.0
All	*	50.0

\* This number represents a weighted average of all grade-levels' mean growth percentile

### Evaluation

SA was unable to find this data for 2014-15.

### Additional Evidence

Please see below for historical data.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Statewide Median
4		46.0		50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All		46.0		50.0

#### Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.  This measure assumes that the general format and structure of the State ELA exam will remain consistent. To the extent that there are significant format and structure changes to the exam, the school understands that its authorizer will take such changes into account when assessing the school's performance.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's 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 proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of 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 English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students	Achieved

	among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2014-15 school district results.)	
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	N/A

### Action Plan

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

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

## MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will show competency in their understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

### Background

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

- Problem Solving – CGI offers students a chance to solve real world, contextualized mathematical problems using conceptual understanding. Students learn the basics of problem solving strategies by solving daily word problems that require critical thinking and both written and verbal expression of mathematical reasoning. Students work individually to solve a problem and then share their strategies with their peers. The teacher leads a discussion based on student strategies that leads to understanding of mathematical properties.
- Assessment – SA administers Math Interim Assessments and weekly quizzes to determine the progress of students with respect to the Common Core standards. Teachers use the data to inform future instruction.
- Common Core State Standard Alignment – SA has mapped the scope and sequence of CGI and the Investigations math program to closely align with the Common Core. This scope and sequence closely follows the state and national requirements of what students should know

and be able to do at each administration of the state math assessments. By aligning closely with the Common Core and assessments, teachers will have a much better sense of where their students stand in SA’s goal of preparing all students for college-track level mathematics in middle and high school.

- **Conceptual Understanding** – Investigations math places an emphasis on open-ended exploration and interactive learning components to each lesson to let students make sense of mathematics by building on ideas and observations from previous experiences. By learning mathematical ideas and procedures that is grounded in meaning, students are able to apply their thinking to new situations and unfamiliar problems. CGI uses daily world problems to give students meaning, understanding, and application to the math they learn.
- **Computational Fluency** – SA also provides students with regular math facts practice because it recognizes the importance of computational fluency. Math facts quizzes emphasize both accuracy and speed.

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

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

This measure assumes that the general format and structure of the State mathematics exam will remain consistent. To the extent that there are significant format and structure changes to the exam, the school understands that its authorizer will take such changes into account when assessing the school’s performance.

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in April 2016. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

**2015-16 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>7</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	91	0	0	0	91
4	76	0	0	0	76
5	76	0	0	0	76

<sup>7</sup> 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.

6	72	0	0	0	72
7					
8					
All	315	0	0	0	315

## Results

Based on scores from 2015-16, SA exceeded the absolute measure goal for math.

### Performance on 2015-16 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	87.91%	91	87.64%	89
4	93.42%	76	93.42%	76
5	92.11%	76	92.11%	76
6	95.83%	72	95.83%	72
7				
8				
All	92.06%	315	92.01%	313

## Evaluation

SA met the absolute measure goal in 2015-16 for mathematics.

## Additional Evidence

SA exceeded this absolute measure goal for math by a wide margin. As it continues to improve its math program, SA expects to continue to perform well in the future.

### Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	98.89%	90	94.05%	84	87.64%	89
4	98.75%	80	97.44%	78	93.42%	76
5			96.05%	76	92.11%	76

6					95.83%	72
7						
8						
All	98.82%	170	95.80%	238	92.01%	313

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 94. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>8</sup>

**Results**

For 2015-16, SA achieved a PLI of 191. This is substantially greater than the target AMO of 101.

**Mathematics 2015-16 Performance Level Index (PLI)**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
315	1%	7%	26%	66%

PLI =	7%	+	26%	+	66%	=	99
		/	26%	+	66%	=	92
					PLI	=	191

**Evaluation**

SA met this goal by achieving a PLI of 191.

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

<sup>8</sup> In contrast to NYSED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

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

### Method

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>9</sup>

### Results

SA achieved an overall proficiency rate of 92.01% (for students enrolled in at least their second year), higher than the local district’s proficiency rate.

### 2015-16 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	87.64%	89	23.08%	2,998
4	93.42%	76	22.71%	2,963
5	92.11%	76	17.47%	2,862
6	95.83%	72	16.47%	2,629
7				
8				
All	<b>92.01%</b>	313	<b>19.93%</b>	11,452

### Evaluation

SA met this goal with a proficiency rate that exceeded the local district’s proficiency rate.

### Additional Evidence

SA outperformed the local district in the below years.

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

<sup>9</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).



Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	98.89%	18%	94.05%	19.80%	87.64%	23.08%
4	98.75%	17%	97.44%	16.20%	93.42%	22.71%
5			96.05%	19.80%	92.11%	17.47%
6					95.83%	16.47%
7						
8						
All	98.82%	18%	95.80%	18.50%	92.01%	19.93%

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

### Method

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

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

### Results

For the 2014-15 academic year, SA demonstrated an effect size of 3.79, greatly exceeding the target value of 0.3.

## **2014-15 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	87.6	86	95	28.3	66.7	3.72
4	84.8	78	97	28.4	68.6	3.60
5	88.5	76	96	24.9	71.1	4.05
6						
7						
8						
All	87.0	240	96.0	27.2	68.7	3.79

<b>School's Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<i>Higher than expected to a large degree</i>

### Evaluation

SA met this goal with an effect size of 3.79. This value is substantially greater than the target effect size of 0.3.

### Additional Evidence

In every academic year for which data has been provided, SA's effect size has been rated as "higher than expected to a large degree." SA believes that it will demonstrate consistently high effect sizes in the years to come.

### Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2012-13	3	84.5	97	96.9	23.7	4.36
2013-14	3-4	84.6	170	99.0	30.4	3.65
2014-15	3-5	87.0	240	96.0	27.2	3.79

### Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>10</sup>

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

### Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the

<sup>10</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2014-15 and also have a state exam score in 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 scores are ranked by their 2014-15 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>11</sup>

## Results

SA was unable to find this data for 2014-15.

### **2014-15 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All	*	50.0

\* This number represents a weighted average of all grade-levels' mean growth percentile

## Evaluation

SA was unable to find this data for 2014-15.

## Additional Evidence

Please see below for historical data.

### **Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Statewide Median
4		66.0		50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0

<sup>11</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

8				50.0
All		66.0		50.0

### **Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.  This measure assumes that the general format and structure of the State math exam will remain consistent. To the extent that there are significant format and structure changes to the exam, the school understands that its authorizer will take such changes into account when assessing the school's performance.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's 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 proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of 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 mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2014-15 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	N/A

### **Action Plan**

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

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

### **SCIENCE**

#### **Goal 3: Science**

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

### **Background**

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

### **Goal 3: Absolute Measure**

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

This measure assumes that the general format and structure of the State science exam will remain consistent. To the extent that there are significant format and structure changes to the exam, the school understands that its authorizer will take such changes into account when assessing the school’s performance.

### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment in spring 2016. The school converted each student’s raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

### **Results**

SA achieved an overall proficiency rate of 100%.

#### **Charter School Performance on 2015-16 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100.00%	76		
8				

### **Evaluation**

SA demonstrated extremely high performance in Science.

**Additional Evidence**

Please see below for historical data.

**Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100%	80	100.00%	78	100.00%	76
8						
All	100%	80	100.00%	78	100.00%	76

**Goal 3: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

**Results**

SA demonstrated an overall proficiency rate of 100%. Proficiency rates for the local district’s 2015-16 New York State Testing Program Science Exam will not be available until spring 2017.

**2015-16 State Science Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100.00%	76		
8				

**Evaluation**

Not yet available.

**Additional Evidence**

Because local district science testing data is not yet publicly available, SA cannot compare its performance with that of its local school district.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	100%		100%		100%	
8						
All	100%		100%		100%	

**Summary of the Science Goal**

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.  This measure assumes that the general format and structure of the State science exam will remain consistent. To the extent that there are significant format and structure changes to the exam, the school understands that its authorizer will take such changes into account when assessing the school's performance.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	N/A

**Action Plan**

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

**NCLB**

**Goal 4: NCLB**

The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

**Goal 4: Absolute Measure**

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status is in good standing; the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

**Method**

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

**Results**

SA achieved a status of “Good Standing” for 2015-16.

**Evaluation**

SA achieved its goal by achieving a status of “Good Standing” for the 2015-16 academic year.

**Additional Evidence**

SA has maintained its status of “Good Standing” for every year for which information is available and expects to maintain this status in the future.

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2013-14	Good Standing
2014-15	Good Standing
2015-16	Good Standing