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## INTRODUCTION

The mission of Success Academy Charter School - Bronx 1 ("SA Bronx 1") 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

| School <br> Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2009-10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2010-11$ | 88 | 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 192 |
| $2011-12$ | 54 | 80 | 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 233 |
| $2012-13^{1}$ | 79 | 76 | 91 | 89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 335 |

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 Bronx 1 goes above and beyond Common Core standards. SA Bronx 1 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.

[^0]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 Bronx 1 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 fastpaced 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 Bronx 1 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 third grade in April 2013. Each student's raw score has been converted to a gradespecific 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.

2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total <br>  Tested | Not Tested $^{2}$ |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^1]| 3 | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

## Results

Based on third grade scores from 2012-13, SA Bronx 1 did not meet the 75 percent proficient rate goal for English language arts. However, as noted below, this is due to significant changes to the exam.

Performance on 2012-13 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 <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | $67.4 \%$ | 89 | $68.6 \%$ | 86 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  | 89 | $68.6 \%$ | 86 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All | $67.4 \%$ |  |  |  |

## Evaluation

Schools across New York State experienced significantly lower scores on state exams in 2012-13 due to the shift to assessments that measure the Common Core Learning Standards. These lower scores were anticipated by the New York State Department of Education as the new examination was expected to "effectively create a new baseline measurement of student learning."3

Despite the drop in pass rate statewide, SA Bronx 1 ranks within the top $3 \%$ in the state and has outperformed other schools in its district in the 2012-13 school year by a wide margin.

## Additional Evidence

As noted above, the New York State English language arts examination increased in difficulty in 2012-13; but as noted elsewhere, SA Bronx 1 ranks among the top 3\% in the state.

[^2]English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year <br> Achieving Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | $2010-11$ |  | $2011-12$ |  | 2012-13 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
|  |  |  |  |  | $68.6 \%$ | 86 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  | $68.6 \%$ | 86 |

## 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 Annual Measurable Objective (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 current year's English language arts AMO. 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 $200 .{ }^{4}$

## Results

English Language Arts 2012-13 Performance Level Index (PLI)

| Number in <br> Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |  |
| 89 | 5 | 27 | 64 | 5 |  |  |

[^3]
## Evaluation

Per the Charter Schools Institute's Progress Report Template ("the Guidelines"), ${ }^{5}$ SA Bronx 1 is not reporting on this absolute measure. The State Education Department has not recalibrated the AMO to align with the new English language arts 3-8 testing program.

## 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. ${ }^{6}$

## Results

SA Bronx 1's students outperformed aggregate results for District 7 by a wide margin.

## 2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam

 SA Bronx 1 and District Performance by Grade Level| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SA Bronx 1 Students In At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | 68.6\% | 86 | 10.3\% | 1391 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All | 68.6\% | 86 | 10.3\% | 1391 |

## Evaluation

[^4]SA Bronx 1 met the comparative measure goal for English language arts by outperforming other schools in its district by a wide margin.

## Additional Evidence

In its first year of administering the New York State tests, SA Bronx 1 considerably outperformed District 7.

## English Language Arts Performance of SA Bronx 1 and Local District by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at <br> Proficiency Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2010-11$ |  |  | $2011-12$ |  | 2012-13 |
|  | LA Bronx <br> 1 | Local <br> District | SA Bronx <br> 1 | Local <br> District | SA Bronx <br> 1 | Local <br> District |
|  |  |  |  |  | 68 | $10.3 \%$ |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  | $68.6 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |

## 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 small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. ${ }^{7}$

## Method

SUNY has not provided Effect Size data.

## Results

Not applicable.
2011-12 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent <br> Eligible for | Number <br> Tested | Percent of Students <br> at Levels $3 \& 4$ | Difference <br> between Actual | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

[^5]|  | Free Lunch |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Actual Predicted |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 |  |
| 7 |  |
| 8 |  |
| All |  |

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
Not applicable

## Evaluation

Not applicable.

## Additional Evidence

Not applicable.
English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent <br> Eligible for <br> Free Lunch | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2009-10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2010-11$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2011-12$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |


#### Abstract

Goal 1: Growth Measure ${ }^{8}$ 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 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order

[^6]for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

## Results

Per the Guidelines, SA Bronx 1 is not reporting on this growth measure. The State Education Department has not yet reported schools' mean growth percentiles for the 2012-13 school year. Furthermore, SA Bronx 1 did not serve testing grades for the English language arts examination in 2011-12.

## 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 proficiencyon the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8. <br> 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. | Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state Engl ish language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. | N/A |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who a re 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 inthe localschool 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 a nalysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students a mong all public schools in New York State. (Using 2011-12 school district results.) | N/A |
| 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 Bronx 1 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 Bronx 1 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.

[^7]- Computational Fluency - SA Bronx 1 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 third grade in April 2013. 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.

## 2012-13 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total <br> Tested | Not Tested $^{9}$ |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IEP | ELL | Absent | Enrolled |
| 3 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

## Results

Based on scores from 2012-13, SA Bronx 1 exceeded the absolute measure goal for math.

## Performance on 2012-13 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

[^8]| Grades | All Students |  | Enrolled in at least their <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | $89.9 \%$ | 89 | $89.5 \%$ | 86 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  | 89 | $89.5 \%$ | 86 |
| 8 |  | $89.9 \%$ |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |

## Evaluation

SA Bronx 1 met the absolute measure goal in 2012-13 for mathematics. As it continues to improve its math program, SA Bronx 1 expects to continue to perform well in the future.

## Additional Evidence

There was a widespread drop in test scores statewide (see ELA Goal 1: Absolute Measure). Despite the widespread drop in scores, this absolute measure goal was met in 2012-13, and each grade level at SA Bronx 1 placed in the top 1\% statewide.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year <br> Achieving Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
|  | $2010-11$ |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
|  |  |  |  |  | $89.5 \%$ | 86 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  | $89.5 \%$ | 86 |

## Goal 1: 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 Annual Measurable Objective (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 current year's mathematics AMO. 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. ${ }^{10}$

## Results

Mathematics 2012-13 Performance Level Index (PLI)

| Number in <br> Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |  |
| 89 | 0 | 10 | 37 | 52 |  |  |

## Evaluation

Per the Guidelines, SA Bronx 1 is not reporting on this absolute measure. The State Education Department has not recalibrated the AMO to align with the new mathematics 3-8 testing program.

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the 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. ${ }^{11}$

## Results

SA Bronx 1's students outperformed aggregate results for District 7 by a very wide margin.

## 2012-13 State Mathematics Exam

[^9]
## Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students In At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | 89.5\% | 86 | 11.8\% | 1408 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All | 89.5\% | 86 | 11.8\% | 1408 |

## Evaluation

SA Bronx 1 met the comparative measure goal for math by outperforming other schools in its district by a very wide margin.

## Additional Evidence

In its first year of administering the New York State test, SA Bronx 1 considerably outperformed District 7. SA Bronx 1 expects that it will continue to outperform District 7 by a wide margin.

## Mathematics Performance of SA Bronx 1 and Local District by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at <br> Proficiency Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2010-11$ |  | 2011 -12 |  | 2012-13 |  |
|  | SA Bronx <br> 1 | Local <br> District | SA Bronx <br> 1 | Local <br> District | SA Bronx <br> 1 | Local <br> District |
|  |  |  |  |  | $89.5 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  | $89.5 \%$ | $11.8 \%$ |

## 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 higherthan expected to a small degree) according
to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. ${ }^{12}$

## Method

SUNY has not provided Effect Size data.

## Results

Not applicable.

## 2011-12 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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| School's Overall Comparative Performance: |
| :---: |
| Not applicable |

## Evaluation

Not applicable.

## Additional Evidence

Not applicable.

## Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent <br> Eligible for <br> Free Lunch | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $2009-10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2010-11$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2011-12$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

[^10]Goal 2: Growth Measure ${ }^{13}$
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 previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean 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.

## Results

Per the Guidelines, SA Bronx 1 is not reporting on this growth measure. The State Education Department has not yet reported schools' mean growth percentiles for the 2012-13 school year. Furthermore, SA Bronx 1 did not serve testing grades for the English language arts examination in 2011-12.

## Summary of the Mathematics 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 proficiencyon the New York State mathematics exam forgrades 3-8. <br> 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 accounta bility system. | N/A |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tes ted students who a re 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 | N/A |

[^11]|  | higher than expected to a small degree) a ccording to a regression a nalysis <br> controlling for economically disadvantaged students a mong all public <br> schools in New York State. (Using 2011-12 school district results.) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Growth | Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted <br> growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students ingrades 4-8 will <br> be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile. | N/A |

## Action Plan

Despite impressive state math test results, SA Bronx 1 is looking to make the following improvements to the math program:

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


## 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

This school did not serve testing grades for the New York State science examination in 2012-13.

## Results

Not applicable.

## Charter School Performance on 2012-13 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 $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |

## Evaluation

Not applicable.

## Additional Evidence

Not applicable.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 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

This school did not serve testing grades for the New York State science examination in 2012-13 or in any of the comparison years.

## Results

Not applicable.

2012-13 State Science Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students In At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |

## Evaluation

Not applicable.

## Additional Evidence

Not applicable.
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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |  |
|  | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Summary of the Science Goal

Not applicable.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at <br> least theirsecond year will perform at proficiencyon the New <br> York State examination. | N/A |
| This measure assumes that the general format and structure <br> of the State science exam will remain consistent. To the |  |  |


|  | extent that there are significant format and structure changes <br> to the exam, the school understands that its authorizer will <br> take such changes into account when assessing the school's <br> performance. | Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled inat <br> least theirsecond yearand performing at proficiency on the <br> state exam will be greater than that of all students in the <br> same tested gradesinthelocalschool district. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Action Plan

While progress cannot yet be measured quantitatively, the school remains confident that the program and curriculum described here and in the charter will lead to academic achievement that meets the goals outlined in the Accountability Plan.

## 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 a local-assistance-plan school.

## 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 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 that indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

## Results

SA Bronx 1 achieved a status of "Good Standing" in 2012-2013.

## Evaluation

SA Bronx 1 achieved its goal of attaining a status of "Good Standing" according to NCLB.

## Additional Evidence

In its first year administering New York State tests, SA Bronx 1 has achieved a status of "Good Standing" and expects to maintain this status in the future.

## NCLB Status by Year

| Year | Status |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2010-11$ | N/A |
| $2011-12$ | N/A |
| $2012-13$ | Good Standing |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Enrollment numbers are current as of April 29, 2013.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ See, e.g., Memo from Commissioner King: Use of State Test Scores in Teacher and Principal Evaluations, dated Aug. 2, 2013, available at http://usny.nysed.gov/docs/memo-scores-release.pdf (last visited Sept. 4, 2013).

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Available at http://www.newyorkcharters.org/schoolsAccountability.htm (last updated July 2013).
    ${ }^{6}$ Schools can acquire these data when the State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The SED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ The Institute will begin using economically disadvantaged instead of eligibility for free lunch as the demographic variable in 2012-13. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

[^7]:    - Assessment - SA Bronx 1 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 Bronx 1 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 Bronx 1'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.

[^8]:    ${ }^{9}$ 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.

[^9]:    ${ }^{11}$ In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.
    ${ }^{11}$ Schools can acquire these data when the State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The SED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

[^10]:    ${ }^{12}$ The Institute will begin using economically disadvantaged instead of eligibility for free lunch as the demographic variable in 2012-13. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

[^11]:    ${ }^{13}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

