

**NEW WORLD PREPARATORY  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY  
PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 16, 2011

By Jamie Esperon, Principal

New World Preparatory Charter School  
26 Sharpe Avenue  
Staten Island, NY 10302  
(718)705-8990  
[info@newworldprep.org](mailto:info@newworldprep.org)  
[www.newworldprep.org](http://www.newworldprep.org)

Jamie Esperon prepared this 2010-11 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

| Trustee's Name      | Board Position         |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| John Tobin          | Chair                  |
| Beverly Peterson    | Vice Chair             |
| Denis P. Kelleher   | Treasurer              |
| Rev. Terry Troia    | Secretary              |
| Araceli Arizmendi   | Board Member           |
| Carin Guarisci      | Board Member           |
| Jack Minogue        | Board Member           |
| Emma Vidals         | Board Member           |
| Peter Weinman, Esq. | Board Member           |
| Miriam Escribano    | PTO President          |
| Angelo Aponte       | Board Member (Pending) |

## INTRODUCTION

New World Preparatory Charter School (“NWP”) will provide an exceptional education for students in grades 6-8 by employing research-proven strategies to raise middle school academic achievement including: academic rigor and relevance, personalization, focused professional development, and meaningful engagement of families and the larger community. We will build on our nation’s promise of opportunity by exemplifying the role social justice holds in shaping a community *of* the people, *by* the people and *for* the people. Our students will graduate from NWP with a strong academic foundation, an awareness of the needs of others, and with the social and emotional readiness needed to succeed in middle school and high school and graduate from college.

Set in a neighborhood in close proximity to the Statue of Liberty, New World Preparatory Charter School will be “a golden door”—a school community where diversity is not just accepted but celebrated. Our school’s design features – academic rigor and relevance, personalization, a focus on professional development, and engaging families and the larger community as critical partners– are specifically targeted toward providing middle school students with the academic, social and emotional foundations to succeed in middle school, high school, college and beyond.

NWP will use a curriculum that is research based and aligned to New York State Learning Standards. Students will benefit from an extended school day with more time on task for mastery of academic subjects. We will have a school-wide focus on critical thinking, reading and writing across all content areas to improve the overall academic performance of every student. Our students will be challenged to develop the habits and dispositions that will enable them to succeed in middle school, be prepared for a college preparatory high school curriculum and be college ready. As opposed to focusing merely on information recall, our students will be challenged in all content areas to cite evidence to support their viewpoints, make connections, consider alternatives, assess importance and understand the connection between what they are learning and its relevance to their life and future success. The curriculum and instructional framework will support student’s preparation for post-secondary education.

We will engage our students around topics that are relevant to their everyday lives. Our board has decided to use a social justice framework as a strategy for engaging students around a curriculum that is relevant to their interests. Some examples of topics that teachers may develop lessons around include health care, environmental issues, civil rights, immigration, the economics of poverty, and the United States’ relationships in a changing world.

Student assessments at NWP will be designed to provide ongoing, useful feedback to staff and students. Our regular classroom assessments, which will be both formal and informal, will include a range of activities such as quizzes, selected responses, open-ended and closed constructed responses, end of unit tests, performance tasks, interviews, open-ended questions and conferences. Our staff will meet regularly to analyze data, review student work and use it to plan instruction. We will incorporate interim assessments quarterly to support a structure for evaluating student progress and identifying students’ needs so that interventions can be integrated into the daily academic program. NWP will analyze classroom, interim assessment and standardized test data to design appropriate interventions and instructional strategies to ensure that student achievement goals are met. Our staff will be trained to deploy instructional methods that are appropriate to the developmental needs of middle grades students.

NWP will present a clear alternative to large, impersonal middle schools by serving only 375 students at full capacity and having structured time scheduled to support the social and emotional needs of each child. Each grade level will contain 5 classes of no more than 25 students in a class. By keeping the school population and class size small, we will create a school community where each student is known

and supported. Additionally, students in all grade levels will participate in a structured advisory program that will function to further develop relationships that support learning. Each teacher will be assigned a group of approximately 18 students to whom they will serve as an advisor over the course of the students' three years at the school. That teacher will establish a relationship with not only the students but their families as well.

Our school has been designed around a focus on continuous and targeted professional development of our staff. The value our board places on quality professional development is evidenced by our school's academic calendar, thoughtful scheduling decisions, and teacher/principal appraisal systems. On a yearly basis, faculty will participate in a two-week pre-service. Bi-weekly, school will be dismissed early to provide time for school-wide professional development. On a daily basis, teachers will have common planning time will have an opportunity to plan curriculum and lessons together, engage in conversations about students in need of support, determine interventions and learn new strategies and approaches to support their own development as teachers. They will receive coaching from staff developers and feedback from the school's instructional leader. There will also be two fall in-service days.

At NWP, professional development will be results-oriented. Studies of successful school improvement efforts have repeatedly shown that good results depend on the building of a collaborative community of adult learners who accept joint responsibility for student achievement. Victory's Continuous Achievement Model ("CAM"), supports the principal in keeping focused on using the student data analysis to make decisions on professional development goals and objectives throughout the school year.

**School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year**

| School Year | 6                | 7               | 8 | Total |
|-------------|------------------|-----------------|---|-------|
| 2006-07     | Not in operation |                 |   | -     |
| 2007-08     | Not in operation |                 |   | -     |
| 2008-09     | Not in operation |                 |   | -     |
| 2009-10     | Not in operation |                 |   | -     |
| 2010-11     | 109              | No grade 7 or 8 |   | 109   |

## 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

NWP uses a balanced comprehensive literacy approach to accomplish our mission of producing students who meet or exceed the State ELA standards. At NWP there will be a school-wide emphasis on reading and writing strategies embedded across all content areas so that students are reading, writing, listening and speaking across the curriculum.

One component of the language arts literature curriculum will be the *Prentice Hall Literature* series, which is a strong, inquiry based language arts program that combines interpretive discussion and activities with outstanding literature to help all students learn to read for meaning and think critically. Students will learn to understand the text; move to analysis, interpretation, and evaluation; weigh several avenues of meaning, revise thinking, and then convey this thinking in an organized, cogent fashion.

Students will analyze fiction and non-fiction books and poetry through the lens of our social justice framework. Teachers will engage the students in group discussion regarding the themes and underlying issues of the books and poems, require students to write critical essays and policy memos, and debate the issues and policies that they have read about.

#### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students<sup>1</sup> who are enrolled in at least their second year<sup>2</sup> will perform at or above “Level 3”<sup>3</sup> on the New York State English language arts exam.

In 2009-10 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State English Language arts examination.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> This measure is for the group of *all* students in the school, not disaggregated by grade or any other factor.

<sup>2</sup> A student will be considered “in at least his second year” if he enrolled on or before the first Wednesday of October of the school year prior to that of the test.

<sup>3</sup> In its December 2010 version of “Guidelines for Creating an Accountability Plan,” CSI clarifies that it might require an alternate measure of proficiency: “Currently, meeting the state’s performance standard is defined by achieving a ‘Level 3’ on the state exam; therefore, in this document achieving a ‘Level 3’ and achieving proficiency are both used to denote meeting state performance standards. Notwithstanding the performance standard, the state testing program for grades 3-8 is itself currently in flux, with changing expectations for meeting the proficiency standard. Therefore, while ‘Level 3’ is used as the standard schools are held to throughout this document, a scale score equivalent may be used in its place at the Institute’s discretion to ensure that schools are held to a consistent standard over time.”

<sup>4</sup> In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school’s Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan’s standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 6th grade in May 2011. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required 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. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores<sup>1</sup>, presented in the table below.

| Grade | Time Adjusted<br>Cut Scores |
|-------|-----------------------------|
|       | Level 3                     |
| 6     | 654                         |
| 7     | 652                         |
| 8     | 652                         |

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.

### 2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total<br>Tested | Not Tested <sup>5</sup> |     |        | Total<br>Enrolled |
|-------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----|--------|-------------------|
|       |                 | IEP                     | ELL | Absent |                   |
| 6     | 108             | 0                       | 1   | 0      | 109               |
| 7     | No grade 7      | -                       | -   | -      | -                 |
| 8     | No grade 8      | -                       | -   | -      | -                 |
| All   | 108             | 0                       | 1   | 0      | 109               |

## Results

New World Preparatory Charter School opened in September 2010 and did not have any students enrolled in their second year. Of the 108 students who took the ELA exam, 54.6% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade students performed at or above Level 3.

### Charter School Performance on 2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | Population   | Percent Scoring at or<br>above Time<br>Adjusted Level 3<br>Cut Score | Number<br>Tested |
|-------|--------------|--|------------------|
| 6     | All Students | 54.6%  | 108              |

<sup>5</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.

|     |   |            |     |
|-----|---|------------|-----|
|     | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year | <u>N/A</u> | N/A |
| 7   | All Students                              | No grade 7 |     |
|     | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year |            |     |
| 8   | All Students                              | No grade 8 |     |
|     | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year |            |     |
| All | All Students                              | 54.6%      | 108 |
|     | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year | <u>N/A</u> | N/A |

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

Each year, the school’s aggregate<sup>1</sup> Performance Index (PI) 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.

**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.

As SED has not yet determined this year’s AMO, schools need not calculate their Performance Index and may omit reporting on this measure.

**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 students in the same tested grades in the local school district<sup>6</sup>.

**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 all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.

**Results**

The school just opened in September 2010 and did not have any students enrolled in their second year. However, 54.6% of 6<sup>th</sup> grade students performed at or above Level 3, which is greater than District 31’s 51.7% of 6<sup>th</sup> graders scoring at or above Level 3.

---

<sup>6</sup> “District” is defined as Community School District 31 within the New York City School District.

**2010-11 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<br>In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year |                  | All District Students |                  |
|       | Percent   | Number<br>Tested | Percent               | Number<br>Tested |
| 6     | No students in their 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr                     |                  | 51.7%                 | 2169             |
| 7     | No grade 7  |                  | 45.1%                 | 1922             |
| 8     | No grade 8  |                  | 41.5%                 | 1797             |
| All   | -   | -                | <b>51.6%</b>          | 13605            |

**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.<sup>7</sup>

**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 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

**Results**

Not applicable. The school opened in September 2010 and does not have 2009-10 results to report.

---

<sup>7</sup> In its December 2010 version of “Guidelines for Creating an Accountability Plan,” CSI describes this as follows: “... school performance is examined in terms of the performance of all other public schools in the state with a similar level of poverty. In order to determine if schools are meeting this measure, the Charter Schools Institute conducts a regression analysis that yields a predicted percent of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 based on the grade-specific test performance and free-lunch statistics of all New York State public schools.”



**2009-10 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 |   |             |
| 6     | -                               | <b>No grade 6</b> | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |
| 7     |                                 | <b>No grade 7</b> | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |
| 8     |                                 | <b>No grade 8</b> | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |
| All   | -                               | -                 | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |

|  |
|--|
| <b>School's Overall Comparative Performance:</b> |
| N/A  |

**Goal 1: Growth Measure**

Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above “Level 3”<sup>3</sup> on the previous year’s state English language arts exam and 75 percent at or above “Level 3”<sup>3</sup> on the current year’s state English language arts exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above “Level 3”<sup>3</sup> in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are 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**

Not applicable. The school’s first year began in September 2010, so none of the students tested have 2009-10 exam scores for New World Preparatory Charter School.

**Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2009-10 to 2010-11**

| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent Performing At or Above Level 3 |        |         | Target Achieved |
|-------|-------------|--|--------|---------|-----------------|
|       |             | 2009-10                                | Target | 2010-11 |                 |
| 7     | -           | -                                      | -      | -       | N/A             |
| 8     | -           | -                                      | -      | -       | N/A             |
| All   | -           | -                                      | -      | -       | N/A             |

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

| <b>Type</b> | <b>Measure</b>  | <b>Outcome</b>   |
|-------------|---|--|
| Absolute    | 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.  | N/A. Did not have students enrolled in their second year.                              |
| 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.   | N/A  |
| 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. | N/A.<br>Outperformed district but did not have students enrolled in their second year. |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.   | N/A  |
| Growth      | On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.  | N/A  |

## MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: Mathematics

All students at the school will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematics computation and problem solving.

### Background

NWP utilizes McGraw Hill-Glencoe's *Impact Mathematics* series. This program is based on the National Forum to Accelerate Middle Grades Reforms identification of three components of academically excellent middle grades curriculum-- academic rigor, equity and developmental appropriateness. *Impact Mathematics* is a comprehensive program that includes the strands of numbers and operations, proportional reasoning, geometry, probability and algebra, as well as the development of algebraic thinking. In *Impact Mathematics*, student understanding of the algebra strand evolves over a three year period, allowing such ideas as patterns, functions, proportional reasoning and algebraic structures and skills, to develop over time.

Students will learn about mathematics as an essential tool that can be used to analyze information, help people in need, and change the world. Students will use problem-solving skills and math concepts to analyze issues such as prison reform, immigration trends and wartime defense budgets. Teachers will deliver lessons directly to students, form cooperative groups of three or four students to practice what they have learned, and create project based activities to apply what they have learned in the real world.

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students<sup>1</sup> who are enrolled in at least their second year<sup>2</sup> will perform at or above "Level 3"<sup>3</sup> on the New York State mathematics exam.

In 2009-10 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State mathematics examination<sup>8</sup>.

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 6th grade in May 2011. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required 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. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores<sup>1</sup>, presented in the table below.

---

<sup>8</sup> In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school's Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan's standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

| Grade | Time Adjusted<br>Cut Scores |
|-------|-----------------------------|
|       | Level 3                     |
| 6     | 653                         |
| 7     | 651                         |
| 8     | 652                         |

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.

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested <sup>9</sup> |     |        | Total Enrolled |
|-------|--------------|-------------------------|-----|--------|----------------|
|       |              | IEP                     | ELL | Absent |                |
| 6     | 109          | 0                       | 0   | 0      | 109            |
| 7     | No grade 7   | -                       | -   | -      | -              |
| 8     | No grade 8   | -                       | -   | -      | -              |
| All   | 109          | 0                       | 0   | 0      | 109            |

**Results**

The school opened September 2010 and did not have any students in their second year; however, 78% of tested students did score above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score for 6<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Charter School Performance on 2010-11 State Mathematics Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

| Grade | Population                                | Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score | Number Tested |
|-------|---|---|---------------|
| 6     | All Students                              | 78.0%   | 109           |
|       | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year | <u>N/A</u>  | N/A           |
| 7     | All Students                              | No grade 7  |               |
|       | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year |   |               |
| 8     | All Students                              | No grade 8  |               |
|       | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year |   |               |
| All   | All Students                              | 78.0%   | 109           |
|       | Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year | <u>N/A</u>  | N/A           |

<sup>9</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

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

Each year, the school's aggregate<sup>1</sup> Performance Index (PI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's 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 mathematics AMO.

As SED has not yet determined this year's AMO, schools need not calculate their Performance Index and may omit reporting on this measure.

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year<sup>2</sup> and performing at or above Level 3 on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district<sup>6</sup>.

**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**

The school opened September 2010 and did not have any students in their second year. However, 78.0% of New World Prep's 6<sup>th</sup> graders scored above Level 3, which was greater than District 31's 62.8% above Level 3 in the same grade.

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

| Grade | Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4                       |                  |                       |                  |
|-------|---|------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
|       | Charter School Students<br>In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year |                  | All District Students |                  |
|       | Percent   | Number<br>Tested | Percent               | Number<br>Tested |
| 6     | No students in their 2 <sup>nd</sup> yr                     |                  | 62.8%                 | 2653             |
| 7     | No grade 7  |                  | 65.1%                 | 2782             |
| 8     | No grade 8  |                  | 57.6%                 | 2507             |
| All   | -   | -                | <b>65.3%</b>          | 17328            |

**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.<sup>10</sup>

**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 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

**Results**

Not applicable. The school just completed its first year and does not have any 2009-10 data.

**2009-10 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 |   |             |
| 6     | -                               | <b>No grade 6</b> | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |
| 7     |                                 | <b>No grade 7</b> | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |
| 8     |                                 | <b>No grade 8</b> | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |
| All   | -                               | -                 | -                                 | -         | -                                       | -           |

|  |
|--|
| <b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b> |
| N/A.   |

**Goal 1: Growth Measure**

Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above “Level 3”<sup>3</sup> on the previous year’s state mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above “Level

<sup>10</sup> In its December 2010 version of “Guidelines for Creating an Accountability Plan,” CSI describes this as follows: “... school performance is examined in terms of the performance of all other public schools in the state with a similar level of poverty. In order to determine if schools are meeting this measure, the Charter Schools Institute conducts a regression analysis that yields a predicted percent of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 based on the grade-specific test performance and free-lunch statistics of all New York State public schools.”

3”3 on the current year’s state mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above “Level 3”3 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are 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**

Not applicable. The school just opened in September 2010, so none of the students tested have 2009-10 exam scores for New World Preparatory Charter School.

**Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2009-10 to 2010-11**

| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent Performing At or Above Level 3 |        |         | Target Achieved |
|-------|-------------|--|--------|---------|-----------------|
|       |             | 2009-10                                | Target | 2010-11 |                 |
| 7     | -           | -                                      | -      | -       | N/A             |
| 8     | -           | -                                      | -      | -       | N/A             |
| All   | -           | -                                      | -      | -       | N/A             |

**Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

| Type        | Measure   | Outcome  |
|-------------|---|--|
| Absolute    | 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.  | N/A. 78% of students scored at or above Level 3, but school did not have students enrolled in their second year. |
| 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.   | N/A  |
| 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. | N/A. School outperformed the district but did not have students enrolled in their second year.                   |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.   | N/A  |
| Growth      | On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.  | N/A  |

## SCIENCE

### Goal 3: Science

All students at the school will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

#### Background

The main component of the science curriculum will be FOSS (Full Options Science System), which is based on concepts and content recommended by the National Science Education Standards. This scientifically research-based program is aligned with the State standards. The program is based on the premise that the best way to learn science is by doing science. This hands-on approach will provide students with ample learning experiences involving experiments and investigations in general science, biology, chemistry, earth science and physics. Students will learn to observe, generate ideas, make hypothesis, test their ideas logically and empirically and apply meaning to their daily lives.

### Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year<sup>2</sup> will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State science exam.

Not applicable. The school did not have students in 4<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> grade this year and did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment to any students.

### Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year<sup>2</sup> and performing at or above Level 3 on a state science exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district<sup>6</sup>.

Not applicable. The school did not have students in 4<sup>th</sup> or 8<sup>th</sup> grade this year and did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment to any students.

#### Summary

| 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.   | N/A. Did not administer exam. |
| 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. | N/A. Did not administer exam. |



**NCLB**

**Goal 5: NCLB**

The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

**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**

Not applicable. The state has not yet released the AYP status for 2010-11. The school has also just completed its first year and will need to make AYP for two consecutive years before having an NCLB status.

**NCLB Status by Year**

| Year    | Status  |
|---------|---|
| 2005-06 | -   |
| 2007-08 | -   |
| 2008-09 | -   |
| 2009-10 | -   |
| 2010-11 | AYP status for 2010-11 has not yet been released. |