# Excel
# CHARTER SCHOOL

# 2015-16 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2016

By Rachel Wiley- Data and Operations Associate

**Excel Lower School Campus**

**1077 Remsen Avenue**
**Brooklyn, NY 11236**

**And**

**Excel Upper School Campus**

**956 East 82nd Street**

**Brooklyn, NY 11236**

# INTRODUCTION

Rebecca Daverin, Chief Operating Officer

Adam Schulman, Director of Operations and Technology

Jessica Willm, Director of Math Curriculum and Instruction

Miriam Barry, Director of Literacy

Maryann Li, Chief of Staff

Rachel Wiley, Data and Operations Associate

Shaini Kothari, Data and Operations Associate

prepared this 2015-16 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

| Trustee's Name | Board Position |
|---|---|
| Morty Ballen | Member- Discipline Committee |
| Kimesha Carnegie | Member- Accountability Committee |
| Beth Cohen | Member- Discipline Committee |
| Graeme Daykin | Board Chair- Finance Committee |
| Hank Mannix | Member- Finance and Accountability Committees |
| Jana Reed | Member |
| Peter Walker | Member- Finance Committee |
| Damion Trent | Parent Representative |

**Karen Francois has served as the Principal since August of 2015.**

# INTRODUCTION

Explore Excel Charter School is a public charter school currently serving grades K-8 in Canarsie, Brooklyn. Excel opened in 2011. Excel's mission is to provide students with the academic skills and critical-thinking abilities they need to succeed in a college-preparatory high school. In the 2015-16 school year, Excel served 477 students.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2011-12 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 63 | | | | | 245 |
| 2012-13 | 54 | 55 | 60 | 59 | 59 | | | | 287 |
| 2013-14 | 58 | 59 | 57 | 60 | 64 | 62 | | | 360 |
| 2014-15 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 59 | 61 | 62 | 62 | | 422 |
| 2015-16 | 58 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 57 | 60 | 63 | 59 | 477 |

# ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

## Goal 1: English Language Arts

Explore Excel Charter School students will meet grade level expectations in English.

### BACKGROUND

In the 2015-2016 school year, Empower Explore Charter School used Core Knowledge Language Arts Skills and Listening & Learning Strands for grades K-2 and Expeditionary Learning in cohort with word study programs, Words Their Way and Grammar Works, for grade 3-8.

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

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

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts ("ELA") assessment to students in 3rd through 7th grade 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[1] | | | | Total Enrolled |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | |
| 3 | 58 | | | | | 58 |
| 4 | 57 | | | | | 57 |
| 5 | 60 | | | | | 60 |
| 6 | 63 | | | | | 63 |
| 7 | 58 | | | 1 | | 58 |
| All | 296 | | | 1 | | 297 |

### RESULTS

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (241 out of 297) 27.80% achieved proficiency on the NYS English Language Arts Exam.

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

# MATHEMATICS

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 | 34% | 58 | 38.78% | 49 |
| 4 | 42% | 57 | 35.71% | 42 |
| 5 | 10% | 60 | 13.64% | 44 |
| 6 | 14% | 63 | 17.31% | 52 |
| 7 | 33% | 58 | 33.33% | 54 |
| **All** | **27%** | **296** | **27.80%** | **241** |

## EVALUATION

We did not meet the first absolute measure.

For students enrolled in at least their second year, overall Explore Excel fell short by 47.2 percentage points. We will discuss our plans to address that gap in the Action plan located in the ELA summary section of this report.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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 | 17.0% | 47 | 28.26% | 46 | 38.78% | 49 |
| 4 | 15.1% | 53 | 8.33% | 48 | 35.71% | 42 |
| 5 | 24.0% | 50 | 9.62% | 52 | 13.64% | 44 |
| 6 | | | 20.00% | 50 | 17.31% | 52 |
| 7 | | | | | 33.33% | 54 |
| **All** | **18.7%** | **150** | **16.33%** | **196** | **27.80%** | **241** |

**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 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.[2]

## RESULTS

Our performance index for the 2015-16 academic year in English Language Arts was 77.

English Language Arts 2015-16 Performance Level Index

| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| 296 | 33% | 41% | 15% | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PI | = | 41 | + | 15 | + | 3 | = | 59 |
| | | | | 15 | + | 3 | = | 18 |
| | | | | | | PLI | = | 77 |

## EVALUATION

We fell short of the PLI for ELA by 27 points. We will discuss our plans to address that gap in the Action plan located in the ELA summary section of this report.

**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.[3]

## RESULTS

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (241 out of 297) 27.80% achieved proficiency on the NYS English Language Arts Exam.

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 2nd Year | All District Students |

[2] In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

[3] 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.

# MATHEMATICS

| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3 | 38.78% | 49 | 36% | 8,841 |
| 4 | 35.71% | 42 | 35% | 8,708 |
| 5 | 13.64% | 44 | 28% | 9,002 |
| 6 | 17.31% | 52 | 26% | 7,280 |
| 7 | 33.33% | 54 | 27% | 8,127 |
| All | 27.80% | 241 | 30% | 41,958 |

## EVALUATION

We did not outperform our local district (CSD 18).

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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 Scoring at or Above 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 | 17.0% | 21.4% | 28.26% | 21% | 36% | 36% |
| 4 | 15.1% | 25.3% | 8.33% | 23% | 35% | 35% |
| 5 | 24.0% | 24.2% | 9.62% | 23% | 28% | 28% |
| 6 | | | 20.00% | 24% | 26% | 26% |
| 7 | | | | | 27% | 27% |
| **All** | **18.7%** | **23.6%** | **16.33%** | **22.8%** | **30%** | **30%** |

**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 SUNY Charter Schools Institute ("Institute") conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. 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 concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's 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.

# MATHEMATICS

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

**We are waiting on data from CSI.**

*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 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| All | | | | | | |

| **School's Overall Comparative Performance:** |
|---|
| ***Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here*** |

## EVALUATION

**We are waiting on data from CSI.**

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

**We are waiting on data from CSI.**

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 | | | | | | |
| 2013-14 | | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | | | | | |

**Goal 1: Growth Measure**[4]

[4] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

# MATHEMATICS

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.[5]

## RESULTS

The school's overall mean growth percentile is 56. Please note that because the 15-16 Growth Model data became available on L2RPT while this report has been compiled, we have used the most recent data for this report. Table identifying marks have been altered to fit this new data.

2015-16 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
|---|---|---|
| | School | Statewide Median |
| 4 | 62 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 53 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 51 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 58 | 50.0 |
| **All** | **56** | **50.0** |

## EVALUATION

The school's overall mean growth percentile exceeds the state median of the 50th percentile. We met this goal.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2015-16 | Statewide Median |
| 4 | 49 | 45.0 | 62 | 50.0 |

[5] Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | | 56.0 | 53 | 50.0 |
| 6 | | | 51 | 50.0 |
| 7 | | | 58 | 50.0 |
| 8 | | | | 50.0 |
| **All** | **49** | **50.5** | **56** | **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. | Did Not Achieve |
| 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. | Did Not Achieve |
| 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. | Did Not Achieve |
| 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 among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2013-14 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. | Achieved |

## ACTION PLAN

We recognize that our 15-16 results do not meet our performance goals and need to be improved upon. We believe this was due to four main needs that we have addressed in our strategy for this coming year:

1. Need for greater refinement and horizontal alignment across literacy curricula
2. Need for greater support in curricula implementation
3. Need for earlier intervention during the school year
4. Need for formative data to tailor strategy throughout the year

In order to address these deficits, Explore Excel Charter School implemented several new structures and processes to improve classroom instruction, the responsiveness to student needs and the implementation of interventions.

# MATHEMATICS

**Aligned and Refined Literary Curricula** – In the 2015-2016 school year, Explore Excel Charter School's Charter Management Organization (CMO) entered year 1 of implementation of their new literacy curricula. Core Knowledge Language Arts Skills and Listening & Learning Strands for grades K-2 and Expeditionary Learning in cohort with word study programs, Words Their Way and Grammar Works, for grade 3-8 were rolled out to Explore Excel Charter School teachers through a robust pre-service program.

During the first year of implementation, we assessed our effectiveness and identified a need for stronger cohesion across our various curricula. Especially, our data for K-2 was lagging the rest of the grades, and we needed to refine our K-2 curriculum and provide additional support for our teachers and leaders in K-2. In May 2015, we hired a Director of Early Childhood Education to provide early childhood expertise and tailored coaching and professional development for K-2 teachers. As a result, we will be able to work closely with our schools to refine the structures for and implementation of our curricula.

In addition, we have revised our power reading curriculum (originally designed to teach close-reading and test preparation strategies) to better integrate with our other ELA curricula and be more aligned with the demands of state testing. This includes a new scope and sequence, a new delivery mechanism that targets all students, and tailors the instruction for each student's needs. This is in service of supporting our students who are measuring on or above grade level based on their F&P level to reach proficiency on their state tests.

**Support for Curricula Implementation—** Our focus while rolling out our curricula changes is ensuring that leaders and teachers have strong network support for implementation. This is through three levers:

1. A robust pre-service over three weeks for training, development and planning for all teachers. This year, pre-service tracks were differentiated by subject, grade, and role to provide even more specific and tailored support and allowed for more strategic planning time.
2. A weekly Professional Learning Community ("PLC"), in which a teacher leader or school leader guides the grade level in planning and preparing units and lessons through content-based discussions about the curriculum and students' needs. These PLC leaders received additional professional development throughout the year to build their capacity to effectively lead these sessions.
3. Intensive leadership coaching for each school leader, through the CMO's program office.

**Earlier Intervention for Highest Need Students –** Our intervention curriculum, Fountas & Pinnell's Leveled Literacy Intervention, was rolled out in the 2015-2016 school year. The first phase of roll out (training) was completed by November 2015, and the second phase (implementation with students) began in late November.

We've seen the effectiveness of our LLI curriculum across our network. As a result, this year we've tripled the number of teachers who are trained in implementing LLI from and doubled the number of students receiving LLI instruction to meet the needs of all students who are below grade level.

**Robust Formative Data Cycles –** Last year, we introduced a new series of data cycles to better assess student progress. To continue on our progress from last year, we have refined our predictive

measures to increase the speed at which we are able to be responsive to student needs and implement interventions. Through a higher focus on our formative data cycles, including daily, weekly, and ongoing assessments, we are able to identify student needs earlier and set up structures in order to support teachers in meeting the needs of students and implementing necessary interventions.

With the refinement and more cohesive alignment of ELA curricula, a more prolific implementation of intervention systems, and buildout of robust formative data cycles, Explore Excel Charter School is confident it can improve results for its students in literacy.

# MATHEMATICS

## Goal 2: Mathematics

Explore Excel Charter School students will meet grade level expectations in Math.

### BACKGROUND

In the 2015-16 school year, Explore Excel Charter School used the Common-Core Aligned TERC/Investigations anchor curriculum in math school-wide for Grades K-5, and Math in Focus for Grades 6-8.

**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.

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 7th grade 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[6] | | | | Total Enrolled |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | |
| 3 | 58 | | | | | 58 |
| 4 | 57 | | | | | 57 |
| 5 | 60 | | | | | 60 |
| 6 | 62 | | | 1 | | 62 |

[6] 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.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 7 | 58 | | | | 1 | 58 |
| All | 295 | | | 1 | 1 | 297 |

## RESULTS

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (240 out of 297) 39.58% achieved proficiency on the NYS Math Exam.

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 | 57% | 58 | 61.22% | 49 |
| 4 | 56% | 57 | 59.52% | 42 |
| 5 | 20% | 60 | 25.00% | 44 |
| 6 | 15% | 62 | 17.65% | 51 |
| 7 | 36% | 58 | 37.04% | 54 |
| All | 37% | 295 | 39.58% | 240 |

## EVALUATION

We did not meet the first absolute measure.

For students enrolled in at least their second year, overall Explore Excel fell short by 35.42 percentage points. We will discuss our plans to address that gap in the Action plan located in the Math summary section of this report

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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 | 44.7% | 47 | 36.96% | 46 | 61.22% | 49 |
| 4 | 24.5% | 53 | 36.73% | 49 | 59.52% | 42 |
| 5 | 46.0% | 50 | 15.69% | 51 | 25.00% | 44 |
| 6 | | | 20.00% | 50 | 17.65% | 51 |
| 7 | | | | | 37.04% | 54 |
| All | **38%** | **150** | **27.04%** | **196** | 39.58% | 240 |

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 PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 101. 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.[7]

## RESULTS

Our performance index for the 2014-15 academic year in Math was 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 |
| 295 | 35% | 29% | 24% | 12% |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PI | = | 29 | + | 24 | + | 12 | = | 65 |
| | | | | 24 | + | 12 | = | 36 |
| | | | | | | PLI | = | 101 |

## EVALUATION

We met the PLI index for Math. We met this goal. We will discuss our next steps in the Action plan located in the Math summary section of this report.

**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 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

[7] In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

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.[8]

## RESULTS

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (240 out of 297) 39.58% achieved proficiency on the NYS Math Exam.

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 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | 61.22% | 49 | 31% | 8,876 |
| 4 | 59.52% | 42 | 26% | 8,729 |
| 5 | 25.00% | 44 | 22% | 9,100 |
| 6 | 17.65% | 51 | 23% | 7,294 |
| 7 | 37.04% | 54 | 19% | 8,225 |
| **All** | **39.58%** | **240** | **24%** | **42,224** |

## EVALUATION

We met the first comparative measure.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics 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 | 44.7% | 21.4% | 36.96% | 28.9% | 61.22% | 31% |
| 4 | 24.5% | 25.3% | 36.73% | 24.9% | 59.52% | 26% |
| 5 | 46.0% | 24.2% | 15.69% | 26.9% | 25.00% | 22% |
| 6 | | | 20.00% | 20.3% | 17.65% | 23% |
| 7 | | | | | 37.04% | 19% |
| **All** | **38%** | **23.6%** | **27.04%** | **25.2%** | **39.58%** | **24%** |

[8] 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.

# MATHEMATICS

**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 Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. 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 concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's 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

We are waiting on data from CSI.

*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 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| All | | | | | | |

| **School's Overall Comparative Performance:** |
|---|
| ***Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here*** |

## EVALUATION

We are waiting on data from CSI.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

We are waiting on data from CSI.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2012-13 | | | | | | |
| 2013-14 | | | | | | |
| 2014-15 | | | | | | |

**Goal 2: Growth Measure**[9]

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 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.[10]

The School's Mean Growth Percentile is 53. Please note that because the 15-16 Growth Model data became available on L2RPT while this report has been compiled, we have used the most recent data for this report. Table identifying marks have been altered to fit this new data.

2015-16 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
|---|---|---|
| | School | Statewide Median |
| 4 | 62 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 29 | 50.0 |

[9] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

[10] Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | 47 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 72 | 50.0 |
| 8 | | 50.0 |
| **All** | **53** | **50.0** |

## EVALUATION

The school exceeded state Mean Growth Percentile.We met this goal.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2015-16 | Statewide Median |
| 4 | 55.8 | 42.0 | 62 | 50.0 |
| 5 | | 46.5 | 29 | 50.0 |
| 6 | | | 47 | 50.0 |
| 7 | | | 72 | 50.0 |
| 8 | | | | 50.0 |
| **All** | | | **53** | **50.0** |

## 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 proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8. | **Did Not Achieve** |
| 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 2013-14 school district results.) | **N/A** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 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. | **Achieved** |

## ACTION PLAN

This year, Explore Excel Charter School has updated its curriculum, using the new Common-Core aligned version of Investigations for K-5, and adopting a new curriculum, Math in Focus, for 6-8. These curricula are aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards.

However, we recognize that our current implementation of the curriculum and support for teachers has not yet met our performance goals. Similar to our approach in literacy, we are addressing our gaps in math using two methods:

1. Increasing support for curricular planning and implementation, including targeted small-group instruction
2. Implementing and supporting use of data to inform instruction and address student needs

**Increasing support for curricular planning and implementation**

In January 2016, our CMO hired a Director of Math to support our network's math curriculum. This role has allowed us to build a cohesive network vision for mathematics, which in turn resulted in a comprehensive revision of our K-8 math curriculum in partnership with a committee of teachers and leaders. In addition, the Director of Math provides additional capacity to organize and implement new professional development structures in math, which are already in place for this school year.

During pre-service, our CMO dedicated 17 days this year to ensure all teachers received robust support in learning the math curriculum and preparing units and lessons aligned with common core standards. During this extended 17-day pre-service, Explore Exceed Charter School math teachers received between 10 and 25 hours, depending on grade level, of math professional development and network-led collaborative planning sessions to ensure alignment on, and support for, curricular implementation across all grades. This year, math pedagogical pre-service sessions focused on inquiry-based instruction, and teachers were trained in protocols for student discourse to accelerate the effectiveness of math instruction throughout the year.

To ensure effective implementation of the curriculum throughout the year, Explore Exceed Charter School is using a network-created scope and sequence of learning objectives and assessment tools. This scope and sequence is horizontally and vertically aligned with learning standards, increasing cohesion and integration across all grades and classrooms.

Additionally, our CMO is hosting collaborative planning sessions for all grade levels at each of our network's four school before the start of each term to review the learning objectives, the key knowledge, skills and content of the term, and to review learning measures (assessments). By engaging in all of the above mentioned activities, Explore Excel Charter School expects to improve teacher effectiveness and responsiveness to student needs in math by developing teachers within the content area, collaboratively planning lessons, and planning for student needs.

# MATHEMATICS

One specific strategy we are implementing this year is targeted small-group instruction through centers in our K-2 classrooms and SGI block across our 3-8 classrooms. In the ’15-’16 school year, we relied heavily on whole group instruction. This shift allows teachers to better target individual student needs and differentiate instruction effectively.

**Implementing and supporting use of data to inform instruction and address student needs**

This year our CMO will continue to use our normed Math Interim Assessments, which were updated by our math content specialists and vetted to ensure alignment with the rigor of the common core and the state exams. Teachers will participate in leader-facilitated sessions during termly in-service days to engage in data analysis of student performance on these assessments with their grade level colleagues. During these data analysis sessions, teachers will identify common errors and overarching trends before creating action plans in response to student needs. These plans may include re-teaching, small group instruction, or modifying subsequent unit plans to address student needs. This process will improve teachers’ abilities to analyze data and increase responsiveness to individual student needs.

In addition, we are digging into specificity within data on student performance on math assessment. Our assessments are aligned to standards and question types measure specific standards, allowing us to analyze data trends and assess proficiency within each standard. As a result, teachers will be able to ensure mastery on a more detailed level, and teach permutations of knowledge and skills to reach proficiency.

# SCIENCE

## Goal 3: Science

Explore Excel Charter School students will meet grade level expectations in Science.

### BACKGROUND

In 2015-2016, Explore Excel Charter School employed a full-time science teacher who utilized FOSS kits in instruction.

**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.

### METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th grade in spring 2015. 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

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (49 of 57) 79.59% achieved proficiency on the 4th grade NYS Science exam.

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 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 | 79.59% | 49 | | |
| **All** | **79.59%** | **49** | | |

### EVALUATION

We met this goal.

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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 |

# SCIENCE

| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | | | 61.22% | 49 | 79.59% | 49 |
| **All** | | | **61.22%** | **49** | **79.59%** | **49** |

**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

We do not have District 18 results.

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 2nd Year | | All District Students | |
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 | 79.59% | 49 | | |
| **All** | **79.59%** | **49** | | |

## EVALUATION

We do not have District 18 results.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

We do not have District 18 results.

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 | | | 61.22% | | 79.59% | |
| All | | | 61.22% | | 79.59% | |

# SCIENCE

## 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. | 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

Explore Excel Charter School implemented several measures to improve support and professional development for the 2016-2017 school year.

During extended pre-service, Explore Excel Charter School science teachers received science-specific professional development sessions including sessions aligned to common core standards. Teachers attended the following sessions:

- Infusing Common Core into the Scope and Sequence
- Guided Unit Planning
- Lesson and Unit Planning Best Practices
- Team-Based Planning and Knowledge Sharing
- Project-Based Learning in Science: The Performance Assessment
- Science Training with McGraw Hill
- The Science of the Do Now: A New Approach

To support implementation of science curriculum, Explore Excel Charter School Science teachers received training from McGraw-Hill on best practices for hands-on experimentation and lab work with students.

In addition to professional development sessions, Explore Excel Charter School science teachers had an opportunity to lesson plan and collaborate with science teachers across the four schools in our network, as well as an opportunity to receive feedback on lesson plans and practice lesson execution.

In addition to pre-service, our CMO is coordinating termly in-service days in which Explore Excel Charter School science teachers can continue to plan collaboratively and receive role-specific professional development. This approach and collaborative structure is new this year and has been very well received by the science teachers based on data received through session feedback slips and anecdotal feedback from individuals.

# NCLB

## Goal 4: NCLB

Explore Excel 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

The school has a focus school NCLB status for the 2015-2016 school year

### EVALUATION

The school has a focus school NCLB status for the 2015-2016 school year

### ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

NCLB Status by Year

| Year | Status |
|---|---|
| 2013-14 | Good Standing |
| 2014-15 | Good Standing |
| 2015-16 | Focus School |