Explore Excel
CHARTER SCHOOL

2013-14 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2014

By Rebecca Daverin, Managing Director of Operations, Explore Schools

Excel Lower School Campus
1077 Remsen Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11236
And
Excel Upper School Campus
956 East 82nd Street
Brooklyn, NY 11236

Emily Volpini, Chief of Staff
Avanthi Witana, Director of Assessments and Accountability
Adam Schulman, Director of IT and Systems
Briana Gibson, Math Specialist
Heath Farnsworth-Williams, Communications Manager
Anna Fountaine, Data and Operations Associate
prepared this 2013-14 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Graeme Daykin	Chair Ad hoc merger committee
Tim Taylor	Vice Chair Finance committee
Hank Mannix	Treasurer Finance committee Ad hoc accountability committee
Reena Bhatia	Voting member Finance committee Ad hoc merger committee
Lizz Pawlson	Voting member Discipline committee
JR Randall	Voting member (term expired June 2014) Discipline committee External affairs committee

Dana Bogle has served as the Principal since August of 2012**.**

INTRODUCTION

Explore Excel Charter School ("Excel") opened in August of 2011 serving 240 Kindergarten through third grade scholars. Excel opened as an alternative option for PS 114, a local district school located in community school district 17 that earned an "F" on the NYC Progress Report the year before Excel opened. An admissions preference was given to scholars who were attending or zoned to attend a "failing school."

Excel's mission is to provide our students with the academic skills and critical-thinking abilities they need to succeed in a college-preparatory high school. Exceed offers a co-teaching model that allows for small group and more differentiated instruction. During the 2013-2014 academic year Excel served the following percentages of at-risk groups:

- 5% of students designated as English Language Learners
- 19% of students with IEPs
- 79% of students eligible for free and reduced lunch

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2010-11														
2011-12	60	60	62	63										245
2012-13	54	55	60	59	59									287
2013-14	58	59	57	60	64	62								360

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts
Excel students will meet grade level expectations in English.

Background

In the 2013-2014 schools year we used the Journeys Anchor curriculum and unit tests for grades K-1, and Interim assessments in ELA provided by the Achievement Network in grades 2-5. We had four data days during the year that were used to review data to drive instruction and provide additional professional development for teachers.

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.[1]

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 5th grade in April 2014. 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.

2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[2]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	60				60
4	64				64
5	62				62
6					
7					
8					
All	186				186

[1] Because of the state's new 3-8 testing program, aligned to its high school college and career readiness standards, the Institute is no longer using Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores. Please report results for previous years using the state's published results for scoring at proficiency.
[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.

Results

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (150 out of 186) 18.7% achieved proficiency on the NYS English Language Arts Exam. In 3rd grade 17.0% were proficient, in 4th grade 15.1% were proficient and in 5th grade 24.0% were proficient.

Performance on 2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	18.3%	60	17.0%	47
4	14.1%	64	15.1%	53
5	21.0%	62	24.0%	50
6				
7				
8				
All	17.8%	186	18.7%	150

Evaluation

We did not meet the first absolute measure.

For students enrolled in at least their second year, in 3rd grade students fell short of the goal by 58 percentage points, 4th grade fell short by 59.1 percentage points, in 5th grade students fell short by 51 percentage points and hence overall Excel fell short by 56.0 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

Overall, school proficiency increased by 2.2 percentage points in the 2013-2014 school year.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3			12.5%	48	17.0%	47
4			21.6%	37	15.1%	53
5					24.0%	50

6						
7						
8						
All			16.5%	85	18.7%	150

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 English language arts AMO of 89. 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.[3]

Results

Our performance index for the 2013-14 academic year in English Language Arts was 73.

English Language Arts 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	44.1	38.2	15.6	2.2

PI	=	38.2	+	15.6	+	2.2	=	56
				15.6	+	2.2	=	17.2
						PLI	=	73.2

Evaluation

We fell short of the PLI for ELA by 16. We did not meet this goal. 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

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

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state 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.[4]

Results

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (150 out of 186) 18.7% achieved proficiency on the NYS English Language Arts Exam. In 3rd grade 17.0% were proficient, in 4th grade 15.1% were proficient and in 5th grade 24.0% were proficient. Excel did not outperform the district in 3rd, 4th or 5th grades in ELA.

2013-14 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	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	17.0%	47	21.4%	1427
4	15.1%	53	25.3%	1362
5	24.0%	50	24.2%	1329
6				
7				
8				
All	18.7%	150	**23.6%**	4,118

Evaluation

For students enrolled in at least their second year, in 3rd grade students underperformed the district by 4.4 percentage points, 4th grade students underperformed the district by 10.2 percentage points, 5th grade students underperformed the district by 0.2 percentage points, and hence overall Excel underperformed the district by 4.9 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 of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3					17.0%	21.4%
4					15.1%	25.3%
5					24.0%	24.2%
6						
7						
8						
All					18.7%	**23.6%**

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.[5]

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

We are waiting for results from CSI.

[5] The Institute will continue using ***economically disadvantaged*** instead of ***eligibility for free lunch*** as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

2012-13 **English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvataged	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:

Evaluation

We are waiting on results from the CSI.

Additional Evidence

There is no additional evidence.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11						
2011-12						
2012-13						

Goal 1: Growth Measure[6]
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

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

have a state exam score from 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 score are ranked by their 2012-13 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[7]

Results

Our mean growth percentile is 51.6.

2012-13 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
3	51.6	50.0
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All	51.6	50.0

Evaluation

We exceeded the state's mean growth percentile by 1.6.

Additional Evidence

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11[8]	2011-12[7]	2012-13	Statewide Average
3			51.6	50.0
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All			51.6	50.0

[7] Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.
[8] Grade level results not available.

Goal 1: Growth Measure (Optional)
On the 2012-13 NYS ELA exam each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2011-12 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next on the NYS ELA exam.

Results

The 4th grade level cohort (53 students out of 64) achieved a proficiency of 15.1% in 2013-2014 compared to 9.3% in 2012-2013.

The 5th grade level cohort (50 students out of 62) achieved a proficiency of 24.0% in 2013-2014 compared to 19.6% in 2012-2013.

ELA % Proficient	Prof. 13-14	Prof. 12-13
Grade 4	15.1%	9.3%
Grade 5	24.0%	19.6%

Evaluation

We did not meet the optional growth measure. We will discuss our plans to address that gap in the Action plan located in the ELA summary section of this report.

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

We met 1 of our 6 goals.

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	N/A

	among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved
Growth (Optional)	On the 2013-2014 NYS ELA exam each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2012-2011 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

In the 2013-14 school year Excel revamped its base literacy curriculum as well as implemented a new approach to coaching teachers and supporting lesson-planning. This work had a positive impact on student outcomes. However, we recognize the need for greater gains to ensure our students are successful. This year, Excel is improving its approach through three basic strategies: shifting focus to formative data, improving support for teacher effectiveness and lesson planning, and implementing more writing into the ELA curriculum.

Shifting focus to formative data: Excel is shifting its focus to formative data and helping its teachers learn how to collect, analyze and respond to data, such as running records, on a more consistent basis. Existing planning structures such as grade-level team meetings and PLCs (Professional Learning Communities), in which grade-level teachers work together to plan lessons that specifically target students' needs, will help support this approach.

Improving and supporting teacher effectiveness and lesson planning: In the 2013-14 school year, Excel launched a coaching program in which teachers were coached for at least a six-week cycle, working on specific goals related to student achievement. Through this experience, school leadership learned that six-week coaching cycles did not allow enough time to result in major improvements in teaching practice. As a result, school leaders will receive support and development from the network with their coaching work and with making strategic decisions about coaching (including teacher selection, duration, and methods). This will improve student outcomes and facilitate effective and timely teacher development. The network will also work with leaders to help them strategically and effectively use this time to help teachers with transferrable skills and thinking that will allow them to make instructional choices and execute lessons that will improve student outcomes. To ensure teachers are getting frequent individualized professional development, the network has implemented staggered in-service days so that school and network leaders can work with teachers one-on-one or in small groups on teach-backs and guided planning.

Implementing more writing into the ELA curriculum: This year, Excel is also implementing a more robust writing curriculum to ensure students are receiving comprehensive, Common-Core-aligned ELA instruction and strengthening their writing skills, which will aid their reading, interpretation and critical-thinking skills. With support from the network, Excel is rolling out the following materials to strengthen the school's writing program and support teacher implementation:

- Writing unit-based assessments
- Writing portfolio guidelines
- Writing prompts and rubrics

These materials are created for each grade level, borrowing from *Teacher's College Writing Pathways: Performance Assessments and Learning Progressions*, and include narrative, informative and opinion/argument writing.

By implementing these improvements to curriculum, teacher support and use of formative data, Excel expects to make greater gains in student proficiency in ELA.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics
Excel students will meet grade level expectations in Math.

Background

In the 2013-14 school year we used the TERC/Investigations anchor curriculum in math school-wide and interim assessments in Math created by the Explore Schools Network Math Specialist for grades K-5. We had four data days during the year that were used to review data to drive instruction and provide additional professional development for teachers.

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 4th grade in April 2014. 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.

2013-14 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[9]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	59			1	60
4	63			1	64
5	61			1	62
6					
7					

[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.

8					
All	183			3*	186

***The students Not Tested chose to Opt Out of the 2013-2014 NYS Math Exam.**

Results

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (150 out of 183) 38% achieved proficiency on the NYS Math Exam. In 3rd grade 44.7% were proficient, in 4th grade 24.5% were proficient and in 5th grade 46.0% were proficient.

Performance on 2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	42.4%	59	44.7%	47
4	28.6%	63	24.5%	53
5	39.3%	61	46.0%	50
6				
7				
8				
All	42.5%	183	38%	150

Evaluation

We did not meet the first absolute measure.

For students enrolled in at least their second year, in 3rd grade students fell short of the goal by 30.3 percentage points, 4th grade fell short by 50.5 percentage points, in 5th grade students fell short of the goal by 29 percentage points and hence overall Excel fell short by 36.6 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		
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14

	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3			31.3%	48	44.7%	47
4			48.6%	37	24.5%	53
5					46.0%	50
6						
7						
8						
All			38.8%	85	38%	150

Goal 2: Absolute Measure
Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the State mathematics exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 mathematics AMO of 86. 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

Our performance index for the 2013-14 academic year in Math was 109.4.

Mathematics 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	27.9	35.5	29.0	7.7

PI	=	35.5	+	29.0	+	7.7	=	72.2
				29.0	+	7.7	=	36.7
						PLI	=	109.4

Evaluation

We exceeded the PLI for math by 23.6.

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

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

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (150 out of 183) 38% achieved proficiency on the NYS Math Exam. In 3rd grade 44.7% were proficient, in 4th grade 24.5% were proficient and in 5th grade 46.0% were proficient. In 3rd and 5th grades Excel outperformed the district, and in 4th grade we underperformed the district.

2013-14 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	44.7%	47	21.4%	1679
4	24.5%	53	25.3%	1581
5	46.0%	50	24.2%	1616
6				
7				
8				
All	38%	150	23.6%	4876

Evaluation

We met the first comparative measure.

Additional Evidence

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

Our students outperformed the local district students in math in both the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years.

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					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3			31.3%	22.2%	44.7%	21.4%
4			48.6%	22.4%	24.5%	25.3%
5					46.0%	24.2%
6						
7						
8						
All			38.8%	22.4%	38%	23.6%

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 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

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small 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 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

[12] The Institute will continue using ***economically disadvantaged*** instead of ***eligibility for free lunch*** as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

We are waiting for results from the CSI.

_2012-13_ Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvataged	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:

Evaluation

We are waiting for results from the CSI.

Additional Evidence

We are waiting for results from the CSI.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11						
2011-12						
2012-13						

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

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

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.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[14]

Our school's mean growth percentile was 55.1.

2012-13 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Average
3	55.1	50.0
4		50.0
5		50.0
6		50.0
7		50.0
8		50.0
All	55.1	50.0

Evaluation

We exceeded the state's mean growth percentile by 5.1.

Additional Evidence

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11[15]	2011-12[14]	2012-13	Statewide Average
3			55.1	50.0
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0

[14] Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.
[15] Grade level results not available.

All			55.1	50.0

Goal 2: Growth Measure (Optional)
On the 2013-2014 NYS Math exam each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2012-2013 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next on the NYS Math exam.

Results

The 4th grade level cohort (53 students out of 63) achieved a proficiency of 24.5% in 2013-2014 compared to 35.2% in 2012-2013.

The 5th grade level cohort (50 students out of 61) achieved a proficiency of 46.0% in 2013-2014 compared to 51.0%% in 2012-2013.

Math % Proficient	Prof. 13-14	Prof. 12-13
Grade 4	24.5%	35.2%
Grade 5	46.0%	51.0%

Evaluation

We did not meet the optional growth measure. We will discuss our plans to address that gap in the Action plan located in the Math summary section of this report.

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

We achieved 3 of our 5 goals.

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	Achieved

	exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	
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 2012-13 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
	On the 2013-2014 NYS Math exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2012-2014 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

This year, Excel will continue using Investigations, a curriculum that we believe is aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards. In order to effectively teach this curriculum, Excel will be strategically implementing changes this year to improve teacher effectiveness and responsiveness to student needs.

In the past, Excel relied on interim assessments conducted every few months to respond to student needs. This method did not allow teachers to collect real-time data and thus did not support students' needs urgently enough. This year, instead of waiting to administer interim assessments, Excel is implementing unit-based assessments, which were created internally and made more rigorous to align to common core standards.

To improve implementation of this curriculum through effective instruction that reaches every students' needs, the Explore Schools network will be supporting Excel in the ways described above for ELA – shifting focus to formative data and improving approach to supporting teacher effectiveness and lesson planning. The specific methods for these approaches are outlined above in the Action Plan under ELA-related goals. We believe that our strong foundational work on curriculum and unit-based assessments, combined with greater focus on strategic teacher coaching and intentional lesson-planning will increase our teachers' capacity to improve their lesson planning and delivery to meet each students' needs.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
Excel students will meet grade level expectations in Science.

Background

We have a Science teacher who works closely with the Academic Directors to plan her lessons and utilize 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 2014. 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 (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at proficiency.

Results

Of the students enrolled in at least their second year (53 out of 64) 56.6% achieved proficiency on the NYS Science exam.

Charter School Performance on 2013-14 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	53.1%	64	56.6%	53
8				

Evaluation

We did not meet 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					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4			94.6%	37	56.6%	53
8						
All			94.6%	37	56.6%	53

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.

2013-14 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	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	56.6%	53		
8				

Evaluation

We do not have District 18 results.

Additional Evidence

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					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4			94.6%		56.6%	
8						
All			94.6%		56.6%	

Summary of the Science Goal

We achieved 1 of our goals.

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.	Did Not Achieve
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

We are taking an intentional approach to developing the Science teacher's ability to effectively use FOSS kits in instruction. Our Dean of Culture is coaching the teacher and helping her to further develop her classroom management skills to modify/differentiate her approach for each grade level.

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB
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 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. The report cards indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Results

The school has not received its NCLB status for the 2013-2014 school year.

Evaluation

The school has not received its NCLB status for the 2013-2014 school year.

Additional Evidence

The school has not received its NCLB status for the 2013-2014 school year.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2011-12	n/a
2012-13	n/a
2013-14	In good standing

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following section contains a Parent Satisfaction optional goal, as well as examples of possible optional measures.

Goal S: Parent Satisfaction
Excel will have high satisfaction rates from key stakeholders

Goal S: Absolute Measure
Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school's program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

Method

The school used the NYC DOE annual survey.

Results

Parents demonstrated greater than 90% satisfaction in 3 key survey areas.

2013-14 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
		67%

2013-14 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
Instructional Core	94%
Systems for Improvement	91%
School Culture	94%

Evaluation

We met this goal.

Goal S: Absolute Measure
Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

Method

Our end of year enrollment will be used to measure this goal.

Results

Our retention rate was 94.4%.

2013-14 Student Retention Rate

2012-13 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2012-13	Number of Students Who Returned in 2013-14	Retention Rate 2013-14 Re-enrollment ÷ (2012-13 Enrollment – Graduates)
287	n/a	271	94.4%

Evaluation

We met this goal.

Additional Evidence

Goal S: Absolute Measure
Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 95 percent.

Method

Student attendance is taken daily by each homeroom teacher, and is entered into our Student Information System. Then, members of the Operations Team review the attendance and layer in any changes that need to be made to account for tardies and absences. The daily attendance rate is calculated by taking the total days a student is present and dividing it by the total days that student is enrolled in the school for the same year.

Results

Attendance was successfully taken every day and overall attendance was 95.0%.

2013-14 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
KG	94.2%
1	95.1%

2	95.9%
3	95.7%
4	94.7%
5	94.6%
Overall	95.0%

Evaluation

We met this goal.

Additional Evidence