Family Life Academy
CHARTER SCHOOLS

# Family Life Academy Charter School II

# 2023-24 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2024

By Valerie Marchionno & Ambar Terrero

296 E 140th Street, Bronx, NY 10454
316 E 165th Street, Bronx, NY 10456

(718) 665-2805
(718)-588-2320

# 2023-24 Accountability plan progress report

Brian Knobloch, Director of Data Driven Instruction, prepared this 2023-24 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the charter school's board of trustees:

| Trustee's Name | Board Position | |
|---|---|---|
| | Office (e.g., chair, treasurer, secretary) | Committees (e.g., finance, executive) |
| Wanda Torres Mercado | Chairperson | Executive, Finance, CEO Evaluation, Bylaws, McKenzie |
| Bryan Rivera | Vice Chair | Executive, Finance, Facilities & Bond, Fundraising, Bylaws, Athletics, McKenzie |
| Miguel Pena | Secretary | Executive, Facilities & Bond, Fundraising, Bylaws, McKenzie |
| Pedro Alvarez | Treasurer | Executive, Finance,Facilities & Bond, Nominations |
| Hilda Sanchez | Trustee | Accountability, Finance, CEO Evaluation |
| Bishop Dr. Raymond Rivera | Trustee | Facilities & Bond, Nominations, McKenzie |
| Florence Wolpoff | Trustee | Accountability, CEO Evaluation |
| Dr. Janet Lerner | Trustee | Nominations |
| Keven Kearns | Trustee | Facilities & Bond |
| Rafael McDonald | Trustee | Accountability, Athletics |
| Kelly Nuńez | Trustee | Accountability |
| Carla Barrios Alvarez | Trustee - FLACS I Parent Association | Fundraising |
| Eneroliza Castillo | Trustee - FLACS II Parent Association | Fundraising, Athletics |
| Maria Rodriguez | Trustee - FLACS III Parent Association | Fundraising |
| Diana Jimenez | Trustee - FLACS MS Parent Association | Fundraising, Athletics |

**Valerie Marchionno has served as the elementary principal since June 1, 2023. Ambar Terrero has served as the middle school principal since October 2021.**

# SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Family Life Academy Charter School II (FLACS II), opened in 2012, serves kindergarten through eighth grade in the Mott Haven and Morrisania areas of the Bronx, in Community School District 7 and 9. FLACS II just completed its twelfth year of operation. The school has two campuses, one elementary and one middle school campus. On BEDS day 895 students were enrolled. FLACS prides itself on attracting students from its surrounding communities in the South Bronx. As of BEDS day, the student population included: 73.6% Hispanic/Latino, 24.9% Black, 96.0% free and reduced lunch, 15.2% current English language learners, and 16.0% students with disabilities.

All FLACS schools share a common mission: Family Life Academy Charter Schools, together with the Latino Pastoral Action Center and parents, creates the conditions for self-empowerment for all its K-12 students to excel academically, take responsibility for their own learning, and affirm human values, today, in college, and beyond.

Every FLACS school has ten key design elements:

- Rigorous Academic Program with a Focus on Scholars Doing the Heavy Lifting
- Data-Driven Planning Fueled by a Rigorous System of Assessment and Accountability
- Intentional Approaches to Meeting the Needs of All Scholars, including English Language Learners
- Professional Learning that Enriches Teaching and Increases Scholar Achievement
- Caring and Consistent Discipline
- Family Involvement and Empowerment
- Shared Responsibility for Learning between the Scholar, their Family, and the School
- School Communities that Affirm Human Values
- A Focus on Preparation for College, Career, and Civic Life
- A Continued Use of Community Resources

This year, the FLACS Network continued with its plan to renew the shared curriculum and instructional vision across all FLACS schools. While the majority of core curriculum at the elementary school did not undergo any major revisions this school year, the school, along with the network, laid the foundation for revision in the 2024-25 school year. The 5th grade piloted the Imagine Learning math curriculum in response to the need for a stronger mathematics curriculum ; the same curriculum was adopted in FLACS Middle School and High School. At the middle school, FLACS II, implemented two new curriculum programs across grades 6-8 – Fishtank ELA Plus (an ELA curriculum which supports integrated knowledge building approach) and Imagine Learning Illustrative Math (a math curriculum which supports critical skills, understandings, and math practices).

FLACS provided opportunities for a cohort of teachers, coaches, and administrators to become experts in the Science of Reading through LETRS training. Alongside this professional learning, administrators, coaches and teachers from all FLACS elementary schools also participated in a year-long evaluation and adoption process to select a new reading and writing curriculum grounded in the Science of Reading. FLACS II also increased the number of opportunities for students to engage with hands-on, phenomenon based science instruction across grades by adding in the required science investigations. The school continued its focus on individualized instruction through a variety of mechanisms–namely more routine response to data whereby grade teams focused on action planning during weekly data meetings.

In addition to core instruction, the school was strategic about how it used two intervention blocks in the day – one in ELA and one in mathematics – to support students with significant learning gaps. During

these two blocks daily, students had the opportunity to engage in individualized, adaptive online curriculum (DreamBox in mathematics and i-Ready in K-5 ELA) in addition to teacher lead instruction offered through programs such as Really Great Reading, The PAF Reading Program, and Read 180 in grades 6-8. Teachers and administrators looked closely at diagnostic assessments through each platform as well as NWEA Growth assessment data and NYS ELA and Math performance data to identify where students had gaps in foundational knowledge for current units. Teachers used a variety of instructional resources to provide explicit and discrete instruction to students during these blocks. For example, in ELA, teachers in the middle school provided targeted groups of students with instruction in phonology and decoding (resources offered through Read 180); grades which typically do not receive intensive instruction of this nature.

FLACS II continued building on the SEL curriculum established during the 2020-2021 school year. Teachers in grades K-5 continued to have a designated time to teach SEL as well as build it into the classroom and school culture. In grades 6-8, all students have an advisory period in their schedule where they engage in their SEL curriculum, connect it to the school's core values, and have time to build relationships with classmates and teachers through activities and discussions. The middle school continued its use of Unified Behavior, formerly Kickboard, to better track student actions aligned to the school's core values. This program functioned as a positive earning points system which in turn generated a comprehensive positivity rating for each student. This positivity rating was used to better support communication about SEL with scholars and their families. Furthermore, FLACS II continued a SEL survey through Panorama Ed to gain additional insights in how students are learning SEL skills and determine ways instruction can be improved. Schools used a tiered approach to differentiating SEL teaching for students who would benefit from additional support from school counselors or small group instruction with their teacher. Each school has an appointed SEL network team member. This team meets monthly to build the FLACS SEL vision and address and SEL challenges as they come up throughout the year.

The guidance staff worked with students and families to support individual students and families during this time, including providing direct services or directing families to outside resources, including crisis counseling. This year, additional students were supported through the addition of a social worker on both campuses.

FLACS II elementary campus hosted a school wide science fair in the spring and its bi-annual choral concerts. FLACS II middle school campus offered: Boys Track, Girls Track, Co-Ed Flag Football, Girls Volleyball, Girls Basketball, Boys Basketball, Co-Ed Soccer, Softball, Cheerleading. The middle school also continued a partnership with Bronx Lacrosse, which increased the number of students participating, while offering mentoring and math tutoring. The middle school also offered afterschool clubs which included the Lego Club, Drumming, Choir, Scrapbooking, Video Game Club, Girls Empowerment, Yearbook, Student Government, Theater, Dance, and Chess. Additionally, this year, all FLACS schools launched a new teacher-leader initiative to strengthen the pipeline of future leaders.

This school year, FLACS II had an assistant principal who was on a maternity leave in spring at the elementary campus.

# ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Year | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2021-22 | 41 | 55 | 55 | 68 | 52 | 49 | 177 | 128 | 135 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 760 |
| 2022-23 | 44 | 49 | 51 | 47 | 66 | 46 | 183 | 177 | 138 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 801 |
| 2023-24 | 33 | 48 | 53 | 48 | 48 | 69 | 197 | 206 | 193 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 895 |

# GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Students will demonstrate proficiency in critical literacy skills.

## Background

FLACS II uses a systematic phonics program, Open Court Foundational Skills Kit, in kindergarten through grade 2. In grades K-5, FLACS uses a network-designed curriculum for whole group instruction based around high quality read alouds, supplemented by Ready NGLS ELA. At all elementary grade levels, time is given for small group instruction and independent reading. Small group instruction, including guided reading with leveled texts occurred, so that scholars learned strategies for decoding and comprehending texts at their instructional level. Students practiced the skills and strategies learned in whole and small group instruction through independent reading periods, during which teachers conferred with individual students to provide individualized instruction. In writing, FLACS II uses the Readers and Writers Project Units of Study in Writing. In grades 6-8, FLACS II uses Fishtank ELA which is an integrated knowledge building approach to teaching reading and writing. During the 2023-24 school year, fidelity to the curriculum was the implementation approach used throughout the year.

Literacy instruction was data-driven. Curriculum based assessments were administered via an online platform to track students' progress in meeting curriculum goals after each unit of instruction throughout the year. Online testing also provided students with an opportunity to engage with a variety of digital interactions prior to state testing. Teachers used results from core curriculum assessments, the NWEA MAP Growth (K-8) and from F&P fluency assessments (K-5) to drive instructional decisions. Data was stored in an online data warehouse and analysis platform so that all teachers and administrators would have readily available access to student data. Teachers met in teams, with instructional coaches and/or the administration to review these multiple points of student data and determine action plans for providing support in reading instruction.

FLACS II continued to implement intervention programs for all grade levels. Teachers utilized small group time to provide intervention and an Academic Intervention Services teacher provided targeted instruction to students in need of literacy intervention in grades K-5. Some of the materials for ELA intervention included Leveled Literacy Intervention and Science of Reading aligned lessons from Really Great Reading and the PAF Reading Program. In addition to small group lessons, students received individualized and targeted practice on i-Ready (K-5) and Read 180 (6-8). Teachers also used this data from i-Ready and Read 180 in conjunction with other assessment data to determine skills to address during small group instruction.

Teachers received professional development in delivering high quality curriculum throughout the year. The principals, assistant principals, coaches and network staff led workshops about literacy topics and using instructional technology to deliver high quality professional development. Teachers received one-on-one coaching from the instructional coach, principal, assistant principal, and FLACS network staff.

## Elementary and Middle ELA

**ELA Measure 1 - Absolute**

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.

The tables below summarize the participation information for this year's test administration as well as the performance of all students and students enrolled for at least two years.

2023-24 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested | | | | | | Total Enrolled |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Absent | Refusal | ELL/IEP | Admin error | Medically excused | Other reason | |
| 3 | 46 | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | 49 |
| 4 | 40 | - | 2 | 4 | - | - | 1 | 47 |
| 5 | 65 | - | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | 68 |
| 6 | 176 | 1 | 4 | 2 | - | - | 1 | 184 |
| 7 | 193 | - | 4 | 6 | - | - | 1 | 204 |
| 8 | 191 | - | - | 4 | - | - | 1 | 196 |
| All | 711 | 1 | 14 | 18 | - | - | 4 | 748 |

Performance on 2023-24 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year[1]

| Grade | All Students | | | Enrolled in at least their Second Year | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient |
| 3 | 46 | 16 | 34.8 | 38 | 13 | 34.2 |
| 4 | 40 | 28 | 70.0 | 35 | 24 | 68.6 |
| 5 | 65 | 35 | 53.8 | 55 | 33 | 60.0 |

[1] Students are considered "enrolled in at least their second year" if they were enrolled on BEDS day of the school year prior to the most recent exam administration.

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 176 | 62 | 35.2 | 102 | 34 | 33.3 |
| 7 | 193 | 92 | 47.7 | 150 | 75 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 191 | 99 | 51.8 | 159 | 88 | 55.3 |
| All | 711 | 332 | 46.7 | 539 | 267 | 49.5 |

**ELA Measure 2 - Absolute**

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the State English language arts exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2023-24 English language arts MIP for all students of **113**. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250. [2]

English Language Arts 2023-24 Performance Index

| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| | 20.0 | 33.3 | 30.9 | 15.8 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PI | = | 33.3 | + | 30.9 | + | 15.8 | = | 80.0 |
| | | | | 30.9 | + | 15.8 | = | 46.7 |
| | | | | | + | (.5)*15.8 | = | 7.9 |
| | | | | | | PI | = | 134.6 |

## Results and Evaluation

FLACS II made progress toward, but did not meet the measure of 75% of students enrolled in their second year at proficiency. FLACS II did meet the second absolute measure, with a PI of 134.6 which exceeded the MIP, 113.

**ELA Measure 3 - Comparative**

[2] You can find the statewide MIP goals for 2022-23 to 2026-27 here

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 school district of comparison.

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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]

2023-24 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | | Local CSD 7 Students | | Local CSD 9 Students | |
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | 34.2 | 38 | 33.2 | 686 | 24.0 | 1586 |
| 4 | 68.6 | 35 | 32.6 | 733 | 28.3 | 1692 |
| 5 | 60.0 | 55 | 24.3 | 818 | 23.1 | 1785 |
| 6 | 33.3 | 102 | 26.8 | 781 | 25.1 | 1727 |
| 7 | 50.0 | 150 | 39.4 | 796 | 39.2 | 1803 |
| 8 | 55.3 | 159 | 38.9 | 846 | 37.7 | 1932 |
| All | 49.5 | 539 | 32.6 | 4660 | 29.8 | 10525 |

**ELA Measure 4 - 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 meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

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 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 target for this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged

[3] Schools can access these data when the NYSED releases its database containing grade level ELA and mathematics results for all schools and districts statewide.

data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2023-24 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2022-23 results.[4]

2022-23 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economically Disadvantaged | Mean Scale Score | | Effect Size |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Actual | Predicted | |
| 3 | 93.6 | 453.0 | 437.8 | 1.47 |
| 4 | 90.9 | 466.0 | 441.3 | 2.44 |
| 5 | 93.5 | 454.0 | 439.4 | 1.55 |
| 6 | 97.8 | 446.0 | 437.8 | 0.94 |
| 7 | 96.0 | 449.0 | 441.7 | 0.83 |
| 8 | 95.7 | 453.0 | 445.8 | 0.77 |
| All | 95.6 | 451.3 | 441.0 | 1.10 |

**ELA Measure 5 - 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 target of 50.

## METHOD

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2023-24 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2022-23 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[5]

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 2022-23 and also have a state exam score from 2021-22 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2021-22 score are ranked by their 2022-23 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 target for this measure, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

2022-23 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
|---|---|---|
| | School | Target |
| 4 | 58.4 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 22.8 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 47.4 | 50.0 |

[4] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2024.

[5] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2024.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7 | 55.4 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 52.0 | 50.0 |
| All | 49.9 | 50.0 |

## ELA Internal Exam Results

FLACS II approached, but did not meet measure 1. The school's median growth percentile for all 3rd through 8th graders was 40; the target was 50.

FLACS II approached, but did not meet measure 2. The school's median growth percentile for all 3rd through 8th graders whose achievement did not meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent in the fall was 37; the target was 55.

FLACS II approached, but did not meet measure 3. The school's median growth percentile of 3rd through 8th grade students with disabilities at the school was lower to the median growth percentile of 3rd through 8th grade general education students at the school which was 40. The median growth percentile of students with disabilities was 33.5.

FLACS II did not meet measure 4. The percentage of 3rd through 8th grade students enrolled in at least their second year at the school who met or exceeded the RIT score proficiency according to the NWEA linking study was 28.9%; the target was 75%.

During 2023-24, in addition to the New York State 3rd – 8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in ELA: NWEA Map Growth.

## NWEA

2023-24 NWEA MAP [ELA/Mathematics] Assessment End of Year Results

| Measure | Subgroup | Target | Tested | Results | Met? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Measure 1: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3rd through 8th grade students will be greater than 50. Student growth is the difference between the beginning of year score and the end of year score. | All students | 50 | 699 | 40 | No |
| Measure 2: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3rd through 8th gradestudents whose achievement did not meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent in the fall will meet or exceed 55 in the spring administration. | Low initial achievers | 55 | 340 | 37 | No |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Measure 3: Each year, the median growth percentile of 3rd through 8th grade students with disabilities at the school will be equal to or greater than the median growth of 3rd through 8th grade general education students at the school. | Students with disabilities[6] | 36.5 | 115 | 33.5 | No |
| Measure 4: Each year, 75% of 3rd through 8th grade students enrolled in at least their second year at the school will meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent according to the most recent linking study comparing NWEA Growth to New York State standards.[7] | 2+ students | 75% | 511 | 28.9 | No |

## End of Year Performance on 2023-24 NWEA MAP ELA Assessment By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grades | All Students | | Enrolled in at least their Second Year | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Proficient[8] | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | 40.0 | 45 | 41.7 | 36 |
| 4 | 31.9 | 47 | 37.8 | 37 |
| 5 | 27.9 | 61 | 33.3 | 51 |
| 6 | 24.1 | 174 | 24.8 | 101 |
| 7 | 17.3 | 196 | 17.0 | 147 |
| 8 | 15.9 | 176 | 18.7 | 139 |
| All | 26.2 | 699 | 28.9 | 511 |

## End of Year Growth on 2023-24 NWEA MAP ELA Assessment By All Students

[6] Schools may elect to report the aggregated data for a different subpopulation of students if the total tested number of students with disabilities is 5 or fewer, or if the school's mission aligns to serving a different specific subpopulation. For schools that choose a different subpopulation (e.g. English language learners, students experiencing housing insecurity, etc.), please explain the rationale in the narrative section

[7] https://www.nwea.org/content/uploads/2020/02/NY-MAP-Growth-Linking-Study-Report-2020-07-22.pdf.

[8] Proficient is defined as scoring at or above the grade-level RIT score cut score according to the most recently available linking study found here. Refer to pages 15-16, tables 3.5 and 3.6.

| Grades | Median Growth Percentile | Number Tested |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 30 | 45 |
| 4 | 53 | 47 |
| 5 | 56 | 61 |
| 6 | 34 | 174 |
| 7 | 36 | 196 |
| 8 | 24 | 176 |
| All | 35 | 699 |

## Summary of the ELA Goal

FLACS II met one of the two absolute goals. FLACS II met both comparative goals. FLACS II came close to meeting the growth 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. | No |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system. | Yes |
| 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 school district of comparison. | Yes |
| 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 meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. | Yes |
| 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 target of 50. | No |

## Evaluation of ELA Goal

FLACS II fell short of the absolute goal for students enrolled for their second year performing proficient

FLACS II exceeded the state's MIP of 113. FLACS had a PI of 134.6.

FLACS II out performed both Local CSD 7 and Local CSD 9 with 65.1 percent more students in their 2nd year performing at proficiency.

FLACS II exceeded the predicted level of performance goal with an effect size of 1.10.

FLACS II fell short of meeting the growth goal (the target was 50, and the school's performance was 49.5). There were areas of relative strength in grades 4, 5, 7 and 8 in absolute performance.

### Additional Context and Evidence

FLACS II did not have any complications testing with internal testing or state testing.

### ELA Action Plan

FLACS II, along with all other FLACS elementary programs, reevaluated its ELA curriculum over the course of the year in light of the Science of Reading and a need to bring a more scripted program that would support teachers new to teaching. A team of teachers-leaders, administrators and coaches, started intensive professional development throughout the year in the Science of Reading through LETRS training; FLACS plans to continue to offer this training to all teachers over the next five years. A team of FLACS administrators, coaches, and teacher leaders met to review the research and choose a new curriculum that is best aligned with these goals. The group selected Fishtank ELA PLus (K-5), which was already adopted in grades 6-8 to address the needs of supporting language comprehension development using an integrated ELA approach whereby writing and reading are taught together. And to address word recognition, the group selected Amplify CKLA Skills which will be implemented in grades K-2. Both Fishtank ELA Plus was rated Green in alignment by EdReports; Fishtank ELA Plus has also been highlighted by the Knowledge Matters Campaign. FLACS' emphasis will be on using these two externally developed curriculum with fidelity. In addition to implementation of each program, each grade level will have a one hour block for independent practice, such as independent reading, and targeted skill instruction, including the use of i-Ready Reading and literacy centers. This one hour block will also be where the classroom teacher and the Academic Intervention Services teacher pull students for intervention. Read 180 will continue to be used as the curriculum to support students who have been identified as having foundational skills gaps in grade 6-8.

The FLACS network also expanded its academics team to include a K-5 Director of Literacy. This individual will be responsible for supporting the implementation of both of these new curriculum in grades K-5 as well as ongoing professional development for those grade levels.

FLACS II will continue to use the NWEA MAP Growth assessment three times a year to monitor growth and continue to use the internal assessments that are part of the core curriculum according to the network pacing guide. FLACS II will abandon using the F&P assessment in grades K-5 in favor of assessments better aligned with the Science of Reading.

While FLACS II has always been committed to data drive instruction, in 2024-25, the FLACS network will continue to support a weekly response to data protocol in which teachers collaborate in grade level PLC to identify specific areas of concern, determine misconception, action plan for reteaching, and reassess. Within this work, teachers and school leaders in partnership with the FLACS network literacy director will analyze student assessment results to negotiate instructional shifts.

FLACS II will continue to use i-Ready in grades K-5 in the 2024-25 school year to support individualized literacy instruction in conjunction with individualized teacher-supported instruction. i-Ready shows evidence as an effective intervention tool as of January 2024 in a study conducted by the National Center for Intensive Intervention and is grounded in the Science of Reading. While i-Ready refers to the interactive digital platform which students use, teachers will continue to receive coaching on how to better implement the scripted teacher-led lessons during small group instruction. Teachers will continue to use classroom data stored on Performance Matters, NWEA data, and i-Ready data to guide the focus of intervention instruction.

A group of teachers at FLACS II who participated in LETRS training during the 2023-24 school year will continue the work on learning best practices of the Science of Reading using LETRS training series. All teachers will receive ongoing professional development from the school instructional coaches and the the FLACS network director of literacy throughout the 2024-25 school year. Teachers in grades 6-8 will participate in the ASPIRE training series to build their knowledge of the Science of Reading with a focus on secondary literacy. Over the next three years, FLACS II will continue to train all of its teachers in this approach. This grounding in the Science of Reading will support better instruction for students to become skilled readers.

# GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

Students will become proficient in the application of mathematical skills and concepts.

## Background

FLACS II continued to use Math in Focus as its core curriculum program in mathematics in grades K-4. This curriculum focused on problem-solving, learning by doing, and conceptual understanding of mathematics. In response to degradation of student mathematics proficiency over time and to become more aligned with mathematics curriculum being used in grades 6-12 at FLACS schools, FLACS II piloted Illustrative Mathematics, a math curriculum which supported critical skills, understandings, and math practices in grade 5. FLACS also continued to use i-Ready Math, an online adaptive program that provided individualized support to students in grades K-5. FLACS II abandoned Math in Focus and implemented the Illustrative Mathematics curriculum for the duration of the school year in grades 6-8. In grade 8 a cohort of students was selected based upon historical mathematics performance to participate in an Algebra I Regents course pilot. This cohort of students received Algebra I instruction using the Illustrative Mathematics Algebra I curriculum. The FLACS network director of mathematics supported the school administration, instructional coach and teachers through a series of professional learning opportunities which included modeling of core instruction, live coaching, and data meetings.

Math instruction was data-driven. Curriculum based pre and post assessments were administered to track students' progress in meeting curriculum goals after each unit of instruction throughout the year. In addition to pre and post assessments, the FLACS network director of mathematics provided additional online assessment to give students additional practice with online testing interactions as well as another data point demonstrating student proficiency. Teachers used the combined results from these

assessments and from the NWEA MAP Growth to drive instructional decisions. Data from these internal assessments and from NWEA was stored in Performance Matters, which allowed for quicker and routine access to analyze student misconceptions. Teachers met in teams, with instructional coaches, and school administration to review these multiple points of student data and determine action plans for providing support in math instruction and plan for interventions.

FLACS II continued to implement intervention programs for all grade levels. Teachers utilized small group time to provide targeted instruction to students in need of mathematics intervention in grades K-5. Some of the materials for Math intervention included i-Ready as well as high quality instructional materials developed by the FLACS network director of mathematics which were in direct response to needs highlighted by the data.

Teachers received professional development in delivering high quality curriculum throughout the year. This PD included the use of coherence maps to observe and plan for vertical alignment. The principals, assistant principals, coaches and network staff led workshops about math topics and various student engagement strategies with norming on highest leverage action steps during data analysis. Teachers received live coaching and modeling support from the FLACS network director of mathematics as well as one-on-one coaching from the instructional coach and school administrators.

The middle school faced challenges in the mathematics department this year. Staffing remained a concern throughout the year, and there were mid-year staffing changes that provided challenges. The instructional coach for mathematics was repositioned to teach the core math class at various times throughout the year and could not support teachers in the way initially envisioned.

## Elementary and Middle Mathematics

**Math Measure 1 - Absolute**

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 Mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

The tables below summarize the participation information for this year's test administration as well as the performance of all students and students enrolled for at least two years

2023-24 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested | | | | | | | Total Enrolled |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Absent | Refusal | ELL/IEP | Admin error | Medically excused | Other reason | Took Regents | |
| 3 | 46 | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | 49 |
| 4 | 44 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 47 |
| 5 | 67 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | 68 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6 | 172 | - | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | 183 |
| 7 | 192 | 1 | 11 | - | - | - | - | - | 204 |
| 8 | 165 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | 28 | 195 |
| All | 686 | 2 | 30 | - | - | - | - | 28 | 746 |

Performance on 2023-24 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | All Students | | | Enrolled in at least their Second Year | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient |
| 3 | 46 | 17 | 37.0 | 38 | 14 | 36.8 |
| 4 | 44 | 23 | 52.3 | 35 | 21 | 60.0 |
| 5 | 67 | 25 | 37.3 | 55 | 24 | 43.6 |
| 6 | 172 | 91 | 52.9 | 98 | 53 | 54.1 |
| 7 | 192 | 109 | 56.8 | 145 | 88 | 60.7 |
| 8 | 165 | 46 | 27.9 | 133 | 41 | 30.8 |
| All | 686 | 311 | 45.3 | 504 | 241 | 47.8 |

**Math Measure 2 - Absolute**

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

## METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or 3 & 4). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2023-24 mathematics MIP for all students of **115.3**. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

Mathematics 2023-24 Performance Index (PI)

| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |

| | 21.9 | 32.8 | 36.0 | 9.3 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PI | = | 32.8 | + | 36.0 | + | 9.3 | = 78.1 |
| | | | | | 36.0 | + | 9.3 | = 45.3 |
| | | | | | | + | (.5)*9.3 | = 4.7 |
| | | | | | | | PI | = 128.1 |

## Results and evaluation

FLACS II's PI exceeded the MIP by 12.8. In comparison to previous year, FLACS II showed a PI increase of 5.1 Results show promise in grades 6 and 7 and staffing changes were most acute in grade 8.

**Math Measure 3 - 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 all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

## Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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.

2023-24 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | | Local CSD 7 | | Local CSD 9 | |
| | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | 36.8 | 38 | 41.4 | 727 | 38.7 | 1679 |
| 4 | 60.0 | 35 | 39.3 | 740 | 37.3 | 1754 |
| 5 | 43.6 | 55 | 27.3 | 814 | 30.1 | 1709 |
| 6 | 54.1 | 98 | 26.9 | 797 | 30.2 | 1784 |
| 7 | 60.7 | 145 | 42.0 | 786 | 41.3 | 1836 |
| 8 | 30.8 | 133 | 29.3 | 753 | 35.1 | 1535 |
| All | 47.8 | 504 | 34.2 | 4617 | 35.5 | 10297 |

**Math Measure 4 - 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 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 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 target for this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2023-24 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2022-23 results.[9]

2022-23 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economically Disadvantaged | Mean Scale Score | | Effect Size |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Actual | Predicted | |
| 3 | 93.6 | 453.0 | 443.2 | 0.68 |
| 4 | 90.9 | 466.0 | 442.8 | 1.64 |
| 5 | 93.5 | 444.0 | 439.6 | 0.35 |
| 6 | 97.8 | 447.0 | 438.7 | 0.66 |
| 7 | 96.0 | 445.0 | 442.2 | 0.24 |
| 8 | 95.7 | 443.0 | 437.5 | 0.33 |
| All | 95.6 | 447.7 | 440.2 | 0.55 |

**Math Measure 5 - 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 target of 50.

## Method

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2023-24 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2022-23 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[10]

[9] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2024.

[10] These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2024.

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 2022-23 and also have a state exam score in 2021-22 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2021-22 scores are ranked by their 2022-23 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 meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50.

2022-23 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile | |
|---|---|---|
| | School | Target |
| 4 | 57.5 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 12.7 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 50.6 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 50.5 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 51.7 | 50.0 |
| All | 48.4 | 50.0 |

## Mathematics Internal Exam Results

FLACS II approached, but did not meet measure 1. The school's median growth percentile for all 3rd through 8th graders was 38.2; the target was 50.

FLACS II approached, but did not meet measure 2. The school's median growth percentile for all 3rd through 8th graders whose achievement did not meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent in the fall was 40.1; the target was 55.

FLACS II approached, but did not meet measure 3. The school's median growth percentile of 3rd through 8th grade students with disabilities at the school was lower to the median growth percentile of 3rd through 8th grade general education students at the school which was 33. The median growth percentile of students with disabilities was 29.5.

FLACS II did not meet measure 4. The percentage of 3rd through 8th grade students enrolled in at least their second year at the school who met or exceeded the RIT score proficiency according to the NWEA linking study was 22.4%; the target was 75%.

During 2023-24, in addition to the New York State 3rd – 8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in mathematics: NWEA Map Growth.

## NWEA

2023-24 NWEA MAP [ELA/Mathematics] Assessment End of Year Results

| Measure | Subgroup | Target | Tested | Results | Met? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Measure 1: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3rd through 8th grade students will be greater than 50. Student growth is the difference between the beginning of year score and the end of year score. | All students | 50 | 716 | 38.2 | No |
| Measure 2: Each year, the school's median growth percentile of all 3rd through 8th gradestudents whose achievement did not meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent in the fall will meet or exceed 55 in the spring administration. | Low initial achievers | 55 | 550 | 40.1 | No |
| Measure 3: Each year, the median growth percentile of 3rd through 8th grade students with disabilities at the school will be equal to or greater than the median growth of 3rd through 8th grade general education students at the school. | Students with disabilities[11] | 120 | 33 | 29.5 | No |
| Measure 4: Each year, 75% of 3rd through 8th grade students enrolled in at least their second year at the school will meet or exceed the RIT score proficiency equivalent according to the most recent linking study comparing NWEA Growth to New York State standards.[12] | 2+ students | 75% | 535 | 22.4 | No |

## End of Year Performance on 2023-24 NWEA MAP Mathematics Assessment By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grades | All Students | | Enrolled in at least their Second Year | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Percent Proficient[13] | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | 30.6 | 49 | 31.6 | 38 |

[11] Schools may elect to report the aggregated data for a different subpopulation of students if the total tested number of students with disabilities is 5 or fewer, or if the school's mission aligns to serving a different specific subpopulation. For schools that choose a different subpopulation (e.g. English language learners, students experiencing housing insecurity, etc.), please explain the rationale in the narrative section

[12] https://www.nwea.org/content/uploads/2020/02/NY-MAP-Growth-Linking-Study-Report-2020-07-22.pdf.

[13] Proficient is defined as scoring at or above the grade-level RIT score cut score according to the most recently available linking study found here. Refer to pages 15-16, tables 3.5 and 3.6.

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 23.4 | 47 | 25.7 | 35 |
| 5 | 16.7 | 66 | 17.9 | 56 |
| 6 | 24.7 | 178 | 31.1 | 106 |
| 7 | 11.8 | 195 | 11.3 | 150 |
| 8 | 15.3 | 189 | 16.7 | 150 |
| All | 20.5 | 716 | 22.4 | 535 |

End of Year Growth on 2023-24 NWEA MAP Mathematics Assessment
By All Students

| Grades | Median Growth Percentile | Number Tested |
|---|---|---|
| 3 | 19.5 | 49 |
| 4 | 41 | 47 |
| 5 | 57 | 66 |
| 6 | 26 | 178 |
| 7 | 24 | 195 |
| 8 | 57 | 189 |
| All | 38.2 | 716 |

## Summary of the Mathematics Goal

The school met one out of two of the absolute measures. The school met both comparative measures. The school did not meet the growth goal for 2023, but anticipates that it will meet the growth for 2024.

| 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. | No |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's mathematics exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system. | Yes |
| 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 school district of comparison. | Yes |
| 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 meaningful degree) according to a regression | Yes |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. | |
| 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 target of 50. | No |

## Evaluation of the Mathematics Goal

FLACS II fell short of the absolute measure but grades 4 and 7 demonstrated 60.0 and 60.7 percent proficiency respectively.

FLACS II exceeded its comparative performance to both Local CSD 7 and 9 in all grades except grade 3 (as compared to Local CSD 7) and grade 8 (as compared to Local CSD 9). FLACS II had 47.1 percent of students enrolled in their second year performing at proficiency as compared to Local CSD 7 and 9 which respectively demonstrated 34.2 percent and 35.5 percent proficiency.

FLACS II's PI was 128.1 in comparison to the state's MIP which was 115.3.

FLACS II's predicted performance based upon effect size was 0.55 which exceeds 0.3. Predicted performance was most notable in grades 4 and 6.

FLACS II fell short of the mean unadjusted growth percentile at 48.4.

## Additional Context and Evidence

FLACS II did not have any issues with data collection and believe these results to be an accurate reflection of performance.

Several 8th Graders took the Algebra Regents in lieu of the 8th grade math text. Those results are listed below

Performance on a Regents Science Exam
Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

| Grade | Year | Regents Exam | Number Tested | Number Passing | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 2021-22 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 2022-23 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 2023-24 | Algebra I | 28 | 18 | 64.3% |

## Mathematics Action Plan

In 2023-24, FLACS II piloted Imagine Learning Illustrative Math in grade 5-8. In the 2024-25 school year, FLACS II will adopt the Illustrative Math curriculum for grades K-4. This decision follows extensive review and ensures alignment with the NYS NGLS standards and the initial data from this year's test suggest that teachers who had fidelity to the program saw gains for students. The focus will be on fidelity to the

curriculum and understanding vertical alignment to enhance instruction, allowing for both remediation and enrichment.

All students in grade 8 will take Algebra I in 2024-25 after the initial pilot of the program. Illustrative Math will be the curriculum for this cohort.

Building capacity within the school, the director of mathematics will collaborate with the director of data -driven instruction to lead data analysis sessions which will focus on providing specific strategies for using data to design interventions that foster student growth in mathematics with school administration, instructional coaches, and teachers. These sessions will focus on identifying key standards and high-impact action steps. Regular live coaching and demonstrations will be provided to model conceptual math and engagement strategies which will include supporting math fluency through the incorporation of math centers, practice problems and targeted instruction tailored to individual needs.

The school will continue using the NWEA MAP Growth assessments three times a year to monitor student progress in mathematics. Regular assessment and data review will drive this shift. Pretests and end-of-unit tests from the core curriculum will be administered according to the network pacing guide. Additionally, the network will supply two cumulative interim benchmark assessments. Teachers and administrators will engage in data-driven PLC conversations and action planning, supported by a new data analysis guide developed through collaboration between the FLACS network and school leadership.

# GOAL 3: SCIENCE

Students will demonstrate proficiency in the practice and methodology of scientific inquiry

## Background

FLACS continues to use Amplify Science as its core program for all grade levels K-8. This phenomena-based curriculum aligns with the Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS) and integrates interactive digital tools and hands-on activities. The program is designed to teach students to think, read, write, and argue like scientists and engineers.

Each Amplify Science unit for grades K-8 is structured around a unit-specific learning progression called the Progress Build. This tool outlines how students' understanding of the unit's focal phenomena is expected to develop and deepen throughout the unit. The Progress Build is crucial for understanding the unit structure and supporting student learning. It organizes the instructional sequence, defines assessment focuses, and grounds inferences about student learning progress to guide instructional adjustments and differentiation. By aligning instruction and assessment with the Progress Build, educators can use evidence of student understanding to support and modify instruction in real time.

In addition to the core curriculum, FLACS incorporates the required elementary and intermediate science investigations for grades 3-8, embedding them as hands-on classroom experiences.

## Elementary and Middle Science

**Science Measure 1 - Absolute**

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 science examination.

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 5th and 8th grade in spring 2024. The table below summarizes the performance of students enrolled for at least two years.

Charter School Performance on 2023-24 State Science Exam
By Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | Students in At Least Their 2nd Year | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient |
| 5 | 68 | 18 | 26.5 |
| 8 | 191 | 74 | 38.7 |
| All | 259 | 92 | 35.5 |

**Science Measure 2 - Comparative**

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 school district of comparison.

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. 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 school district of comparison.

2023-24 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| | Charter School Students in at Least 2nd Year | | | All District Students | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient |
| 5 | 68 | 18 | 26.5 | | | |
| 8 | 191 | 74 | 38.7 | | | |
| All | 259 | 92 | 35.5 | | | |

### Summary of the Elementary/Middle Science Goal

FLACS fell short of its goal with 35.5 percent of students demonstrating proficiency on the New York State science examination.

| 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. | No |
| 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 school district of comparison. | TBD |

## Evaluation of the Science Goal

FLACS II's grade 5 did not meet the absolute measure with 26.5 percent of students demonstrating proficiency. While grade 8 also did not meet the absolute measure, there was a 15.8 percent increase of students demonstrating proficiency from the previous year. In grade 5, instructional time was not maximized for science.

## Additional Context and Evidence

FLACS II did not have any issues with data collection and believe these results to be an accurate reflection of performance.

FLACS did not offer a Regents exam in 2022-2023.

Performance on a Regents Science Exam
Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

| Grade | Year | Regents Exam | Number Tested | Number Passing | Percent Passing |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 2021-22 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 2022-23 | - | - | - | - |
| 8 | 2023-24 | - | - | - | - |

## Action Plan

FLACS will continue to utilize Amplify Science in grades K-8 as the core science program. In K-5, science instruction will have a consistent block of dedicated time during the Fall and Winter and is being prioritized as such so that teachers have more capacity for internalizing content. In 6-8 students will still receive daily 45 minute instruction in science.

In addition to tracking the results of the internal curriculum-based assessments that are part of Amplify Science. The FLACS network will support the FLACS II in digitizing some of these internal assessments so that they better mirror computer-based testing and content literacy. Teachers will analyze measures from these internal curriculum-based assessments to support future planning and instructional shifts. To support continued integration of elementary science investigations, the FLACS network director of

science will engage schools in professional development in how to carry out the investigations with fidelity and on best practices for evaluating student work through a normed lens on these investigations.

In supporting students with being more prepared for high school, FLACS II in concert with the FLACS network will explore and adopt NGSS aligned biology curriculum. This will allow FLACS II to offer a Biology Regents course to all 8th graders beginning in the school year 2025-26.

# GOAL 4: ESSA

**ESSA Measure 1**

Under the state's ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute 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. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school's status under the state accountability system. More information on assigned accountability designations and context can be found here.

Accountability Status by Year

| Year | Status |
|---|---|
| 2021-22 | Good Standing |
| 2022-23 | Local Support and Improvement |
| 2023-24 | Local Support and Improvement |

## Additional Context and Evidence

The school's ESSA status has been at the highest level, either "In Good Standing" (2021-22) or "Local Support and Improvement" (2022-23 and 2023-2024).