

**ELM COMMUNITY  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 12, 2025

By Kayla Cobb

79-17 51st Avenue  
Elmhurst, NY 11373

(347) 474-3288



## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Kayla Cobb (Principal) prepared this 2024-25 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)
Zaineب Hussain	Board Chair	Executive, Academic
Anupa Jacob	Treasurer	Executive, Finance
Derian De La Torre	Member	Finance, Development
Pamela Chin	Member	Academic
Kyla Chirico	Member	Development
Vanessa Lugo Rippee	Member	Development

**Kayla Cobb has served as the Principal since 2024.**

**Priscilla Walton has served as the Founder since 2017.**

## SCHOOL OVERVIEW

As a school dedicated to investing in Queens, our vision is to see every child in the central Queens area discover their passions, talents, and power to enrich their community. We believe that to truly invest in this community's growth and development, we must aim high, committing to reaching every child that walks through our doors.

Our mission is to cultivate student leaders with the character and capacity to form their own identity, seize any opportunity, and shape the world around them through integrated studies and collaborative learning. We strive to provide a rigorous and holistic academic program that will enable our students to choose a middle-school program of their choice.

Elm Community Charter School opened its doors in August 2018, initially serving Kindergarten and 1st Grade students. We have since grown to full capacity, now educating over 500 learners across grades Kindergarten through Fifth Grade.

Our academic program and school culture are built upon five key design elements:

1. **Collaborative Learning:** We believe students learn best when challenged to discuss, debate, and form conclusions with others similar and different from themselves. This approach develops critical thinking, creativity, social skills, and the ability to articulate ideas clearly. Our program emphasizes collaborative group work, using rubrics that focus on the learning process as much as the final product.
2. **Student-Led Integrated Studies:** Our curriculum engages learners in interdisciplinary studies, pushing them to use higher-order thinking skills and adapt their knowledge to real-world scenarios. Our Integrated Studies blocks in Humanities and STEM encourage learners to design their own experiments and projects, explore divergent solutions and conclusions, and show their understanding of content through the development of their own evidence-based conclusions fostering a love for learning and academic success.
3. **Data-Driven Small Group Learning:** We tailor instruction to the individual needs of learners through weekly data analysis of learner work and strategic scheduling. Our approach includes splitting classes for up to 2 hours daily and providing small group instruction for up to 3 hours a day. With two teachers in every classroom, teachers have the flexibility to implement a myriad of teaching options, including parallel teaching and co-teaching.
4. **Self-Exploration and Self-Awareness:** We prioritize learners' social and emotional intelligence, believing self-awareness is crucial for academic success. Our schedule includes time for learners to process their emotions around failure, disagreements, and conflicts. The goal is to cultivate learners' self-awareness so that they are able to articulate their feelings, preferences, and ideas with one another. We utilize our school counselors SEL curriculum as well as Yale's RULER program on Emotional Intelligence to nurture this development.
5. **Creative Courses (Doing and Making to Think Differently):** We believe students learn best when they can make things with their hands and voices, experiencing topics through the arts. We offer a well-rounded education through our Creative Courses, which consist of fine arts, chorus/vocal

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

and music theory, physical education and organized sports, dance, and media. This approach allows students to experience topics through various artistic mediums and present their knowledge through creative projects rather than an academic task.

Since our founding year, we have maintained consistency in our core academic program while continuously refining our approaches to best serve our growing student body. Our commitment to these design elements has remained steadfast, allowing us to provide a unique and effective educational experience for learners of central Queens.

### ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

In the table below, provide the school's BEDS Day enrollment for each school year.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year														
School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2022-23	70	74	82	80	54	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
2023-24	68	79	79	89	82	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
2024-25	65	70	83	97	98	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454

### GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

All students will be proficient readers and writers in English Language Arts.

#### BACKGROUND

Elm Community Charter School employs a balanced literacy approach that provides students with structured workshops, explicit instruction, and dedicated time for individualized and small group support. All students receive at least two hours of daily literacy instruction across multiple components: Writing, Phonics (K-2), Read Aloud (K-2), Guided Reading, Close Reading (3-5), and Humanities.

The school has developed in-house curricula aligned to New York Next Generation Standards. The writing curriculum, inspired by Teachers College Reading and Writing Project, emphasizes a mastery based approach to learning explicit, compounding skills. Writing instruction is often integrated into the humanities curriculum, creating cohesive learning experiences that reinforce both content knowledge and literacy skills. This approach particularly benefits Emergent Bilingual Learners (EBLs) as they develop receptive and expressive language skills. The Read Aloud curriculum is written in-house and guided by Next Generation reading standards, while the Close Reading curriculum is adapted from the Lavinia Group.

The Humanities program represents a unique cornerstone of Elm's academic approach, utilizing EL Education's structure to engage students as leaders and changemakers. Students investigate historical and contemporary topics through text analysis, shared experiences or investigations, and field studies

that connect classroom learning to real-world issues. Each unit culminates in authentic public exhibitions where students share their research and findings with community members, developing both academic skills and civic engagement. This approach cultivates critical thinking, collaborative problem-solving, and empowers students to see themselves as capable of making meaningful contributions to their community.

Assessment data from ELA benchmarks, Fountas & Pinnell assessments (grades 1-5), and phonics assessments (grades K-1) drives instructional decisions. Leaders and teachers conduct regular data analysis to form homogeneous mastery groups, heterogeneous inquiry groups, identify at-risk learners for differentiated instruction, and determine Response to Intervention support levels. This assessment cycle also informs instructional priorities and professional development focus areas.

## 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.

### METHOD

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.

2024-25 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	93	1	3	0	0	0	0	97
4	97	1	0	0	0	0	0	98
5	38	0	2	0	0	1	0	41
All	228	2	5	0	0	1	0	236

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

### Performance on 2024-25 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year<sup>1</sup>

Grade	All Students			Enrolled in at least their Second Year		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
3	93	72	77%	71	59	83%
4	97	60	62%	70	46	66%
5	38	24	63%	35	22	63%
All	228	156	68%	176	127	72%

#### 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.

#### 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 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 2024-25 English language arts MIP for all students of **117.3**. 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.<sup>2</sup>

#### English Language Arts 2024-25 Performance Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
228	11%	22%	35%	32%

$$PI = 0 * 11 + 1 * 22 + 2 * 35 + 2.5 * 32 = 172$$

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>2</sup> You can find the statewide MIP goals for 2022-23 to 2026-27 [here](#)

**ELA 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 English language arts 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.<sup>3</sup>

2024-25 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 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	83%	71	46%	3,365
4	66%	70	45%	3,466
5	63%	35	50%	3,453
All	72%	176	47%	20,284

**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.

**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

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

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results.<sup>4</sup>

### 2023-24 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
		Actual	Predicted	
3	84.4%	450.0	432.1	1.12
4	76.2%	449.0	441.7	0.69
5	65.8%	448.0	442.7	0.59
All	77.9%	449.3	440.8	0.86

### 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 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>5</sup>

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 2023-24 and also have a state exam score from 2022-23 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2022-23 score are ranked by their 2023-24 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.

### 2023-24 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	54.5	50.0
5	63.8	50.0
All	57.2	50.0

<sup>4</sup> These data can be found in the school’s Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

<sup>5</sup> These data can be found in the school’s Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

**ELA INTERNAL EXAM RESULTS**

During 2024-25, in addition to the New York State 3<sup>rd</sup>– 8<sup>th</sup> grade exams, the school used the Fountas and Pinnell (F&P) Assessment System (1-5), Success for All Phonics Assessments (K-1), and in-house standards based ELA Benchmarks (K-5). These assessments, administered three times annually, provide comprehensive reading level data and align with our balanced literacy approach, providing ongoing data to inform our teaching practices.

The internal assessment results reveal variations across grade levels and assessment types. Our foundational phonics program showed strong performance in Kindergarten, with 86% of students meeting Reading Roots benchmarks, exceeding our 80% goal. However, 1st grade phonics performance at 57% fell substantially short of targets. F&P results showed varying patterns across all tested grades, with no grade level achieving the 80% proficiency goal: 1st grade (61%), 2nd grade (64%), 3rd grade (61%), 4th grade (58%), and 5th grade (56%). ELA Benchmark assessments presented the most challenging results, with upper elementary grades showing particularly low performance - 5th grade (24%), 4th grade (36%), and 2nd grade (5%) - while 3rd grade achieved higher levels of proficiency at 67%.

Upon analysis, Elm leaders recognize a significant discrepancy between these internal results and our state exam performance, which suggests potential misalignment between our internal assessments and state standards. This discrepancy limits our ability to make informed instructional adjustments and represents a priority area for improvement.

<b>F&amp;P</b>	<b>Trimester 1</b>	<b>Trimester 2</b>	<b>Trimester 3</b>	<b>Growth</b>
Kindergarten				
1st Grade		56%	61%	+5%
2nd Grade	67%	68%	64%	-3%
3rd Grade	55%	50%	61%	+6%
4th Grade	54%	59%	58%	+4%
5th Grade	56%	60%	56%	N/A

*Fountas and Pinnell Results, SY 2024-25*

<b>Phonics</b>	<b>Trimester 1</b>	<b>Trimester 2</b>	<b>Trimester 3</b>	<b>Growth</b>
Kindergarten	80%	89%	86%	+6%
1st Grade	53%	59%	57%	+4%

*Success For All: Phonics Assessment Results, SY 2024-25*

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

ELA Benchmark	Trimester 1	Trimester 2	Trimester 3	Growth
Kindergarten	78%	89%	73%	-5%
1st Grade	53%	14%	59%	+6%
2nd Grade	47%	18%	5%	-42%
3rd Grade	24%	44%	67%	+43%
4th Grade	8%	22%	36%	+28%
5th Grade	11%	22%	24%	+13%

*ELA Benchmark Results, SY 2024-25*

### SUMMARY OF THE ELA GOAL

Elm Community Charter School achieved four out of five ELA accountability measures for the 2024-25 school year, demonstrating strong state-level performance while identifying areas requiring focused improvement in internal assessment systems.

#### Measure Achievement Overview:

- **Measure 1 (Absolute):** Not Met - 72% of second-year students achieved proficiency, falling 3 percentage points short of the 75% target
- **Measure 2 (Absolute):** Met - Performance Index of 172 significantly exceeded the state MIP target of 117.3
- **Measure 3 (Comparative):** Met - 72% proficiency rate substantially outperformed the district comparison of 47%
- **Measure 4 (Comparative):** Met - Effect size of 0.86 exceeded the 0.3 target, indicating performance well above predicted levels
- **Measure 5 (Growth):** Met - Mean growth percentile of 57.2 surpassed the target of 50.0

The school's performance demonstrates exceptional strength in comparative measures, significantly outperforming both district peers and state predictions. While narrowly missing the absolute proficiency target, the school's 72% proficiency rate represents strong academic achievement.

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.	Not Met
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.	Met

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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.	Met
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.	Met
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.	Met

### EVALUATION OF ELA GOAL

Measure 1 fell short of the 75% target, achieving 72% proficiency. Grade-level performance varied significantly, with third grade reaching exceptional 83% proficiency while fourth grade (66%) and fifth grade (63%) present clear opportunities for improvement.

Measure 2 demonstrated strong success with a Performance Index of 172, substantially exceeding the required threshold. This result reflects robust performance at both Level 3 (35%) and Level 4 (32%), indicating that our balanced literacy approach effectively develops advanced reading comprehension and writing skills while challenging high-achieving students.

Measure 3 showed remarkable comparative performance, with the school's 72% proficiency rate substantially exceeding the district's 47%. Every grade level significantly outperformed district averages: 3rd grade (83% vs 46%), 4th grade (66% vs 45%), and 5th grade (63% vs 50%). This consistent outperformance across all tested grades validates our instructional model.

Measure 4 achieved a 0.86 effect size, indicating performance significantly higher than predicted for schools with similar economically disadvantaged populations (77.9%). All grade levels exceeded predicted performance, with 3rd grade showing particularly strong results (effect size 1.12).

Measure 5 exceeded growth targets with a mean growth percentile of 57.2, particularly driven by 5th grade's exceptional 63.8 growth percentile. This suggests that students are making substantial year-over-year progress in reading and writing skills.

### ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

**Internal vs State Assessment Discrepancy:** A substantial discrepancy exists between our internal benchmark data and state exam performance. While internal F&P and ELA benchmark assessments showed concerning performance across all grades, state results demonstrated strong achievement. This misalignment suggests our internal assessments may not accurately reflect student readiness for state standards or may emphasize different literacy competencies than those prioritized on state exams.

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

**Foundational Skills Concerns:** The 23-percentage point gap between phonics goals and 1st grade achievement (57% vs 80% target) in Reading Roots assessments indicates foundational reading difficulties that may compound in later grades, despite kindergarten success at 86%.

### Understanding Our Growth Trajectory

ELA   G3	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	DIFF
Level 1	21%	21%	8.60%	-12%
Level 2	24%	25%	13.98%	-11%
Level 3	44%	29%	43.01%	14%
Level 4	11%	25%	34.41%	9%

ELA   G4	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	DIFF
Level 1	14%	13%	11.34%	-1%
Level 2	32%	30%	26.80%	-3%
Level 3	36%	44%	22.68%	-21%
Level 4	18%	14%	39.18%	25%

ELA   G5	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	DIFF
Level 1	9%	17%	13.16%	-4%
Level 2	16%	25%	23.68%	-1%
Level 3	53%	53%	39.47%	-13%
Level 4	22%	6%	23.68%	18%

Third grade has been on an upward trajectory with students performing at the advanced level jumping from just 11% in 2022-23 to 34% this year, while we've cut the percentage of struggling students from 21% down to 9%. This grade level clearly demonstrates that our instructional approach can work powerfully when implemented well.

Additionally, fourth grade shows some encouraging signs with advanced performance bouncing back to 39% this year after dipping to 14% in 2023-24. But we're seeing fewer students maintaining solid proficiency, with Level 3 performance dropping from 44% two years ago to just 23% now. Fifth grade presents a similar pattern where students seem to be clustering at the high and low ends rather than maintaining steady proficiency in the middle ranges.

What this suggests is that something significant is happening as students move through our upper elementary grades. Either our curriculum becomes more challenging to implement effectively, or students are experiencing a polarization where they either excel or struggle more than they should. The success we see in third grade proves our methods can work, but we clearly need to understand why that effectiveness doesn't consistently carry forward through fourth and fifth grade.

### ELA ACTION PLAN

**Assessment Alignment and Data Systems:** We will conduct a comprehensive alignment study between our internal F&P, ELA Benchmark, and Reading Roots assessments with New York State exam standards. ELA Benchmarks will be revised to better predict state performance and provide more reliable results for teachers to understand student performance and therefore plan and prioritize support in service of student growth, while maintaining alignment with our balanced literacy and Success for All pedagogical approaches. In the 2025 school year, we will incorporate a system of spiral assessments between assessment rounds meant to help teachers pause, reflect, and action plan using data more consistently.

**Foundational Skills Intervention:** Given the critical importance of phonics foundations, we will continue to implement intensive 1st grade Reading Roots intervention protocols. Students will receive phonics instruction in data-driven small groups every day, in addition to engaging with Science-of-Reading aligned decodable books during their guided reading block. Additionally, in second grade, students who fell far below their end of year phonics benchmark target will continue to receive phonics interventions in addition to the grade-level curriculum to support their continued growth.

**Targeted Grade-Level Support:** We will establish differentiated professional development focusing on teachers and grades showing the greatest gaps between internal and state performance. Our successful 3rd grade practices will be systematically analyzed and replicated across 4th and 5th grade instruction, with particular emphasis on close reading strategies adapted from the Close Reading curriculum and integrated humanities writing opportunities that strengthen both content knowledge and literacy skills. We will strengthen our instructional data practices to ensure we are considering both comprehensive current and historical data to establish goals and implement ongoing progress monitoring to inform instructional practices. Teachers will engage in critique and revision protocols with our humanities curriculum to help strengthen the depth of teacher understanding of themes, big ideas, and lessons. We will introduce student work analysis, data analysis, and lesson study protocols to strengthen teachers' abilities to more effectively diagnose, teach, and assess students through their coaching.

## GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

### BACKGROUND

Elm will utilize two main components for Math: Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) and Math Workshop. During the 2024-25 school year, learners in each grade will have approximately 90 minutes of math instruction three days a week, ensuring ample time for both conceptual understanding and skill mastery.

Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) is an inquiry-based math program that operates in direct alignment with New York State's Common Core Learning Standards for Mathematics, which are based on the Common Core State Standards for Mathematical Practice. CGI emphasizes problem-solving and critical thinking, encouraging students to develop their own strategies for solving mathematical problems. This approach allows teachers to gain insight into students' mathematical thinking and tailor instruction accordingly. Through CGI, students engage in rich mathematical discussions, explain their reasoning, and learn from their peers' strategies.

Math Workshop, our mastery-based academic component, is designed to teach learners fundamental math skills through a structured, yet flexible format. The focus of this curriculum is on building a strong conceptual foundation that students can apply to solve problems in their everyday experiences. Math Workshop typically includes a mini-lesson, guided practice, independent work, and a sharing/reflection time.

For Grades Kindergarten through 5th grade, we adapt materials from EngageNY, modifying them to place a greater emphasis on mastering essential math skills. This adaptation ensures that our students develop a solid foundation in core mathematical concepts while still being challenged to apply their knowledge in various contexts.

Additionally, in Kindergarten, we supplement some of the math with the Context for Learning Mathematics curriculum. This curriculum is known for its use of realistic contexts to introduce and explore mathematical concepts, helping students see the relevance of mathematics in their daily lives.

By combining these approaches, we aim to develop students who are not only proficient in mathematical procedures, but also confident problem-solvers capable of applying mathematical thinking to real-world situations.

## 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.

2024-25 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	93	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	97
4	97	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
5	38	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	41
All	228	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	236

Performance on 2024-25 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	93	81	87%	71	62	87%
4	97	65	67%	70	47	67%
5	38	22	58%	35	21	60%
All	228	168	74%	176	130	74%

### 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

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 2024-25 mathematics MIP for all students of **119.4**. 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 2024-25 Performance Index (PI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
228	8%	21%	42%	29%

$$PI = 0 * 8 + 1 * 21 + 2 * 42 + 2.5 * 29 = 177.5$$

### 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.

2024-25 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 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	87%	71	53.4%	3,541
4	67%	70	50.5%	3,619
5	60%	35	52.9%	3,560
All	74%	176	52.3%	10,720

### 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)

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results.<sup>6</sup>

### 2023-24 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Mean Scale Score		Effect Size
		Actual	Predicted	
3	84.4%	464.0	446.1	1.26
4	76.2%	463.0	451.2	0.76
5	65.8%	460.0	448.8	0.89
All	77.9%	462.9	448.6	1.00

### 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 2024-25 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2023-24 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>7</sup>

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 2023-24 and also have a state exam score in 2022-23 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2022-23 scores are ranked by their 2023-24 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are

<sup>6</sup> These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

<sup>7</sup> These data can be found in the school's Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2025.

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

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.

### 2023-24 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Target
4	56.8	50.0
5	69.3	50.0
All	60.3	50.0

### MATHEMATICS INTERNAL EXAM RESULTS

During 2024-25, in addition to the New York State exams, Elm primarily used internal benchmark assessments aligned with our CGI and Math Workshop curricula to measure student growth and achievement in mathematics. These assessments, administered at the end of each trimester, are aligned with our CGI and Math Workshop instructional approaches and provide ongoing data to inform our teaching practices.

The internal assessment results reveal variations across grade levels. Our primary grades demonstrated strong performance, with kindergarten students improving from 67% proficiency in Trimester 1 to 95% by Trimester 3. This represents a 28 percentage point gain. First grade showed a similar positive trajectory, growing from 53% to 87% proficiency. These results align with our emphasis on building foundational mathematical understanding in the early grades.

Fifth grade students experienced significant performance variation, beginning at 21% proficiency in Trimester 1, declining to 2% in Trimester 2, before recovering to 28% by Trimester 3. The mid-year decline prompted immediate intervention efforts. Fourth grade also showed concerning trends, moving from 40% to 32% proficiency across the academic year.

We recognize a discrepancy between these internal results and our state exam performance, which suggests potential misalignment between our internal assessments and state standards. This discrepancy limits our ability to make informed instructional adjustments and represents a priority area for improvement.

	Trimester 1	Trimester 2	Trimester 3	Growth
Kindergarten	67%	94%	95%	+28%
1st Grade	53%	65%	87%	+ 34%
2nd Grade	63%	60%	54%	-9%
3rd Grade	35%	44%	62%	+27%
4th Grade	40%	36%	32%	-8%
5th Grade	21%	2%	28%	+7%

*Math Benchmark, SY 2024-25*

**SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL**

Elm Community Charter School achieved four out of five mathematics accountability measures for the 2024-25 school year, demonstrating strong overall performance while identifying specific areas requiring focused improvement.

**Measure Achievement Overview:**

- **Measure 1 (Absolute):** Not Met - 74% of second-year students achieved proficiency, falling 1 percentage point short of the 75% target
- **Measure 2 (Absolute):** Met - Performance Index of 177.5 significantly exceeded the state MIP target of 119.4
- **Measure 3 (Comparative):** Met - 74% proficiency rate substantially outperformed the district comparison of 52.3%
- **Measure 4 (Comparative):** Met - Effect size of 1.00 exceeded the 0.3 target, indicating performance well above predicted levels
- **Measure 5 (Growth):** Met - Mean growth percentile of 60.3 surpassed the target of 50.0

The school’s performance demonstrates strength in comparative measures, significantly outperforming both district peers and state predictions. While narrowly missing the absolute proficiency target, the school’s 74% proficiency rate represents solid academic achievement.

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.	Not Met
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.	Met
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.	Met
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.	Met
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.	Met

### EVALUATION OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Measure 1 fell just short of the 75% target at 74% proficiency, with grade-level variation significantly impacting overall results. Third grade achieved exceptional 87% proficiency, while fifth grade achieved 60% proficiency.

Measure 2 demonstrated exceptional success with a Performance Index of 177.5, driven by strong Level 3 (42%) and Level 4 (29%) performance. The high proportion of students achieving advanced performance levels indicates that our approach effectively challenges high-achieving students and develops deep mathematical understanding.

Measure 3 showed strong comparative performance, with the school's 74% proficiency rate substantially exceeding District 24's 52.3%. Every grade level outperformed district averages: 3rd grade (87% vs 53.4%), 4th grade (67% vs 50.5%), and 5th grade (60% vs 52.9%). This consistent outperformance across all tested grades validates our instructional model.

Measure 4 achieved a 1.00 effect size, indicating performance significantly higher than predicted for schools with similar economically disadvantaged populations (77.9%). All grade levels exceeded predicted performance, with 3rd grade showing particularly strong results (effect size 1.26).

Measure 5 exceeded growth targets with a mean growth percentile of 60.3, particularly driven by 5th grades exceptional 69.3 growth percentile. This suggests that despite lower absolute performance, 5th grade students are making substantial year-over-year progress.

### ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

**Internal vs State Assessment Discrepancy:** A substantial discrepancy exists between our internal benchmark data and state exam performance. While internal assessments showed declining performance in upper grades throughout the year, state results were considerably stronger. This misalignment suggests our internal assessments may not accurately reflect student readiness for state standards or may emphasize different mathematical competencies than those prioritized on state exams.

**Grade-Level Performance Patterns:** The strong performance in 3rd (87% proficiency) versus challenges in 4th and 5th grades suggests potential curriculum alignment issues or instructional transition difficulties as students advance through elementary grades. This pattern warrants investigation into vertical alignment and consistent instructional practices across grade levels.

**Understanding Our Growth Trajectory**

MATH   G3	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	DIFF
Level 1	5%	2%	2.15%	0%
Level 2	36%	23%	10.75%	-12%
Level 3	44%	53%	48.39%	-4%
Level 4	15%	22%	38.71%	17%

MATH   G4	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	DIFF
Level 1	10%	5%	7.22%	2%
Level 2	29%	24%	25.77%	2%
Level 3	47%	53%	36.08%	-17%
Level 4	14%	18%	30.93%	13%

MATH   G5	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	DIFF
Level 1	3%	6%	15.79%	10%
Level 2	25%	28%	26.32%	-1%
Level 3	53%	47%	39.47%	-8%
Level 4	19%	19%	18.42%	-1%

Third grade has been particularly impressive with the percentage of students reaching advanced performance has more than doubled from 15% to 39%, while we've kept the number of struggling students consistently low at just 2%. Fourth grade shows a similar pattern with advanced performance climbing steadily from 14% to 31% over the three years.

Even fifth grade, which shows the most significant performance gap this year, maintains relatively strong performance when viewed over time. While we saw some decline in the proficient band, advanced performance has stayed consistent around 18-19%, and importantly, we've never had more than 16% of students performing below basic level.

What's encouraging about these mathematics trends is their consistency. Unlike ELA where we see more variability year to year, our math results show steady upward movement in advanced performance across all three grades. This suggests that our CGI and Math Workshop approaches are taking hold systematically. Teachers seem to be getting more skilled at implementing these methods, and students are developing stronger mathematical reasoning abilities as the program matures. The fact that we consistently keep the vast majority of students at proficient or advanced levels, even while pushing more students into the advanced category, indicates that our foundational instruction is solid.

### Strategic Program Changes

Two significant programmatic decisions this year provide important context for understanding our performance data. First, we deliberately reduced our test preparation from eight weeks to four weeks in both ELA and mathematics. This builds on our 2023-24 decision to shorten test prep to six weeks, demonstrating our sustained commitment to authentic instruction over test preparation. Our goal is to eventually eliminate dedicated test preparation entirely as our daily instruction becomes more aligned and effective. We knew this reduction might impact short-term scores, but we believe it represents a healthier, more sustainable approach to student learning.

Second, we made interdisciplinary studies a major focus area this year, particularly revamping our Humanities program with emphasis on critique and revision processes, rubric-based assessment, goal-setting, and student-led conferences. This shift meant less time dedicated purely to skills mastery and more time on developing critical thinking, communication, and self-reflection capabilities. We anticipated this change might cause some temporary decline in traditional assessment results, but we're convinced these deeper learning experiences will benefit students more significantly over time.

Both decisions reflect our commitment to long-term student growth over short-term test performance. The fact that we maintained strong comparative performance and achieved substantial Performance Index scores while making these shifts suggests our core instructional model remains sound.

### MATHEMATICS ACTION PLAN

**Data Systems and Consistency:** We will establish mandatory weekly use of mathematics progress trackers across all grade levels to ensure consistent data collection and analysis. SchoolRunner utilization will become systematic for all exit tickets and spiral reviews, with monitoring for compliance. We will expand our successful third-grade data meeting model to grades 4-5, implementing bi-weekly meetings focused on student work analysis and instructional adjustments.

**Curriculum Alignment and Assessment:** We will conduct a comprehensive alignment study between our internal assessments and New York State exam standards, particularly for grades 4-5 where discrepancies were most pronounced. Internal assessments will be revised to better predict state performance while maintaining alignment with our CGI and Math Workshop pedagogical approaches. We will implement bi-weekly spiral assessments across all grades, using results to form strategic, flexible instructional groups.

**Targeted Interventions and Professional Development:** As we have seen success in grades using CFLM unit, we will continue our transition to Context for Learning Mathematics curriculum in lower grades, as initiated in 2023-24, while expanding its use to build stronger conceptual foundations. We will implement systematic weekly flexible grouping protocols for grades 3-5, utilizing homogeneous skill-based groups for targeted strategy instruction. Professional development will focus on the effective incorporation of math spirals into instruction, building on promising 2023-24 results in grades that implemented this approach.

## GOAL 3: SCIENCE

Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of the scientific method to design, conduct, and analyze experiments, and represent conclusions.

### BACKGROUND

Elm’s engaging science curriculum is inquiry and project-based. The curriculum builds students' foundational science skills by completing experiments that answer scientific questions related to life, earth, and physical science. Currently, Elm has adopted Amplify as our science curriculum due to its emphasis on experiments and inquiry-based learning, as well as its direct alignment to New York State’s CCLS and Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Pacing calendars, assessments, units and lessons will be developed in-house and eventually achieve horizontal alignment with Humanities.

## 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 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in spring 2025. The table below summarizes the performance of students enrolled for at least two years.

Charter School Performance on 2024-25 State Science Exam  
By Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Students in At Least Their 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		
	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
5	39	20	51%

### 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.

2024-25 State Science Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

	Charter School Students in at Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year			All District Students		
Grade	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Number Proficient	Percent Proficient
5	39	20	51%	N/A	N/A	N/A

### SUMMARY OF THE ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCIENCE GOAL

**Measure 1 (Absolute):** Our fifth-grade students achieved 51% proficiency on the 2024-25 New York State Science exam, falling short of our 75% target by 24 percentage points.

**Measure 2 (Comparative):** We are unable to complete the district comparison analysis as the district science data was not available at the time of this report's preparation. This missing information prevents us from understanding our relative performance against similar student populations in our district.

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.	Not Met
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.	N/A

### EVALUATION OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

**Measure 1:** Our results fell short of expectations, with fifth grade students achieving 51% proficiency compared to the 75% target.

**Measure 2:** We cannot evaluate our comparative performance due to the unavailability of district science data at the time of this report.

### ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

In addition to the state tests, Elm administers Science Benchmarks at the end of every trimester to assess learner proficiency on relevant Next Generation Science Standards. The table below shows the results of these benchmarks.

	Trimester 1	Trimester 2	Trimester 3
K	96%	97%	96%
1	89%	76%	68%
2	79%	67%	84%
3	70%	22%	46%

## 2024-25 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

4	82%	43%	45%
5	99%	43%	45%

Kindergarten maintained consistent high performance throughout the year, scoring in the high 90s across all trimesters, which demonstrates that our foundational approach can be effective when properly implemented. However, all other grade levels experienced mid-year declines. First grade declined from 89% to 76% in Trimester 2, ending the year at 68% proficiency. In second grade, proficiency scores dropped from 79% to 67% before recovering to 84% by spring.

In third through fifth grades, there were more significant declines. Third grade fell from 70% proficiency to 22% proficiency in Trimester 2. Fourth grade dropped from 82% proficiency to 43% proficiency and fifth grade declined from 99% proficiency to 43% proficiency. While these grades showed improvement by the end of the year, they remained substantially below their starting performance levels.

This pattern indicates a gap with STEM curriculum implementation, assessment design, or instructional consistency that developed mid-year and persisted through Trimester 3.

### ACTION PLAN

**Science Routines:** We will develop and implement systematic science routines on a weekly basis that provide regular review and reinforcement of transferable science concepts across third through fifth grades. These routines will be strategically aligned with our science habits of thinking, which directly correspond to the NGSS Science and Engineering Practices. Similar to our successful math spiral approach, these science routines will be administered weekly to ensure consistent exposure to core scientific concepts and practice. Teachers will receive professional development on creating routines that emphasize evaluating and communicating information, analyzing and interpreting data, constructing explanations and designing solutions, and engaging in argument from evidence. These routines will bridge the gap between the hands-on investigations of the Amplify curriculum and the analytical thinking required for state assessments.

**Strengthening Vertical Alignment:** The stark contrast between kindergarten through second grades high performance and the significant declines in upper elementary grades indicates a breakdown in our vertical progression that must be addressed. We will implement an analysis of successful early elementary practices and create pathways for maintaining that level of engagement and understanding as students advance through the grades. This includes establishing consistent STEM instructional protocols across all elementary grades, ensuring that the inquiry-based approaches that work are adapted appropriately for increasing cognitive complexity in upper grades. We will also continue to develop our assessments & scope and sequence to ensure they are backwards planned from the state test, ensuring that each grade level builds systematically toward the knowledge and skills required for fifth grade science assessment success. We've also increased our common meeting time between all science teachers to ensure that best practices are shared consistently.

**Project-Based Learning Integration:** We will incorporate more of our project-based learning design elements into our STEM instruction, leveraging the authentic learning experiences that have proven

successful in our Humanities program. This integration will include real-world problem-solving scenarios, community connections, and exhibitions of student work.

## 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
2022-23	Good Standing
2023-24	Good Standing
2024-25	Good Standing

### ADDITIONAL CONTEXT AND EVIDENCE

Elm Community Charter School ensures that all state reporting, city reporting, and accountability reports are provided in a timely manner.