Our World Neighborhood CHARTER SCHOOL

2015-16 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 1, 2016

By Brian Ferguson
36-12 35th Avenue, Astoria, NY 11106
bferguson@owncs.org
718-392-3405

Brian Ferguson, Executive Director prepared this 2015-16 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Jeanette Betancourt EdD.	Chairperson (Education, Executive, Development committees)
Melissa Chin	Vice-Chairperson (Education, Executive committees)
Maura Fitzgerald	Secretary (Finance & Audit, Executive committees)
Charles Guadagnolo	Treasurer (Finance & Audit, Facilities committees)
Sara Espanol	Member (Education, Development committees)
Olubunmi Emigli	Member (Education, Development committee)
Manu Bhagavan PhD	Member
Richard Bogle	Member (Facilities committee)

Brian Ferguson has served as the Executive Director since 2002.

INTRODUCTION

Narrative description of the school, e.g. mission, when it opened, what grades served, number of students, demographic characteristics of students, etc. In addition, the description may also include key design elements or other unique aspects of the school program.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts
All students attending Our World Neighborhood Charter School will become proficient readers and writers of the English Language.

Background

Brief narrative discussing English language arts curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the English language arts program or staff prior to or during the 2014-15 school year.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in grades 3 through grade 8 in April 2016. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year).

2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[1]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All					

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

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table below that directly addresses the measure, i.e. the overall percent of students *in at least their second year* achieving at proficiency.

Performance on 2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All OWNCS Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period. This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The school can use a supplemental table for this section on performance disaggregated by number of years in the school. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school's instructional program.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of OWNCS Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						

4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

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

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index ("PLI") value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 English language arts AMO of 104. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.[2]

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure by comparing the PLI to this year's AMO.

English Language Arts 2015-16 Performance Level Index (PLI)

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

PI	=	?	+	?	+	?	=	?
				?	+	?	=	?
						PLI	=	?

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

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

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[3]

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure, e.g. the aggregate charter school performance compared to the aggregate district performance in the same tested grades.

2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	OWNCS Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District 30 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure, i.e., whether the charter school fell short of, equaled or exceed the aggregate district performance and by how much. In addition the evaluation may also include a discussion of specific grade levels' comparative performance.

Additional Evidence

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

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school's performance in comparison to the local district in previous years. In addition, the school can use a supplemental table for this section on a comparison of the charter school to selected local schools. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.
Also, additional evidence may include demographic differences between the school and the district as well as compelling reasons for comparing the school to a subset of schools within the district.

English Language Arts Performance of OWNCS and NYC District 30 by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of OWNCS Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to NYC District 30 Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	OWNCS	District 30	OWNCS	District 30	OWNCS	District 30
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2013-14 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: overall Effect Size. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective Effect Sizes.

2015-16 **English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

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

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's aggregate Effect Size exceeded 0.3 and, if not, whether it was at least a positive Effect Size. In addition, the narrative may also include specific grade levels' comparative performance.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance of this comparative measure, including trends over time.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2013-14	3-8					
2014-15	3-8					
2015-16	3-8					

Goal 1: Growth Measure[4]
Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2013-14 and also have a state exam score from 2012-13 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2012-13 score are ranked by their 2013-14 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[5]

Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2013-14 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: the school's mean growth percentile. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective percentiles.

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

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

Evaluation

[4] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.
[5] Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's overall mean growth percentile is greater than the state median of the 50th percentile. In addition, the narrative may also include discussion of specific grade-level results.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance in comparison to the statewide average.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Statewide Median
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan 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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to maintain or improve academic performance based on the *specific results* associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts or sub-populations.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics
All students attending Our World Neighborhood Charter School will demonstrate competency in their understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

Background

Brief narrative discussing mathematics curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the mathematics program or staff prior to or during the 2014-15 school year.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in grade 3 through grade 8 in April 2016. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[6]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					

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

6					
7					
8					
All					

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table below that directly addresses the measure, i.e. the overall percent of students *in at least their second year* achieving at proficiency.

Performance on 2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All OWNCS Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period. This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The school can use a supplemental table for this section on performance disaggregated by number of years in the school. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school's instructional program.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of OWNCS Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

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

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 101. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.[7]

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure by comparing the PLI to this year's AMO.

Mathematics 2015-16 Performance Level Index (PLI)

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

PI	=	?	+	?	+	?	=	?
				?	+	?	=	?
						PLI	=	?

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

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[8]

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure, e.g. the aggregate charter school performance compared to the aggregate district performance in the same tested grades.

2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
OWNCS and NYC District 30 Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	OWNCS Students In At Least 2nd Year		All NYC District 30 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

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

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure; i.e., whether the charter school fell short of, equaled or exceeded the aggregate district performance and by how much. In addition the evaluation may also include a discussion of specific grade levels' comparative performance.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school's performance in comparison to the local district in previous years. In addition, the school can use a supplemental table for this section on a comparison of the charter school to selected local schools. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include demographic differences between the school and the district as well as compelling reasons for comparing the school to a subset of schools within the district.

Mathematics Performance of OWNCS and NYC District 30 by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to NYC District 30 Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	OWNCS	District 30	OWNCS	District 30	OWNCS	District 30
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

Goal 2: Comparative Measure
Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage.

The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2013-14 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: overall Effect Size. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective Effect Sizes.

2015-16 **Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

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

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's aggregate Effect Size exceeded 0.3 and, if not, whether it was at least a positive Effect Size. In addition, the narrative may also include specific grade levels' comparative performance.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance on this comparative measure, including trends over time.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2013-14	3-8					
2014-15	3-8					
2015-16	3-8					

Goal 2: Growth Measure[9]
Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2013-14 and also have a state exam score in 2012-13 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2012-13 scores are ranked by their 2013-14 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[10]

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2013-14 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: the school's mean growth percentile. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective percentiles.

2015-16 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

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

[9] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.
[10] Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

All		50.0

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure; i.e. whether the school's overall mean growth percentile is greater than the state median of the 50th percentile. In addition, the narrative may also include discussion of specific grade-level results.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides a discussion of current and past performance in comparison to the statewide average.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Statewide Median
4				50.0
5				50.0
6				50.0
7				50.0
8				50.0
All				50.0

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

	schools in New York State. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to maintain or improve academic performance based on the *specific results* associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts or sub-populations.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
All students attending the Our World Neighborhood Charter School will become proficient in their understanding and use of Science.

Background

Brief narrative discussing science curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the science program or staff.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State science examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2015. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table below that directly addresses the measure, i.e. the overall percent of students *in at least their second year* achieving proficiency.

OWNCS Performance on 2015-16 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency	
	OWNCS Students In At Least 2nd Year	All NYC District 30 Students

	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, as well as notable performance in specific grades and populations. Also, use this section to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period. This discussion shows how the school is making progress towards, or maintaining, a high level of performance. The school can use a supplemental table for this section on performance disaggregated by number of years in the school. The table shell appears on page 66 in the Appendix.

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the science program.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of OWNCS Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4						
8						
All						

Goal 3: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; e.g. the charter school performance compared to the district performance in the same tested grades.

2015-16 NY State Science Exam
OWNCS and NYC District 30 Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	OWNCS Students In At Least 2nd Year		All NYC District 30 Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure; i.e. whether the charter school fell short of, equaled or exceeded the district performance in each grade and by how much.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides a discussion of the charter school's performance in comparison to the local district in previous years.

Science Performance of OWNCS and NYC District 30
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of OWNCS Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to NYC District 30 Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	OWNCS	District 30	OWNCS	District 30	OWNCS	District 30
4						
8						
All						

Summary of the Science Goal

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the specific results and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented.

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB
All students attending the Our World Neighborhood Charter School will become proficient in their understanding and use of Science.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure
Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

Method

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Results

Our World Neighborhood Charter School has been designated a school in good standing by the NY State Education Department for the 2015-16 school year.

The table below shows that since 2013, Our World Neighborhood Charter School has been designated as a school in good standing thus meeting the overall requirements of NCLB.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2013-14	Good Standing
2014-15	Good Standing
2015-16	Good Standing

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65/80
by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort[11]

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65 / 80
2009		
2010		
2011		

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.
REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade math exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents math exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.
REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

The school demonstrates the effectiveness of its mathematics program by enabling students who were not meeting proficiency standards in the eighth grade to meet the mathematics requirement for graduation with a Regents diploma / the college and career readiness standard.

Results

[11] Based on the highest score for each student on the Mathematics Regents exam

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2010 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Indicate 65 or 80 passing score

Mathematics Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 / 80 among Students

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a Regents mathematics exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

SAME FOR ALL SCHOOLS

Method

In receiving a waiver for its federal No Child Left Behind accountability system, the State Education Department now law holds high schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards meeting college and career readiness standards. See page 72 of SED's ESEA waiver application for the high school AMOs:
http://www.p12.nysed.gov/accountability/documents/NYSESEAFlexibilityWaiver_REVISED.pdf
The AMO continues to be SED's basis for determining if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the annual goal. To achieve this measure, all tested students in the Accountability Cohort must have an Accountability Performance Level (APL) that equals or exceeds 2014-15 mathematics AMO of **154.**

The APL is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of students in the Accountability Cohort at Levels 2 through 4 to the sum of the percent of students at Level 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible APL is 200. The Regents exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is Level 1, 65 to 79 is Level 2, 80 to 89 is Level 3, and 90 to 100 is Level 4. The Regents Common Core exams in mathematics are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 64 is level 1; 65 to 73 is level 2, 74 to 84 is level 3, and 85 to 100 is level 4.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure, by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district.
REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED PRIOR TO 2012-13

(§) Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in mathematics of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district.
REQUIRED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY PLANS DEVELOPED IN 2012-13 OR LATER

Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available school district results.[12]

Results

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure. Select the appropriate table depending on Accountability Plan.

Summary of the High School Mathematics Goal [13]

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

Use the first summary if the Accountability Plan is prior to 2012-13; use the second if it is from 2012-13 or later.

[12] The New York State Report Card provides the district results for students scoring at or above 65.
[13] If the school includes a middle school component, add these measures to the subject area goal for the younger grades.

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan Prior to 2012-13)	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will did not score proficient on the New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a New York State Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Type	Measure (Accountability Plan from 2012-13 or later)	Outcome
Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	(§) Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort who did not score proficient on their New York State 8th grade mathematics exam will meet the college and career ready standard (currently scoring 80 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam) by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Comparative	(§) Each year, students in the high school Total Cohort will exceed the predicted pass rate on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all high schools in New York State.	N/A
Comparative	(§) Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a New York State Regents mathematics exam of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the *specific results* and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented.

Include the following section under the Accountability Plan science goal.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents science exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Method

New York State administers multiple high school science assessments; current Regent exams are Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. The school administered Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. It scores Regents on a scale from 0 to 100; students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass any one of the Regents science exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents science exam multiple times or have taken multiple science exams. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a science exam.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure; i.e., the percent of students in the 2011 Cohort who have passed the exam with a comparison to previous years' performance.

Science Regents Passing Rate with a Score of 65 by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort[14]

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing with a score of 65
2009		
2010		
2011		

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure and notable performance in specific cohorts. Also, use this section to discuss the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Provide narrative discussing passing rates on individual assessments, and additional analysis of the data such as performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year, showing the school is making progress towards meeting the measure's target.

[14] Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

Goal 3: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent to students in the high school Total Cohort passing a Regents science exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Total Cohort from the local school district.

Method

The school compares the performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school high school Total Cohort to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the school presents most recently available district results.

Results

Provide brief narrative highlighting results in the data table that directly addresses the measure.

Science Regents Passing Rate
of the High School Total Cohort by Charter School and School District

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2009				
2010				
2011				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the school met the measure and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth, showing year the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Include the following section as a separate Accountability Plan subject area goal following the science section.

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

Goal 5: Parent Satisfaction
Parents and students at OWN Charter will indicate satisfaction with the school's educational programs.

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

Method

Provide a narrative explaining how the school developed, administered, collected and analyzed the survey. The school presents results as a percentage of all families in the school, not as a percentage of respondents only.

Results

Provide a narrative of parents' responses.

2014-15 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
##	##	%

2014-15 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
	%
	%
	%
	%
	%

Evaluation

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure with a discussion of individual items, changes from previous years, areas of concern, etc.

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

Method

Provide a narrative explaining how students are tracked year to year

Results

Present a narrative describing number of students in various categories and the retention rate.

2015-16 Student Retention Rate

2013-14 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2013-14	Number of Students Who Returned in 2014-15	Retention Rate 2014-15 Re-enrollment ÷ (2013-14 Enrollment – Graduates)
#	#	#	%

Evaluation

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and how close the retention rate was to the target.

Additional Evidence

Year	Retention Rate
2013-14	%
2014-15	%
2015-16	

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

Method

Provide a narrative explaining how the school tracks student attendance and calculates its daily attendance rate.

Results

Provide a narrative describing the year's attendance rate.

Evaluation

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and how close the attendance rate was to the target.

Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2013-14	%
2014-15	%
2015-16	