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SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Excel Charter School is a K–8 public charter school in Canarsie, Brooklyn. Excel opened in 2011 and graduated its first class of 8th graders in 2017 to some of the top college-preparatory high schools in New York City. While Excel’s mission continues to be to provide students with the academic skills and critical-thinking abilities they need to succeed in a college-preparatory high school, we have honed the vision and priorities for how we go about achieving that mission. Our vision for instruction includes:

* We view excellent curriculum and instruction as a pathway to equity and a response to the opportunity gap by providing our scholars with access and opportunities to succeed
* Our curriculum is culturally responsive, rigorous, and standards aligned
* We believe children are natural problem solvers, and so we value teaching that balances critical thinking with learning new skills and knowledge
* We cultivate student investment by nurturing curiosity, providing high-quality feedback, and using data to drive our decision making

In the 2022-23 school year, Excel served 519 students as of BEDS Day (October 5, 2022).

For the 2022-23 school year, after a multi-year strategy to respond to students’ unfinished teaching and learning, Excel Charter School returned to many of the strategies that drove student growth prior to the pandemic, while expanding on the new supports put in place in the 2021-22 school year. Staff focused on strengthening data driven math instruction, adding writing opportunities within ELA, and expanding the resources for teachers when intellectually preparing for lessons.

The 2022-23 school year also saw the implementation of a fully aligned K-8 science curriculum with PhD science in grades K-5, Amplify Science in grades 6-7, and New Visions in 8th grade to prepare students to take the HS Regents Living Environment exam.

We expanded our focus on SEL programs by implementing Morning Meeting across all grades to create positive, equitable environments fostering relationship building and supporting students in developing their self-awareness, self-control, and interpersonal skills.

Finally, through expanded support from the network, we introduced new family engagement activities such as annual events bringing families together and periodic webinars on various topics from helping students with homework to understanding the math curriculum to learning about the school’s SEL programming.

ENROLLMENT SUMMARY

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| School Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | **Total** |
| 2020-21 | 52  | 58  | 58  | 67  | 66  | 57  | 76  | 71  | 67  | 572  |
| 2021-22 | 53 | 46 | 57 | 55 | 57 | 60 | 69 | 63 | 63 | 519 |
| **2022-23** | **48** | **57** | **54** | **66** | **54** | **55** | **70** | **73** | **56** | **533** |

GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

## Background

For the 2022-23 school year, Excel Charter School continued to use the Core Knowledge Language Arts (CKLA) Skills and Knowledge Strands for grades K–2 and EL Education (formerly known as Expeditionary Learning) in grades 3–8.

K–2

Excel’s early literacy curriculum focuses on developing phonological awareness, building content knowledge and vocabulary, and developing comprehension skills. Excel uses the Core Knowledge Language Arts (CKLA) program as the main curriculum. CKLA has two program strands: Knowledge and Skills. CKLA’s two strand program is research-based and provides extensive support for students as they become critical readers and writers.

According to CKLA, the **Knowledge** Strand emphasizes comprehension skill development in a language- and knowledge-rich context. The primary instructional activity is a read-aloud that exposes students to complex texts, related to a systematically ordered set of topics, or domains. The materials are designed to build knowledge in areas of history, science, literature, and geography. The lesson activities emphasize vocabulary acquisition, build comprehension skills through interactive discussions during and after reading, and use writing to extend and explore the texts and their content.The**Skills** strand is a comprehensive, explicit, and systematic phonics program designed to build decoding, fluency, and writing/spelling skills.

In addition to the CKLA Program, Excel’s K-2 literacy program also includes: Independent Reading, Small Group Instruction, Play Labs, and Interactive Read Aloud as supplemental supports for comprehension development, skill practice, and discourse.

3–8

Our literacy program is designed to help our students become successful readers and life-long learners who are prepared to thrive in college-preparatory high school programs and beyond.

Specifically, Exce; uses the EL Education curriculum as the primary resource for teaching literacy in grades 3–8. EL Education includes both reading and writing instruction as well as explicitly embedding the Speaking and Listening Standards. The curriculum is designed to address the three key components of the standards: (1) regular practice with complex text and its academic language, (2) reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from both literary and informational text, and (3) building knowledge through content-rich non-fiction. Based on the latest research supporting the power of background knowledge, EL modules are designed around topics that help students build background knowledge. Modules also include a blend of fiction and non-fiction complex texts. In each module, students have the opportunity to dig deeply into a high-interest topic by analyzing complex, grade-level texts and then completing performance tasks and assessments aligned to the standards.

In addition, we offer students four periods per week of Close Reading where they read short grade-level texts, dissect the main ideas and craft and structure moves in order to build independence as readers. Beginning in 20-21, Excel uses i-Ready as a diagnostic assessment tool as well as to progress monitor RTI and small group instruction.

Writing was also a focus for the 2022 – 23 school year. We improved our approach to writing both within our EL curriculum and across content areas. This has helped us utilize EL to its full capacity, highlighting the writing instruction it already contains as well as supplementing when needed. This was in service of improving collaboration and consistency in writing across content areas and throughout data cycles.

In the 22-23 school year, we focused on improving the quality and cultural relevance of texts students engaged with daily, providing more prescriptive and detailed guidance around teaching craft and structure, and providing more structure around explicit test sophistication strategies.

Students who required additional reading support in 22-23 received small group, targeted instruction using mCLASS intervention, Just Words, Wilson, or Leveled Literacy Intervention. Students who are Multi-Lingual Learners (MLLs) were offered SIOP. In our 12:1:1 program, our approach is to balance targeted instruction aligned to IEP goals through small group interventions with standards-aligned instruction through the EL Education curriculum.

In addition to their core literacy programming, each week, Excel’s students received four intensive periods of Close Reading. During Close Reading, students read short grade-level texts and analyzed the craft and structure moves the author used in service of the main idea and deepest meaning of the text. Throughout Close Reading, students were taught transferable thinking that provided access to unlock the deepest meaning of any texts, across all subject matters. ESI’s Program Team continued to provide support directly to Excel’s leaders and teachers in these areas.

For our youngest students, Excel used the mCLASS DIBELS 8 assessment as the central literacy assessment in K-2. Data from the assessment was used to inform responsive instruction across core content blocks and small group instruction (SGI). Excel also continued use of Amplify Reading to provide personalized instructional support. Amplify Reading is an interactive, game-based platform that targets specific literacy skills for students based on their performance on the DIBELS 8.

Excel continued to use mCLASS Intervention as an additional curricular structure to provide enhanced support for students in response to mCLASS data. The mCLASS Intervention program groups students into SGI groups based on the highest-leverage skill they need support on and provides teachers with detailed scope and sequence and lessons for 2 weeks of intensive instruction with embedded progress monitoring.

For 3-8 students, Excel administered i-Ready diagnostic assessments during the beginning of the year, middle of the year and end of the year. These assessments determined beginning of the year RTI groups and well as informed small group intervention and cross curricular differentiated supports throughout the year.

Elementary and Middle ELA

ELA Measure 1 - Absolute

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

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

2022-23 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 | 60 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 62 |
| 4 | 49 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 51 |
| 5 | 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 57 |
| 6 | 64 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  | 68 |
| 7 | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 |
| 8 | 54 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 55 |
| **All** | **355** |  | **8** |  |  |  |  | **363** |

Performance on 2022-23 State English Language Arts Exam

By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | All Students  | Enrolled in at least their Second Year |
| Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient  | Number Tested  | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient  |
| 3 | 60 | 27 | 45.0% | 49 | 24 | 49.0% |
| 4 | 49 | 27 | 55.1% | 42 | 25 | 59.5% |
| 5 | 57 | 19 | 33.3% | 45 | 14 | 31.1% |
| 6 | 64 | 28 | 43.8% | 48 | 23 | 47.9% |
| 7 | 71 | 31 | 43.7% | 59 | 26 | 44.1% |
| 8 | 54 | 34 | 63.0% | 43 | 31 | 72.1% |
| **All**  | 355 | **166** | **46.8%** | **286** | **143** | **50.0%** |

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.

Schools are not required to report attainment of this measure for 2022-23. Subsequent to the completion of this document, the Institute may calculate and report out results to schools pending further information from the NYSED.

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.

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.[[2]](#footnote-2)

2022-23 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency |
| Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | All District Students\* |
| PercentProficient | Number Tested | PercentProficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | 49.0% | 49 | 43.9% | 640 |
| 4 | 59.5% | 42 | 50.2% | 669 |
| 5 | 31.1% | 45 | 45.5% | 767 |
| 6 | 47.9% | 48 | 38.8& | 744 |
| 7 | 44.1% | 59 | 46.7% | 781 |
| 8 | 72.1% | 43 | 53.7% | 854 |
| **All** | **50.0%** | **286** | **46.7%** | **4455** |

\*We do not believe that charter schools are included in the district’s proficiency and number of tested students. These may be revised later this year upon further data release if warranted.

ELA Measure 4 - Comparative

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

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the target for this measure. Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2022-23 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2021-22 results.[[3]](#footnote-3)

2021-22English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | PercentEconomically Disadvantaged | Percent of Students at Levels 3&4[[4]](#footnote-4) | Effect Size |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Actual | Predicted |
| 3 | 86.2% | 18.2 | 34.1 | -0.81 |
| 4 | 80.3% | 35.1 | 31.5 | 0.20 |
| 5 | 85.5% | 22.4 | 26.0 | -0.22 |
| 6 | 78.8% | 41.3 | 49.0 | -0.46 |
| 7 | 69.7% | 52.5 | 43.4 | 0.50 |
| 8 | 72.6% | 46.8 | 45.1 | 0.09 |
| **All** | **78.7%** | **36.4** | **38.5** | **-0.11** |

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.

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2022-23 analysis is not yet available. As such, schools are not required to report on this measure for 2022-23. The Institute will calculate and report out results to schools pending availability of the data.

## ELA Internal Exam Results

During 2022-23, in addition to the New York State 3rd – 8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in ELA: i-Ready

2022-23 i-Ready ELA Assessment End of Year Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Subgroup | Target  | Tested | Results | Met? |
| Measure 1: Each year, the school’s median percent progress to Annual Typical Growth of 3rd through 8th grade students will be equal to or greater than 100%.  | All students | 100% | 366 | 165% | Yes |
| Measure 2: Each year, the school’s median ​ percent progress to Annual Typical Growth​ of all 3rd through 8th grade students who were two or more grade levels below grade level in the fall will be equal to or greater than 110% by the spring assessment administration.​ | Low initial achievers | 110% | 155 | 181% | Yes |
| Measure 3: Each year, the median percent progress to Annual​ Typical Growth of 3rd through 8th grade students with disabilities at the school will be equal to or greater than the median percent progress to Annual Typical Growth of 3rd ​through 8th grade general education students at the school.   | Students with disabilities[[5]](#footnote-5) | 165% | 65 | 138% | No |

End of Year Performance on 2022-23 i-Ready ELA Assessment

By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grades | All Students  | Enrolled in at least their Second Year |
| Percent Mid-On Grade Level or Above | NumberTested  | Percent Mid-On Grade Level or Above | NumberTested  |
| 3 | 26.9% | 67 | 31.4% | 51 |
| 4 | 25.9% | 54 | 29.5% | 44 |
| 5 | 26.3% | 57 | 27.3% | 44 |
| 6 | 27.7% | 65 | 28.6% | 49 |
| 7 | 23.9% | 67 | 25.9% | 54 |
| 8 | 27.3% | 44 | 27.0% | 37 |
| **All**  | **26.3%** | **354** | **28.3%** | **279** |

End of Year Growth on 2022-23 i-Ready ELA Assessment

By All Students

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grades | Median Percent of Annual Typical Growth | NumberTested  |
| 3 | 134% | 62 |
| 4 | 132% | 53 |
| 5 | 100% | 58 |
| 6 | 206% | 68 |
| 7 | 235% | 71 |
| 8 | 179% | 54 |
| **All**  | **165%** | **366** |

## Additional CONTEXT AND Evidence

For iReady there are three additional measures and Excel Charter School met two them while falling short in one. With regards to all students, Excel set a goal for median percent progress toward annual growth of 100% or greater. Excel exceeded this goal with 165% median progress toward annual growth. For students who started the year 2 or more grade levels behind, this was even higher at 181%. While students with disabilities made an encouraging 138% growth, this fell short of the general education growth of 165% by 27 percentage points.

Goal 1: Additional Growth Measure

85% of students in KG-2 will reach or exceed their mCLASS growth goal or meet/exceed their grade level benchmark from 22-23 Beginning of Year to 22-23 End of Year.

## Method

Using the mCLASS assessment hosted by Amplify, students are tested regarding their early literacy skills at various points throughout the school year. Growth goals are determined by the platform based on beginning of year assessment/diagnostic and results are gathered in the spring as part of an end of year assessment.

## results and Evaluation

Performance on 22-23 mCLASS EOY

By All Students

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grades | All Students  |
| Met Measure | Number Tested |
| KG | 91.1% | 41 |
| 1 | 76.8% | 43 |
| 2 | 58.9% | 34 |
| **All**  | **74.5%** | **118** |

Excel did not meet this measure overall, falling short by 10.5 percentage points, however it met or surpassed the measure in Kindergarten, and came within 9 percentage points of meeting the measure in 1st grade. There is room for improvement in 2nd grade, where Excel fell short by 26.1 percentage points.

Goal 1: Additional Growth Measure

When comparing internal dress rehearsal data (multiple choice questions only) we will see schoolwide growth between 18-19 and the same assessment administered in 21-22.

## Method

Students in grades 3-8 are tested on a simulated state test assessment focusing on multiple choice responses. This assessment was administered in 18-19, 21-22 and 22-23 to measure growth and trends between the years.

## Results and evaluation

Performance on ELA Dress Rehearsal

By All Students in 18-19, 21-22 and 22-23

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grades | All Students in 18-19 | All Students in 21-22 | All Students in 22-23 |
| Met Measure | Number Tested | Met Measure | Number Tested | Met Measure | Number Tested |
| 3 | 16.7% | 54 | 6.0% | 50 | 33.9% | 59 |
| 4 | 19.0% | 58 | 10.2% | 59 | 25.0% | 48 |
| 5 | 23.2% | 56 | 20.7% | 58 | 24.6% | 57 |
| 6 | 12.7% | 55 | 4.8% | 63 | 4.7% | 64 |
| 7 | 12.3% | 57 | 11.3% | 53 | 14.3% | 63 |
| 8 | 12.5% | 48 | 19.0% | 58 | 55.6% | 45 |
| **All**  | **16.2%** | **328** | **12.0%** | **341** | **24.7%** | **336** |

Excel met this measure overall, exceeding overall proficiency 12.7 percent over 21-22 levels, and 8.5 percent over 18-19. There was positive growth in 5 of 6 grade levels, and double digit growth in 3 grades. The largest jump was in 8th grade, where Excel saw a 36.6 percent increase between 21-22 and 22-23.

## Summary of the ELA Goal

Overall, of the eight measures that could be evaluated given current data, Excel met four of them while falling short in four others.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure** | **Outcome** |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.  | Did Not Meet |
| 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. | N/A |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested studentswho 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.  | Did Not Meet |
| 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.  | N/A |
| Growth (iReady) | Each year, the school’s median percent progress to Annual Typical Growth of 3rd through 8th grade students will be equal to or greater than 100%.  | Met |
| Growth (iReady) | Each year, the school’s median ​ percent progress to Annual Typical Growth​ of all 3rd through 8th grade students who were two or more grade levels below grade level in the fall will be equal to or greater than 110% by the spring assessment administration.​ | Met |
| Growth (iReady) | Annual​ Typical Growth of 3rd through 8th grade students with disabilities at the school will be equal to or greater than the median percent progress to Annual Typical Growth of 3rd ​through 8th grade general education students at the school.   | Did Not Meet |
| Growth (mClass) | 85% of students in KG-2 will reach or exceed their mCLASS growth goal or meet/exceed their grade level benchmark from 22-23 Beginning of Year to 22-23 End of Year.  | Did Not Meet |
| Growth (Internal) | When comparing internal dress rehearsal data (multiple choice questions only), we will see growth between 18-19 schoolwide and the same assessment administered in 21-22 and 22-23. | Met |

## ELA Action Plan

**Curriculum, Teaching, and Learning**

As the Science of Reading has become more prominently recognized as a proven approach to a comprehensive literacy education, we have redoubled our efforts in the 2023-2024 school year to ensure that every element of our programming is aligned with the science of reading approach.

In 22-23, we separated one component of CKLA from its counterpart – Skills was taught by the classroom teacher, while one teacher taught the Core Knowledge component across all grades. In 23-24, in order to give our teachers a more holistic understanding of students’ progress and to facilitate the interconnection between skills acquisition, reading comprehension and writing, we are consolidating the teaching responsibilities of the entire CKLA program to one teacher. We believe that this streamlined approach will lead to more efficient and effective progress monitoring and will ultimately strengthen our foundational literacy outcomes. The network is providing monthly core knowledge domain unpacking sessions to teachers to develop their expertise in teaching the CKLA curriculum.

Additionally, K-2 leaders are utilizing a bi-monthly K-2 data snapshot to progress monitor student growth. This snapshot will include assessment data from Boost Usage, Skills assessments, and Core Knowledge assessments. Our K-2 leaders will use these snapshots to inform the planning foci of PLCs and one on one coaching meetings.

To build on our writing focus from 22-23, we have introduced assessed writing cycles across grades 3-8 approximately every 6 weeks. Students produce an on-demand writing assignment based on a grade level text(s) and a standards-aligned question. We are utilizing a 3-5 writing rubric and a 6-8 writing rubric to grade, identify grade level trends and clear reteaching opportunities and goals, and give students feedback on their work. We believe that a more consistent and systematic approach to progress monitoring our students’ writing will lead to stronger outcomes.

In grades 6-8, we added a fourth EL Education module this year to increase our students’ exposure to high-level topics, texts and tasks. In so doing, we are deepening our students’ background knowledge, exposure to content-specific vocabulary, and a variety of texts and genres – all aligned to the science of reading.

Across grades 3-8 we are utilizing a bi-monthly data snapshot to support progress monitoring of the grade level standards from our bi-weekly quizzes and set goals for standards mastery. This is new for 2023-24. We believe that by making our data visible and accessible to both leaders and teachers, we will be able to monitor more closely the progress and achievement of our students.

**Special Populations of Students (MLLs, Students with Disabilities):**

Aligned to our belief that all children can learn when immersed in a rich environment full of high expectations, rigorous academics, and caring, committed adults, Explore Schools has a multi-tiered system of support (“MTSS”) to meet the needs of all learners. Our multi-tiered system of support creates inclusive and equitable systems that ensure that all students have equal opportunities to learn and develop their social-emotional well-being at high levels. Our staff is equipped with the necessary tools and supports to cultivate identity, skills, intellect, and criticality in all of our students. The key components of our MTSS are:

* Strong core instruction at the tier 1 level, including responding to data to maximize student achievement.
* Strengths-based perspective to support students’ social, emotional, and behavioral needs.
* Universal screening to identify students in need of additional support.
* Progress monitoring for all students
* Multi-level prevention/tiered interventions
* Data-based decision making

In addition to ensuring that we provide high-quality mandated services, including SETSS, integrated co-teaching, 12:1:1 settings, and ENL services, we believe in using data to make informed decisions to support students in areas in which they need targeted support. Given this belief, we utilize a wide range of intervention programs, and we train our teachers to implement data-driven, student-centered, targeted instruction by collecting and closely analyzing assessments and student work. Our intervention programming includes mCLASS intervention, LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention), Wilson, Just Words, and iReady. We also offer targeted close reading, aligned to specific needs identified in our universal screening process. We consistently develop the skillset of our staff to provide effective intervention through network-led professional development, ongoing PLCs and RTI meetings, and individual teacher coaching. This year, we continue to focus on using progress monitoring data aligned to the interventions to ensure that students are progressing towards their growth goals.

GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

## Background

Excel’s approach to math instruction prioritizes focus and cohesiveness as New York State shifts to Next Generation Learning Standards, which balances rigor of conceptual understanding, procedural skill and fluency, and application in preparation for college and career. Excel implements research-based curricular resources that best support this vision for mathematical instruction. In grades K–8, Excel uses Navigator math, also known as Achievement First’s math curriculum. We also offer an Algebra 1 elective to 8th graders who are prepared to take on high school level standards. ESI’s Program Team continued to provide support directly to Excel’s leaders and teachers with a focus on strengthening instruction and data-driven practices.

Recognizing the learning loss that many of our students experienced in the latter half of the 19-20 school year and the disruption that followed in 20-21 as a result of the pandemic, Excel implemented a multi-year strategy to address unfinished teaching and learning. Through acceleration and just-in-time teaching, we were able address students’ gaps over time. In the 2022-23 school year, Excel ensured that all standards were taught ahead of the NYS exam, in alignment with the updated NYS Next Generation Standards Educators’ Guide. In service of this approach, Excel made significant changes to our pacing calendars, assessment strategies, and our approach to preparing for the tests. Excel returned to interim assessments and math quizzes in addition to a formalized preparation program leading up to the state exams. In support of all these changes, ESI’s Program Team worked to ensure Excel leaders had the tools, resources, and access to high-quality trainings for strong data analysis and response and standards-aligned math instruction.

To address the dip in performance from 2021-22 on the math state exam, Excel made the following changes in the 2022-23 school year:

* Excel shifted the scope and sequence to ensure that all tested standards are covered prior to the state exams and aligned to NYS Next Generation Standards implementation. This restructuring of the scope and sequence ensured the content on the state exam was not new or unfamiliar to students.
* Excel used its interim assessments in alignment with the updated Next Generation Standards to benchmark student progress across all grades. Excel moved away from using the interim assessment in 2021-22 to measure progress in favor of shorter, more frequent unit assessments to respond to students’ immediate learning gaps. However, those assessments did not provide staff with the means to measure year-over-year growth or anticipate NYS performance. Returning to the interim assessments better informed Excel on student progress and allow for more accurate data driven instruction.
* Excel returned to utilizing network bi-weekly quizzes in grades 3-8 and included K-2 starting in the second academic term to progress monitor. This gave teachers and leaders frequent data points to track progress. These quizzes will inform small group math instruction.
* With support and resources from ESI, Excel implemented a more explicit approach to teaching problem solving called the “strategic math plan,” which is rooted in visible behaviors observable in student work. This shift helped students understand and internalize math problems and make a plan to solve them.
* Finally, Excel provided opportunities for students to practice testing, including stamina and pacing.

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.

2022-23 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 | 60 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 63 |
| 4 | 51 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 53 |
| 5 | 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 58 |
| 6 | 64 |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 68 |
| 7 | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 71 |
| 8 | 54 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 55 |
| **All** | **358** |  | **9** |  |  |  | **1** |  | **368** |

Performance on 2022-23 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 | 60 | 39 | 65.0% | 49 | 33 | 67.3% |
| 4 | 51 | 39 | 76.5% | 42 | 37 | 88.1% |
| 5 | 58 | 22 | 37.9% | 46 | 19 | 41.3% |
| 6 | 64 | 25 | 39.1% | 48 | 19 | 39.6% |
| 7 | 71 | 40 | 56.3% | 59 | 37 | 62.7% |
| 8 | 54 | 32 | 59.3% | 43 | 29 | 67.4% |
| **All**  | **358** | **197** | **55.0%** | **287** | **174** | **60.6%** |

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.

Schools are not required to report attainment of this measure for 2022-23. Subsequent to the completion of this document, the Institute may calculate and report out results to schools pending further information from the NYSED.

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.

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.

2022-23 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grade | Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency |
| Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year | All District Students\* |
| PercentProficient | Number Tested | PercentProficient | Number Tested |
| 3 | 67.3% | 49 | 55.4% | 650 |
| 4 | 88.1% | 42 | 51.1% | 679 |
| 5 | 41.3% | 46 | 49.9% | 765 |
| 6 | 39.6% | 48 | 31.7% | 744 |
| 7 | 62.7% | 59 | 42.9% | 787 |
| 8 | 67.4% | 43 | 37.3% | 730 |
| **All** | **60.6%** | **287** | **44.4%** | **4355** |

\*We do not believe that charter schools are included in the district’s proficiency and number of tested students. These may be revised later this year upon further data release if warranted.

Math Measure 4 - Comparative

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

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 2022-23 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2021-22 results.

2021-22 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | PercentEconomically Disadvantaged | Percent of Students at Levels 3&4 | Effect Size |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Actual | Predicted |
| 3 | 86.2% | 36.4 | 34.3 | 0.10 |
| 4 | 80.3% | 35.1 | 30.2 | 0.24 |
| 5 | 85.5% | 24.1 | 22.8 | 0.07 |
| 6 | 78.8% | 14.5 | 27.8 | -0.69 |
| 7 | 69.7% | 33.3 | 28.4 | 0.26 |
| 8 | 72.6% | 24.6 | 19.4 | 0.27 |
| **All** | **78.7%** | **27.7** | **27.1** | **0.03** |

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.

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2022-23 analysis is not yet available. As such, schools are not required to report on this measure for 2022-23. The Institute will calculate and report out results to schools pending availability of the data.

## Mathematics Internal Exam Results

During 2022-23, in addition to the New York State 3rd – 8th grade exams, the school primarily used the following assessment to measure student growth and achievement in mathematics: Curriculum based

2022-23 Math Interim (IA) EOY Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measure | Subgroup | Target  | Tested | Results | Met? |
| Measure 1: 75% of students will increase their 21-22 EOY Math IA % correct by at least 30 points over their 20-21 EOY Math IA or meet the grade level benchmark.  | All students | 75% | 464 | 50.2% | No |

Performance on Math IA EOY

By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grades | All Students  | Enrolled in at least their Second Year |
| Met Measure | Number Tested | Met Measure | Number Tested |
| KG | 81.4% | 43 | 100% | 1 |
| 1 | 81.8% | 55 | 85% | 40 |
| 2 | 16.7% | 54 | 21% | 38 |
| 3 | 54.9% | 62 | 56.2% | 48 |
| 4 | 53.9% | 52 | 60.5% | 43 |
| 5 | 37.4% | 56 | 38.6% | 44 |
| 6 | 36.1% | 61 | 40% | 45 |
| 7 | 59% | 61 | 63.2% | 49 |
| 8 | 15% | 20 | 14.2% | 14 |
| **All**  | **50.2%** | **464** | **50.9%** | **322** |

## Additional CONTEXT AND Evidence

Excel did not meet the internal measure of 75% of students increasing their 22-23 EOY Math IA % correct by at least 30 points over their 21-22 EOY Math IA (or meet the grade level benchmark) and fell short by 24.8 percentage points for all students, and by 24.1 percentage points for 2nd year students. There were bright spots, with students in 3 grade levels exceeding this measure, including Kindergarten and 1st grade, who both exceeded the measure by more than 6 percentage points.

Goal 2: Additional Growth Measure

When comparing internal dress rehearsal data (multiple choice questions only), we will see growth between 18-19 and the same assessment administered in 21-22 and 22-23.

## Method

Students in grades 3-8 are tested on a simulated state test assessment focusing on multiple choice responses. This assessment was administered in 18-19 and 21-22 and 22-23 to measure growth and trends between the years.

## Results and Evaluation

Performance on Math Dress Rehearsal

By All Students in 18-19, 21-22 and 22-23

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grades | All Students in 18-19 | All Students in 21-22 | All Students in 22-23 |
| Met Measure | Number Tested | Met Measure | Number Tested | Met Measure | Number Tested |
| 3 | 35.7% | 56 | 19.2% | 52 | 46.8% | 62 |
| 4 | 66.1% | 59 | 28.8% | 59 | 76.6% | 47 |
| 5 | 58.9% | 56 | 27.6% | 58 | 46.6% | 58 |
| 6 | 49.1% | 55 | 14.5% | 62 | 41.5% | 65 |
| 7 | 51.7% | 58 | 55.8% | 52 | 62.1% | 66 |
| 8 | 39.6% | 48 | 8.9% | 42 | 67.4% | 43 |
| **All**  | **50.6%** | **332** | **26.2%** | **325** | **55.4%** | **341** |

Excel met this measure overall as well as at each grade level individually, exceeding overall proficiency by 29.2 percentage points when compared to 21-22 and by 4.8 percentage points when compared to 18-19. Excel saw double digit positive growth in 5 out of 6 grade levels when compared to 21-22 and was particularly strong in 4th grade and 8th grade, which each saw an over 45 percent increase year over year.

Goal 2: Additional Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested 8th grade students will perform at proficiency on the New York State Algebra I Regents.

## Method

A subset of students in 8th grade received a high school Algebra I curriculum throughout the 21-22 school year and sat for the June 2022 Algebra I Regents. Proficiency is defined by scoring a 65% or higher.

## Results and evaluation

Performance on a Regents Math Exam

Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | Regents Exam  | PercentPassing with a 65 | NumberTested  |
| 8 | 2017-18 | Algebra | 100% | 6 |
| 8 | 2018-19 | Algebra | 100% | 15 |
| 8 | 2021-22 | Algebra | 89.5% | 19 |
| 8 | 2022-23 | Algebra | 80.0% | 14 |

We are proud that we have met our goals on the Algebra Regents. Looking toward the 23-24 school year, we are looking for a greater percentage of students earning a mastery score of at least 80% and increasing the percent of students who have access to Regents level math.

## Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Overall, of the six measures that could be evaluated given current data, Excel met three of them while falling short in three others.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Measure** | **Outcome** |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State Mathematics exam for grades 3-8.  | Did Not Meet |
| 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. | N/A |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested studentswho 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.  | Did Not Meet |
| 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.  | N/A |
| Growth | 75% of students will increase their 21-22 EOY Math IA % correct by at least 30 points over their 20-21 EOY Math IA or meet the grade level benchmark.  | Did Not Meet |
| Growth | When comparing internal dress rehearsal data (multiple choice questions only), we will see growth between 18-19 and the same assessment administered in 21-22 and 22-23 | Met |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested 8th grade students will perform at proficiency on the New York State Algebra I Regents. | Met |

## Mathematics Action Plan

With the adoption of the Navigator curriculum, Excel elevated the level of rigor in math instruction for its students. Below, we outline the additional steps Excel is taking by grade band to continue to improve the quality of math instruction :

* **Grades K–4:** In 2022-23, Excel continued implementation of Achievement First’s Math Stories curriculum in grades K–4. Math Stories is a curriculum that uses strategically designed routines to help students develop a deep number sense and flexibility with numbers in order to support complex problem solving. Math Stories also provides students with an access point into basic math operations by using real life topics familiar to students. In the 2023-24 school year, we are increasing the training for teachers around implementing the 3-reads strategy during math stories instruction to give students a systematic approach to comprehending the story problem they are solving.

Excel’s K–8 grade math teachers participate in robust training designed to deepen their understanding of the math content and the critical thinking work students must engage with to show mastery of the standards. To continue bolstering differentiated, data-driven reteaching, we are implementing Khan Academy in our 3-8th grade classes and Khan Kids in our K-2 classes. Students engage with the Khan platform during our additional intervention blocks and teachers monitor their usage and progress on a regular basis. Excel offers additional math intervention blocks to respond to differentiated student needs and employ timely and effective interventions in addition to Khan Academy such as, small group instruction, mixed review of standards, and fact fluency. Interventions ensure students struggling with grade-level standards continue to get exposure to grade-level content while still remediating lagging skills.

**Special Populations:** During the 2022-23 school year, Excel’s Special Populations team continued to focus on responsive math groups to provide small group instruction. The aim was for small group instruction and SETSS to be aligned to the current classroom curriculum and aligned to data. We also piloted Tier 3 Math Interventions in 2022-2023 school year, seeking to identify a high-quality, standards-aligned, research-based intervention to support the needs of students identified as needing additional instruction. Based on these pilots, in 2023-2024, we have launched Do the Math for students in need of Tier 3 math intervention. Students are identified for these interventions based on our universal screening process, then placed in appropriate intervention groups using the intervention assessments. We closely monitor and respond to progress monitoring data to ensure that students are making appropriate growth towards their goals. Additionally, our 12:1:1 upper school math classrooms made the shift to using the Transmath curriculum to better serve our students in 12:1:1 placement. Transmath is a targeted, multi-sensory approach to teaching mathematics to students who are two or more years behind grade level which reflects the data of our 12:1:1 population. Our Transmath teachers have received training both from our network program team and also from Transmath developers.

**Approach to data-driven instruction**

In the 2022-23 school year, we implemented numerous data systems and structures to provide school leaders and teachers with actionable data to accelerate student learning. We’ve continued using a comprehensive data platform, PowerBI, to provide school leaders earlier access to assessment data that can be analyzed and compared across grades, schools, terms, and years.

We use a set of common benchmarks and measures for student performance in ELA and math. In collaboration with the school’s leadership, the network sets End of Year (EOY) measures tied to official assessments. They include:

* Math Interim Assessments
* Math and ELA Quizzes
* IReady for ELA
* mClass for ELA, and
* NYSESLAT

We did not name the ELA and Math NYS exams as a an EOY measure for 21-22, in service of focusing on unfinished learning and a multi-year strategy to address gaps in student learning resulting from the pandemic. This changed in 22-23, in addition to professional development time to support focused, data-driven analysis and response.

Aligned to the EOY measures, the network also sets cycle measures that identify intervals for improvement on internal assessments in order to be on track to meet EOY measures. In the 2022-23 school year, we used our Interim Assessments and quizzes for math in place of unit tests.

Moving into the 2023-24 school year, we will prioritize the following End of Year (EOY) measures:

* the mathematics and English language arts state exams,
* mCLASS
* iReady (Reading)
* Bi-weekly Reading Quizzes
* Math Interim Assessments
* Bi-weekly Math Quizzes

Progress toward benchmarks is tightly monitored, through bi-weekly data tracking of student outputs aligned to each measure, and through teacher observations, feedback, and professional development aligned to a focused set of teacher inputs. Almost all network-driven professional development and resource creation is aligned to the benchmarks with student outputs and teacher inputs identified termly. Student outputs are evaluated through student work analysis that indicates progress toward achieving the cycle and EOY measures. Teacher inputs are defined as observable strategies and actions teachers can take that will lead to the student outputs.

In 2023-2024, there is a continued commitment to professional development and oversight of data driven planning. Teachers and leaders facilitate formal data driven planning around key assessments. This planning includes reflection on progress toward measures, studying the assessment results to determine what students already know and what they don’t yet know, data driven lesson planning to close gaps, reassessment and reflection.

GOAL 3: SCIENCE

## Background

In 2022-23, Explore Schools implemented a cohesive K-5, 6-7, and grade 8 science program. In grades K-5, the science program used PhD Science by Great Minds. In Gr6-7, the science program was Amplify Science, and grade 8 was New Visions Living Environment. In 2022-23, Excel employed full-time K-2, 3-5, and 6-8 science teachers. Excel’s chosen science curricula is designed to promote inquiry, problem solving skills, and exposure to 21st century learning and skills. All three science curricula support rigorous, aligned instruction to NYS Next Generation Science standards.

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 8th grade in spring 2023. Only students that did not sit for the June 2023 Living Environment Regents sat for the Intermediate Science test, which explains the low participation numbers. The table below summarizes the performance of students enrolled for at least two years. There was no Elementary Science Test administered in Spring 2023 due to the shifting of examination schedules at the state level. 5th grade data will be provided in Spring 2024.

Charter School Performance on 2022-23 State Science Exam

By Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Grade | Students in At Least Their 2nd Year |
| Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient |
| 8 | 5 | 1 | 20.0% |
| All | 5 | 1 | 20.0% |

Excel did not meet this measure and fell short by 55 percentage points. This was the second year Excel administered the Living Environment exam to a majority of 8th graders, so only a few 8th grade students sat for the intermediate state science test.

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.

2022-23 State Science Exam

Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Charter School Students in at Least 2nd Year | All District Students |
| Grade | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Number Proficient | Percent Proficient  |
| 8 | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | TBD | TBD | TBD |
| All | 5 | 1 | 20.0% | TBD | TBD | TBD |

Science Measure 3 - Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all tested 8th grade students will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State Living Environment Regents.

Performance on a Regents Science Exam

Of 8th Grade All Students by Year

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Grade | Year | Regents Exam  | PercentPassing with a 65 | NumberTested  |
| 8 | 2018-19 | NA | NA | NA |
| 8 | 2021-22 | Living Environment | 53.3% | 45 |
| 8 | 2022-23 | Living Environment | 70.0% | 33 |

This was the second year Excel administered the Living Environment exam to a majority of 8th graders. Looking toward the 23-24 school year, we are looking for a greater percentage of students earning a mastery score of at least 80% and increasing the percent of students prepared to sit for the Living Environment Regents at the end of year.

## Summary of the Elementary/Middle Science Goal

Overall, of the two measures that could be evaluated given current data, Excel did not meet either measure, but came within 5 percentage points of reaching our measure on Living Environment Regents results. The outcome of the comparative measure regarding district scores will be determined once city and statewide data is released later this year.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.  | Did Not 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.  | TBD |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested 8th grade students will perform at proficiency on the New York State Living Environment Regents. | Did Not Meet |

## Science Action Plan

Science education has become a central focal point of Explore School’s strategic planning. In a world that has become so complex, science knowledge and skills are a necessity for comprehending current events and making informed decisions. Science is at the center for our abilities to innovate, lead and create in a world that is evolving quickly.

We are striving to support our students to develop scientific knowledge, skills, and thinking. We will do this by:

* Increasing the time and frequency of science coursework across K–5 to allow for developing and deepening of scientific learning.
* Adopting a NGSS science standards aligned science curriculum in K–5 to support the three dimensions of science learning: disciplinary core ideas (content), scientific and engineering practices, and cross-cutting concepts. Using NGSS science standards and the 5E method to teaching science as the shared framework for teaching and learning.
* Creating shared learning experiences for teachers to develop content and pedagogical practice with the three dimensions of science teaching and learning.
* Leveraging shared materials, resources, and assessments to support students having similarly rich, standards-aligned learning across all campuses.

For our 6–8 program, Excel is continuing to build a robust, high-quality science program that gives students a 21st century science experience. Excel Upper will continue to use Amplify Science, a high-quality curriculum that blends hands-on investigations with literacy rich tools to support students. Also rated highly by ED Reports, we expect that Amplify Science will help support Excel teachers in providing high-quality instruction in science. All 8th grade students at Excel will have the opportunity to take the Living Environment course, culminating with the Regents exam for qualifying students. Additionally, we are accelerating our science curriculum in 2023-2024 to ensure that all 7th graders are prepared to take the 8th grade state science test at the end of 7th grade ensuring that they can focus entirely on learning the Living Environment standards when they are in 8th grade the following year.  In 2023-24, all science teachers will continue to participate in network-wide professional development sessions during our staff in-service days. Additionally, Living Environment teachers will participate in periodic collaborative planning meetings to prepare for each unit of instruction.

In our K-5 program, we introduced and implemented a shared science curriculum and vision that will yield:

* Students having access, time, and experiences with NGSS science standards-aligned teaching and learning.
	+ Increasing science in grades K – 2 to four times a week
	+ Increasing science in grades 3 – 5 to four times a week for a full year
* Explicit alignment of teaching and learning to NGSS science standards with a shared science curriculum implemented with common pedagogical practices that incorporate the three dimensions of science learning.
* Proficiency of grade-level science content and performance as demonstrated on (and not limited to) written assessments, practices, and presentations.

Across 3-8, our students are also engaging in the NYS Science Investigations to support preparation for the upcoming revised state assessments.

We will measure the success of our curricular implementation through the following measures:

* Growth on our observation checklist rubric ratings from far from approaching to approaching.
* 100% of students who sit for Living Environment Regents pass.
* 75% class average on unit assessments
* Culminating network-wide science fair projects.

The network will support Excel with leadership coaching, resource development, and assessment creation and analysis.

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](http://www.nysed.gov/accountability/essa-accountability-designations).

Accountability Status by Year

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Year | Status |
| 2020-21 | Good Standing |
| 2021-22 | Good Standing |
| 2022-23 | Good Standing |

## Additional Context and Evidence

We have met this measure; Excel Charter School has been in good standing with ESSA for at least the last 3 school years where data is available.

1. Students are considered “enrolled in at least their second year” if they were enrolled on BEDS day of the school year prior to the most recent exam administration. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Schools can access these data when the NYSED releases its database containing grade level ELA and mathematics results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the releases of these data [here](https://www.nysed.gov/news/2023). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. These data can be found in the school’s Accountability Summary provided by the Institute in spring 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Typically, the Institute uses schools’ mean scale scores (when available) to calculate the comparative performance analysis. Due to the late availability of the 2021-22 mean scale scores, the Institute formally reported out the analysis using proficiency rates. The Institute will retroactively send schools the 2021-22 comparative performance analysis using mean scale scores in fall 2023. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)