Rochester Preparatory Elementary School 3

2016-17 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2017

By Amy Sponsler, Director of Operations

85 St. Jacob Street, Rochester, NY 14621

The Directors of Operations prepared this 2016-17 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Christopher Shaffer has served as the Principal since 2016.

The mission of True North Rochester Preparatory Charter School ("Rochester Prep") is to prepare all students to enter and succeed in college through effort, achievement and the content of their character. All Rochester Prep students will demonstrate excellence in reading, writing, math, science, and history, while consistently exemplifying the virtues of diligence, integrity, responsibility, compassion, perseverance and respect.

Rochester Prep ensures that students develop the skills, knowledge, and character necessary to grant them full access to opportunity and prosperity, including enrollment and success in college. The school features a rigorous academic program that guides students to meet the highest standards and at the same time develops young men and women of character and integrity.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year										
School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2012-13										
2013-14										
2014-15										
2015-16										
2016-17	90									90

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at the school will become proficient in reading and writing of the English language.

BACKGROUND

Rochester Prep's curriculum is developed with the goal of maximizing student academic achievement through intentional standards-driven teaching and the systematic use of objective performance data to continually inform decision making. To this end, Rochester Prep middle school created a scope and sequence for reading and writing and divided the year into units, each culminating in a formal assessment. During the 2013-2014 school year, Rochester Prep began to develop its scopes, sequences, and assessments in alignment with the Common Core Learning Standards. Rochester Prep continued to refine this process during the past three school years.

Each academic year, Rochester Prep uses three formative assessments in ELA, each aligned to state standards and to the school's scope and sequence. Starting in August, teachers and administrators develop curricular strategy, unit plans and daily lessons based upon the scope and sequence. At the close of each unit, an assessment is administered, graded and data produced so that teachers and administrators develop action plans based upon objective, standards-driven data. The principal and leadership team work closely with teachers at every step of this process, giving feedback on daily lesson plans, curriculum, action plans and the implementation of these plans.

Rochester Prep's ELA program emphasizes both strong reading and strong writing. In reading the program emphasizes four key aspects of literacy: decoding, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. In the elementary school grades (K-4) there are 3 literacy blocks of 50 minutes each day and students are broken up into groups based on STEP (Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress) levels. In the literacy blocks, students focus on reading mastery, guided reading, and reading comprehension. Students spend 45 minutes writing daily, in addition to the 3 literacy blocks.

In the middle school grades (5-8), in 2014-2015 we moved away from separate Reading and Writing classes. Instead, students had a 2 hour English class. This was done again this year as it aligns more accurately to the Common Core Learning Standards, whereby students' written work must be based on a text they have read.

Every year Rochester Prep provides teachers with an intense training program where we instruct teaching and student behavior management techniques and strategies to employ in their classrooms and throughout the school. We achieve complete consistency throughout the school with regard to behavior and academic standards.

Additionally, all staff meets one day each week to review the past week's progress and to finalize preparations for the coming week. Teachers are regularly observed teaching by the school leadership and receive constant feedback for improvement.

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

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts ("ELA") assessment to students in [X] through [Y] grade in April 2017. 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).

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

**2016 17 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

RESULTS

Not applicable.

**Performance on 2016 17 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

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

---

[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.

6				
7				
8				
All				

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
Grade	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

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 PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 English language arts AMO of **111**. 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

Not applicable.

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

English Language Arts 2016 17 Performance Level Index

$$PI = [?] + [?] + [?] = [?]$$
$$[?] + [?] = \underline{?}$$
$$PLI = [?]$$

---

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

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

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 school district of comparison.

METHOD

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

RESULTS

Not applicable.

	2016 17 State English Language Arts Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level			
	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
Grade	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District by Grade Level and School Year

---

[3] 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.

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
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 SUNY Charter Schools Institute ("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 Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. 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 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

Not applicable.

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						

MATHEMATICS

8						
All						

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

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

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						
2014-15						
2015-16						

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 2015-16 and also have a state exam score from 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 score are ranked by their 2015-16 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains <u>2015-16</u> results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[5]

---

[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.

MATHEMATICS

RESULTS

Not applicable.

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

2015 16 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

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

	Mean Growth Percentile			
Grade	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

Not applicable.

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.	
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	
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 2015-16 results.)	
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile. (Using 2015-16 results.)	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

ACTION PLAN

Not applicable.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will achieve mastery of skills in Mathematics.

BACKGROUND

Rochester Prep's Mathematics program emphasizes both strong computational procedures and problem solving skills. The math program at Rochester Prep takes arithmetic concepts and breaks them down to concrete, step-by-step approaches toward solving problems. At Rochester Prep, math instruction incorporates a rigorous balance between mechanics and problem solving.

In the elementary school, there is one 65-minute block of math a day that focuses on number sense, number systems, and problem-solving. During this block, students chant, act out, and model math with activities and math manipulatives.

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 [X] through [Y] grade in April 2017. 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.

2016 17 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

MATHEMATICS

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

RESULTS

Not applicable.

Performance on 2016 17 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year				

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

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year						
Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested

---

[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.

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 PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 mathematics AMO of **109**. 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

Not applicable.

Mathematics 2016 17 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

Not applicable.

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 school district of comparison.

---

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

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of 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.[8]

RESULTS

Not applicable.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5">2016 17 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">Grade</td><td colspan="4">Percent of Students at Proficiency</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year</td><td colspan="2">All District Students</td></tr>
<tr><td>Percent</td><td>Number Tested</td><td>Percent</td><td>Number Tested</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>7</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>8</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>All</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

---

[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.

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Local District by Grade Level and School Year

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 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 Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. 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 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 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

Not applicable.

MATHEMATICS

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

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

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

> **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.

---

[9] See Guidelines for <u>Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan</u> for an explanation.

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 2015-16 and also have a state exam score in 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 scores are ranked by their 2015-16 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[10]

Not applicable.

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
All		50.0

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

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

---

[10] Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Not applicable.

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.	
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 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.	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

ACTION PLAN

Not applicable.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
Students will demonstrate mastery of skills and knowledge in Science.

BACKGROUND

Rochester Prep's Science curriculum takes a comprehensive instructional look at Science standards over the course of five grades, 4 through 8. The Science program has expanded in scope and depth as the school has grown over the past eight years.

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 2017. 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

Not applicable.

Charter School Performance on 2016 17 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year				
	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
Grade	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8				
All				

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year	
Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY TABLES

		2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
		Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
	4						
	8						
	All						

METHOD

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.

RESULTS

Not applicable.

2016 17 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4				
8				
All				

EVALUATION

Not applicable.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Not applicable.

Science Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter	District	Charter	District	Charter	District

	School		School		School	
4						
8						
All						

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Not applicable.

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.	
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.	
	[Write in optional measure here]	

ACTION PLAN

Not applicable.

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB

The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as 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

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, Rochester Prep was deemed to be in "Good Standing."

EVALUATION

The goal has been achieved.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

NCLB Status by Year	
Year	Status
2014-15	
2015-16	
2016-17	Good Standing