

| TABLE 1: Absolute Performance - NYS ELA Examination | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress toward attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | % of Students Levels 3 and 4 | Goal Met Y/N | |
| Each year, 75% of 3 rd through 8 th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination. | 3 | NYS ELA Examination | 2010-11 | | <p>Literacy has been an ongoing focus of TRCS during this charter term. To support growth and achievement in ELA in the elementary and middle school programs, TRCS added instructional capacity including certified reading specialists to support struggling students in Grades 3-8, a dual certified English and literacy teacher for grade 7 ELA and middle school Reading and Writing Lab and a Collaborative Team Teaching model in a number of grades within the elementary and middle school to support these classes of students. In addition, TRCS’s middle school Director of Teaching and Learning was also charged with overseeing the middle school’s ELA improvement initiative, working with English teachers both in and out of class. TRCS also made an important change in the School Management Team responsibilities by including a Director of Teaching and Learning dedicated to grade K-5 curriculum and teaching support.</p> <p>TRCS has provided teachers with a significant amount of targeted professional development around literacy instruction. This PD included (1) training in implementing the Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Reading System to assess and address reading weaknesses in their students, (2) working in curriculum groups to support literacy within other disciplines, working in Professional Learning Communities supported by the Director of Data and Accountability and Directors of Teaching and Learning to analyze student data from interim assessments and revise instruction as needed, (3) implementing the Junior Great Books curriculum (to support shared inquiry and critical thinking skills), (4) Reading in the Content Area PD for middle school teachers, (5) Teachers College Writing Workshop PD for K-5 teachers, among other areas. Further, TRCS has been utilizing the Danielson Framework for Teaching to support highly effective teaching.</p> <p>TRCS also introduced new curricular materials to support the increased rigor of the CCLS. Among them, TRCS has been utilizing the EngageNY ELA modules, Wilson Reading and Foundations in grades K-8 for reading intervention, TC Writing Workshop Model for Grades 7 and 8.</p> |
| | | | 52.0% | N | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 80.0% | Y | |
| | | | 2012-13 | | |
| | | | 34.8% | N | |
| | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | 43.5% | | N | | |
| | 4 | | 2010-11 | | |
| | | | 46.2% | N | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 65.4% | N | |
| | | | 2012-13 | | |
| | | | 15.4% | N | |
| | 5 | | 2013-14 | | |
| | | | 37.5% | N | |
| | | | 2010-11 | | |
| | | | 76.0% | Y | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 48.1% | N | |
| | 6 | | 2012-13 | | |
| 13.7% | | N | | | |
| 2013-14 | | | | | |
| 15.1% | | N | | | |
| 2010-11 | | | | | |
| 64.9% | | N | | | |
| 7 | 2011-12 | | | | |
| | 77.8% | Y | | | |
| | 2012-13 | | | | |
| | 26.4% | N | | | |
| | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | 29.6% | N | | | |
| 7 | 2010-11 | | | | |
| | 38.9% | N | | | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| | | | |
|------------|----------|---------|---|
| | | 2011-12 | |
| | | 64.2% | N |
| | | 2012-13 | |
| | | 37.0% | N |
| | | 2013-14 | |
| | | 27.8% | N |
| | 8 | 2010-11 | |
| | | 45.3% | N |
| | | 2011-12 | |
| | | 42.9% | N |
| | | 2012-13 | |
| | | 37.7% | N |
| 3-8 | 2013-14 | | |
| | 41.5% | N | |
| | 2010-11 | | |
| | 54.9% | N | |
| | 2011-12 | | |
| | 60.8% | N | |
| | 2012-13 | | |
| | 28.1% | N | |
| | 2013-14 | | |
| | | 30.6% | N |

| TABLE 2: Absolute Performance - NYS Mathematics Examination | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress toward attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | % of Students Levels 3 and 4 | Goal Met Y/N | |
| Each year, 75% of 3 rd through 8 th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination. | 3 | NYS Math Examination | 2010-11 | | <p>Math has also been an ongoing focus of TRCS during this charter term. To support growth and achievement in math in the elementary and middle school programs, introduced new curriculum, professional development for teachers from outside consultants and within the PLCs; data driven analysis that supports student groupings, differentiation and re-teaching; building literacy proficiencies with highly qualified reading teachers out of recognition that literacy challenges were also impeding students' math problem solving skills; promoting math and literacy skills in other content areas and utilizing the Danielson Framework for Teaching to support highly effective teaching.</p> <p>Among the new curricula that TRCS introduced were Singapore Math for K-5 and Go Math for Grades 6-8. TRCS also utilized the EngageNY Math modules to support math curriculum and instruction. TRCS staff was supported by intensive professional development support in the implementation of Singapore Math and Go Math.</p> <p>TRCS also engaged an external math consultant to support the major shifts as a result of CCLS in mathematics instruction in the middle school. This support included multiple days of PD at the start of the school year and ongoing planning through the school year.</p> |
| | | | 56.0% | N | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 88.0% | Y | |
| | | | 2012-13 | | |
| | | | 52.2% | N | |
| | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | 43.5% | | N | | |
| | 4 | | 2010-11 | | |
| | | | 53.8% | N | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 76.9% | Y | |
| | | | 2012-13 | | |
| | | | 19.2% | N | |
| | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | 50.0% | | N | | |
| | 5 | | 2010-11 | | |
| | | | 94.4% | Y | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 64.8% | N | |
| | | | 2012-13 | | |
| | | | 27.8% | N | |
| | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | 38.9% | | N | | |
| | 6 | | 2010-11 | | |
| | | | 77.3% | Y | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 88.9% | Y | |
| 2012-13 | | | | | |
| 34.0% | | N | | | |
| 2013-14 | | | | | |
| 20.4% | N | | | | |
| 7 | 2010-11 | | | | |
| | 75.9% | Y | | | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| | | | | |
|---------|-------|---|---------|---|
| | | | 2011-12 | |
| | | | 86.8% | Y |
| | | | 2012-13 | |
| | | | 51.9% | N |
| | | | 2013-14 | |
| | 42.6% | | N | |
| | 8 | | 2010-11 | |
| | | | 66.0% | N |
| | | | 2011-12 | |
| | | | 76.8% | Y |
| | | | 2012-13 | |
| | | | 40.7% | N |
| | 3-8 | | 2013-14 | |
| | | | 51.9% | N |
| | | | 2010-11 | |
| 74.0% | | N | | |
| 2011-12 | | | | |
| 79.9% | | Y | | |
| 2012-13 | | | | |
| 37.9% | N | | | |
| 2013-14 | | | | |
| 39.9% | N | | | |

| TABLE 3: Absolute Performance - NYS Science Examination | | | | | |
|---|---------------|--|------------------------------|--------------|--|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress toward attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | % of Students Levels 3 and 4 | Goal Met Y/N | |
| Each year, 75% of 4 th and 8 th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination. | 4 | NYS Science Examination | 2010-11 | | In the first year of the renewal term, TRCS met in PLCs to look more closely at the science assessment data to inform revisions in science instruction. TRCS also reviewed and revised its 8 th grade science skills curriculum to more closely align instruction to the NYS standards inclusive of CCLS and students' identified needs. The results clearly were very positive as TRCS students met the goal in each subsequent year. |
| | | | 65.4% | N | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 92.3% | Y | |
| | | | 2012-13 | | |
| | | | 88.5% | Y | |
| | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | 91.7% | | Y | | |
| | 8 | | 2010-11 | | |
| | | | 73.4% | N | |
| | | | 2011-12 | | |
| | | | 76.8% | Y | |
| | | | 2012-13 | | |
| | | | 88.7% | Y | |
| | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | 90.4% | | Y | | |
| | Total 4 and 8 | | 2010-11 | | |
| 70.9% | | N | | | |
| 2011-12 | | | | | |
| 81.7% | | Y | | | |
| 2012-13 | | | | | |
| 88.6% | Y | | | | |
| 2013-14 | | | | | |
| 90.8% | Y | | | | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| TABLE 4: Absolute Performance – ECLAS-2 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|--|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress toward attainment of goal or objective | 2010-11 | Goal Met Y/N | 2011-12 | Goal Met Y/N | 2012-13 | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| 75% or more of students in Grades K-2 will score at or above the specified level on the specified strands indicated in this chart. | Grade K | ECLAS-2 | % of students at Level 1 | | | | | | TRCS added instructional capacity to support early literacy achievement and address identified gaps. Full time paraprofessionals were added to each of the Kindergarten and first grade classes to support literacy development and more individualized support for students. TRCS implemented Wilson Reading and Foundations in the early grade classrooms to support basic reading skills. |
| | | Rhyme recognition | 78% | Y | 100% | Y | 100% | Y | |
| | | Rhyme generation | 82% | Y | 96% | Y | 87% | Y | |
| | | Syllable clapping | 100% | Y | 96% | Y | 100% | Y | |
| | | Initial Consonants | 91% | Y | 96% | Y | 100% | Y | |
| | | Total Level 1 | 88% | Y | 97% | Y | 97% | Y | |
| | | ECLAS-2 | % of students at Level 2 | | | | | | |
| | | Final consonants | 87% | Y | 96% | Y | 96% | Y | |
| | | Blending | 61% | N | 40% | N | 91% | Y | |
| | | Segmenting | 22% | N | 78% | Y | 83% | Y | |
| | | ABC recognition | 65% | N | 100% | Y | 100% | Y | |
| | | Alphabet Writing | 17% | N | NA* | | 65% | N | |
| | | Spelling | 74% | N | 100% | Y | 96% | Y | |
| | | Decoding | 48% | N | 68% | N | 91% | Y | |
| | | Sight words | 70% | N | 60% | N | 100% | Y | |
| | Emergent reading strands | 70% | N | NA* | | 100% | Y | | |
| | Total Level 2 | 57% | N | NA* | | 91% | Y | | |
| | Total Level 1 and 2 | 72% | N | NA* | | 94% | Y | | |
| | Grade 1 | ECLAS-2 | % of students at or above Level 4 | | | | | | |
| | Spelling | 80% | Y | 100% | Y | 73% | N | | |
| | Decoding | 60% | N | 88% | Y | 91% | Y | | |
| | Vocabulary | 72% | N | 95% | Y | 95% | Y | | |
| | Sight words | 84% | Y | 95% | Y | 100% | Y | | |
| | Reading accuracy | 80% | Y | 100% | Y | 91% | Y | | |
| | Reading compr. | 80% | Y | 100% | Y | 91% | Y | | |
| | Total Level 4 | 76% | Y | 95% | Y | 90% | Y | | |
| | Grade 2 | ECLAS-2 | % of students at or above Level 6 | | | | | | |
| | Spelling | 71% | N | 40% | N | 67% | N | | |
| Decoding | NA* | | NA* | | 96% | Y | | | |
| Vocabulary | 67% | N | 76% | Y | 88% | Y | | | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----|----|-----|---|-----|---|--|
| | | Sight words | NA* | N | 80% | | 96% | Y | |
| | | Reading accuracy | 71% | N | 88% | Y | 92% | Y | |
| | | Reading compr | 71% | N | NA* | | 92% | Y | |
| | | Total Level 6 | NA | NA | NA | | 89% | Y | |

*Due to a testing administration misunderstanding, the asterisked strands were not administered, thus total proficiency at the indicated Level could not be determined.

| TABLE 5: Absolute Performance – Fountas & Pinnell | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--|------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress toward attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | % of Students Levels 3 and 4 | Goal Met Y/N | |
| <p>By the end of the year, 80% of the Kindergarten students who were enrolled on BEDS day will perform at or above Level B on the F&P A-Z Text Level Gradient.</p> <p>By the end of the year, 80% of 1st graders and 80% of 2nd graders who were enrolled at the School on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above a Level G and at or above a Level K, respectively, on the F&P A-Z Text Level Gradient.</p> | K | F&P A-Z Text Gradient | 2013-14 | | TRCS lost the Kindergarten teacher mid-year due to health reasons and this impacted the performance of this class. TRCS hired a highly experienced first grade teacher who will be the teacher for this class in 2014-15 and is confident that this class will experience greater growth and achievement. |
| | | | 65.2% | N | |
| | 1 | | 2013-14 | | |
| | | | 91.3% | Y | |
| | 2 | | 2013-14 | | |
| | | | 85.7% | Y | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| TABLE 6: Value Added Performance - NYS ELA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results % Of Students | | | | | | | | | | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective | |
| | | | 2010-11 | | | | 2011-12 | | | | 2012-13 | | | | |
| | | | % at Level 3 or 4, 2009-10 | Target % for 2010-11 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2010-11 | Goal Met Y/N | % at Level 3 or 4, 2010-11 | Target % for 2011-12 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2011-12 | Goal Met Y/N | % at Level 3 or 4, 2011-12 | Target % for 2012-13 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2012-13 | | Goal Met Y/N |
| Each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam (Baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA exam. If the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceed 75% on the previous year's ELA exam, the school is expected to | 4 | NYS ELA | 44.0 % | 59.5% | 46.2% | N | 52.0% | 64.0% | 65.4% | Y | 80.0% | >80% | 15.4% | N | See response in Table 1. |
| | 5 | | 80.0 % | > 80.0% | 76.0% | N | 46.2% | 60.6% | 48.1% | N | 65.4% | 70.2% | 13.7% | N | |
| | 6 | | 60.0 % | 67.5% | 64.9% | N | 76.0% | > 76.0% | 77.8% | Y | 48.1% | 61.6% | 26.4% | N | |
| | 7 | | 52.0 % | 63.5% | 38.9% | N | 64.9% | 70.0% | 64.2% | N | 77.8% | > 77.8% | 37.0% | N | |
| | 8 | | 53.0 % | 64.0% | 45.3% | N | 38.9% | 57.0% | 42.9% | N | 64.2% | 69.6% | 37.7% | N | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| demonstrate some growth (above 75%) in the current year. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| TABLE 6 continued: Value Added Performance - NYS ELA | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results % Of Students | | | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | | | % at Level 3 or 4, 2012-13 | Target % for 2013-14 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2013-14 | Goal Met Y/N | |
| Each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam (Baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA exam. If the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceed 75% on the previous year's ELA exam, the school is expected to demonstrate some growth (above 75%) in the current year. | 4 | NYS ELA | 34.8% | 54.9% | 37.5% | N | |
| | 5 | | 15.4% | 45.2% | 15.1% | N | |
| | 6 | | 13.7% | 44.4% | 29.6% | N | |
| | 7 | | 26.4% | 50.7% | 27.8% | N | |
| | 8 | | 37.0% | 56.0% | 41.5% | N | |

| TABLE 7: Value Added Performance - NYS Math | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results % Of Students | | | | | | | | | | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective | |
| | | | 2010-11 | | | | 2011-12 | | | | 2012-13 | | | | |
| | | | % at Level 3 or 4, 2009-10 | Target % for 2010-11 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2010-11 | Goal Met Y/N | % at Level 3 or 4, 2010-11 | Target % for 2011-12 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2011-12 | Goal Met Y/N | % at Level 3 or 4, 2011-12 | Target % for 2012-13 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2012-13 | | Goal Met Y/N |
| Each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Math exam (Baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Math exam. If the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceed 75% on the | 4 | NYS Math | 52.0% | 63.5% | 53.8% | N | 56.0% | 65.5% | 76.9% | Y | 88.0% | > 88.0% | 19.2% | N | See Response in Table 2. |
| | 5 | | 92.0% | > 92.0% | 94.4% | Y | 53.8% | 64.6% | 64.8% | Y | 76.9% | > 76.9% | 27.8% | N | |
| | 6 | | 85.0% | > 85.0% | 77.3% | N | 94.4% | > 94.4% | 88.9% | N | 88.9% | > 88.9% | 34.0% | N | |
| | 7 | | 61.5% | 75.0% | 75.9% | Y | 77.3% | > 77.3% | 86.8% | Y | 86.8% | > 86.8% | 51.9% | N | |
| | 8 | | 79.0% | > 79.0% | 66.0% | N | 75.9% | > 75.9% | 76.8% | N | 76.8% | > 76.8% | 40.7% | N | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| previous year's Math exam, the school is expected to demonstrate some growth (above 75%) in the current year. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| TABLE 7 continued: Value Added Performance – NYS Math | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Grade Level | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results % Of Students | | | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | 2013-14 | | | | |
| | | | % at Level 3 or 4, 2012-13 | Target % for 2013-14 | % at Level 3 or 4, 2013-14 | Goal Met Y/N | |
| Each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Math exam (Baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Math exam. If the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceed 75% on the previous year's Math exam, the school is expected to demonstrate some growth (above 75%) in the current year. | 4 | NYS Math | 52.2% | 63.6% | 50.0% | N | |
| | 5 | | 19.2% | 47.1% | 38.9% | N | |
| | 6 | | 27.8% | 51.4% | 20.4% | N | |
| | 7 | | 34.0% | 54.5% | 42.6% | N | |
| | 8 | | 51.9% | 63.5% | 51.9% | N | |

| TABLE 8: High School and Post-Secondary Success Goals—New York State Regents Examinations | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---|--|--|
| Academic goal or objective | Regents Exam | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results | | | | | | | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective | | |
| | | | % Of Students | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | % Receiving at least a 65 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 2010-11 | Goal Met Y/N | 2011-12 | Goal Met Y/N | 2012-13 | Goal Met Y/N | 2013-14 | Goal Met Y/N | | | |
| Each year, 75% of the 9 th grade cohort will have scored at least a 65 on the New York State Regents examinations in English, Math, Global Studies and Science by the end of their fourth year at the school. | English | NYS Regents Examinations | 96% | Y | 96% | Y | 89% | Y | 81% | Y | | | |
| | Integrated Algebra | | 89% | Y | 90% | Y | 80% | Y | 84% | Y | | | |
| | Living Environment | | 91% | Y | 98% | Y | 78% | Y | 82% | Y | | | |
| | Global History & Geography | | 78% | Y | 86% | Y | 77% | Y | 76% | Y | | | |

| TABLE 9: High School and Post-Secondary Success Goals—Graduation Rates | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|---|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | School Year | Measure used to evaluate progress toward attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | % of 9 th grade cohort which Graduated in Four Years | Goal Met Y/N | |
| Each year, at least 80% of each 9 th grade cohort will graduate within four years. | 2011 | Receipt of High School Diploma | 98% | Y | |
| | 2012 | | 94% | Y | |
| | 2013 | | 90% | Y | |
| | 2014 | | 86% | Y | |

| TABLE 10: High School and Post-Secondary Success Goals—AYP Graduation Rate Targets | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|-------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | School Year | Measure used to evaluate progress toward attainment of goal or objective | Academic Results | | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | Made AYP Graduation Rates Y/N | Goal Met Y/N | |
| Each year, the school will meet AYP Graduation Rate Targets | 2011 | NYSED Accountability Report/NYSTART AYP Results | Y | Y | |
| | 2012 | | Y | Y | |
| | 2013 | | Y | Y | |
| | 2014 | | Y | Y | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| TABLE 11: Comparison of TRCS Performance Against CSD 30 and New York City—New York State ELA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------|--------|--------------------------|------|--------|--------------|------|--------|--------------|------|--------|--------------|
| % Students Scoring at Least a Level 3 on the NYS ELA Assessment (2011-2014) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Each year, the % of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the CSD in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of the performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYCDOE. | Grade | 2011 | | | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | 2014 | | |
| | | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N |
| | 3 | 52% | 50% | Y | 80% | 53% | Y | 35% | 31% | Y | 44% | 34% | Y |
| | 4 | 46% | 52% | N | 65% | 55% | Y | 15% | 29% | N | 38% | 34% | Y |
| | 5 | 76% | 57% | Y | 48% | 56% | N | 15% | 33% | N | 15% | 30% | N |
| | 6 | 65% | 50% | Y | 78% | 54% | Y | 26% | 27% | N | 30% | 28% | Y |
| | 7 | 39% | 45% | N | 64% | 53% | Y | 37% | 33% | Y | 28% | 31% | N |
| | 8 | 45% | 43% | Y | 43% | 47% | N | 37% | 31% | Y | 41% | 35% | Y |
| | All Grades | 55% | 49% | Y | 61% | 53% | Y | 28% | 31% | N | 31% | 32% | N |
| If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective | | | | See Response in Table 1. | | | | | | | | | |

| TABLE 12: Comparison of TRCS Performance Against CSD 30 and New York City—New York State Math | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------|------|--------|--------------------------|------|--------|--------------|------|--------|--------------|------|--------|--------------|
| % Students Scoring at Least a Level 3 on the NYS Math Assessment (2011-2014) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Each year, the % of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the CSD in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of the performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYCDOE. | Grade | 2011 | | | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | 2014 | | |
| | | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N | TRCS | CSD 30 | Goal Met Y/N |
| | 3 | 56% | 56% | N | 88% | 63% | Y | 52% | 35% | Y | 44% | 42% | Y |
| | 4 | 54% | 66% | N | 77% | 72% | Y | 19% | 39% | N | 50% | 44% | Y |
| | 5 | 94% | 71% | Y | 65% | 70% | N | 28% | 33% | N | 39% | 41% | N |
| | 6 | 77% | 65% | Y | 89% | 69% | Y | 34% | 37% | N | 20% | 42% | N |
| | 7 | 76% | 67% | Y | 87% | 79% | Y | 52% | 33% | Y | 43% | 38% | Y |
| | 8 | 66% | 64% | Y | 77% | 69% | Y | 41% | 36% | Y | 52% | 34% | Y |
| All Grades | 74% | 65% | Y | 80% | 69% | Y | 38% | 35% | Y | 40% | 41% | N | |
| If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective | | | | See Response in Table 2. | | | | | | | | | |

| TABLE 13: Comparative Performance: Student Progress Grade on NYCDOE Progress Report | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|------------------------|----|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | School Year | Student Progress Grade | | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, the School will receive a "B" or higher on the Student Progress section of the NYCDOE Progress Report | NYS Report Card | 2010-11 | ES/MS | C | N | TRCS met the goal for HS in each year. With regard to ES/MS, the responses undertaken by TRCS in ELA and Math as discussed in Tables 1 and 2 are relevant here. In addition, it should be noted that as the standards moved to the CCLS, TRCS like all schools have seen declines in test scores. NYCDOE, however, in 2013-14 eliminated the letter grading system for schools. |
| | | | HS | A | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | ES/MS | C | N | |
| | | | HS | B | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | ES/MS | F | N | |
| | | | HS | B | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | ES/MS | NA | NA | |
| | | | HS | NA | NA | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| TABLE 14: Comparative Performance: English Regents Performance versus CSD 30 | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------|-----------------------------|------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | School Year | % with a score 65% or above | | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing the English Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools as determined by the NYCDOE Progress Report peer schools*. | NYC DOE Progress Report | 2010-11 | TRCS | 96% | Y | |
| | | | CSD 30 | 75% | | |
| | | 2011-12 | TRCS | 96% | Y | |
| | | | CSD 30 | 78% | | |
| | | 2012-13 | TRCS | 89% | Y | |
| | | | CSD 30 | 64% | | |
| | | 2013-14 | TRCS | NA** | | |
| | | | CSD 30 | NA** | | |

*Because TRCS was unable to secure Regents data for each of its Peer Schools in its Peer Group, it has alternatively compared its results to that of CSD 30 high school results on the Regents exams.

** Data for 2013-14 CSD 30 performance is not yet available.

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| TABLE 15: Comparative Performance: Math Regents Performance versus CSD 30 | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|-----------------------------|------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | School Year | % with a score 65% or above | | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing the Math Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools as determined by the NYCDOE Progress Report peer schools*. | NYC DOE Progress Report | 2010-11 | TRCS | 90% | Y | |
| | | | CSD 30 | 76% | | |
| | | 2011-12 | TRCS | 90% | Y | |
| | | | CSD 30 | 77% | | |
| | | 2012-13 | TRCS | 80% | Y | |
| | | | CSD 30 | 74% | | |
| | | 2013-14 | TRCS | NA** | | |
| | | | CSD 30 | NA** | | |

*Because TRCS was unable to secure Regents data for each of its Peer Schools in its Peer Group, it has alternatively compared its results to that of CSD 30 high school results on the Regents exams.

**Data for 2013-14 CSD 30 performance is not yet available.

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| TABLE 16: AYP Status | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|------------------|--------------|---|
| Academic goal or objective | Measure used to evaluate progress towards attainment of goal or objective | School Year | AYP Status | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Report Card. | NYS Report Card | 2010-11 | In Good Standing | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | In Good Standing | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | In Good Standing | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | In Good Standing | Y | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| Table 17: Student Engagement: Average Daily Attendance | | | | | |
|---|--|---------|--------|--------------|---|
| Goal | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Result | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, the school will have an average daily student attendance rate of at least 95%, as measured using the methodology set out in the NYCDOE Attendance Template | ATS | 2010-11 | 94.7% | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | 95.5% | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | 95.5% | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | 95.5% | Y | |

| Table 18: Student Engagement: Student Retention | | | | | |
|---|--|---------|--------|--------------|--|
| Goal | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Result | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, 95% of all students enrolled on the last day of the school year who do not move (and who, after 8 th grade, do not choose to apply for and gain admission to specialized or private high schools), will return the following September. | ATS Discharge Report | 2010-11 | 98.4% | Y | Although we were slightly under our goal of 95% retention in 2013-14, we want to point out that we retained 93% of our 8 th graders, an increase over the previous years, due to an intensive effort to inform our 8 th grade students and parents about our HS. Our Kindergarten lost a teacher mid-year due to illness, and 5 parents opted to remove their students. We replaced this teacher with a highly experienced early-grade teacher. 14 of the 48 discharged students moved away from the state or the country. |
| | | 2011-12 | 98.4% | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | 96.5% | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | 94.2% | N | |

| TABLE 19: Adherence to Contract Terms | | | | |
|--|--|---------|--------------|---|
| Academic Goal or Objective | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, the School will comply will all applicable laws, rules, regulations | Board | 2010-11 | Y | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| | | | | |
|--|--|---------|---|--|
| and contract terms including, but not limited to, the New York Charter Schools Act, the New York Freedom of Information Law, and the New York Open Meetings Law, the Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act. | Minutes, Special Education files, Internal School Documents and Files. | 2011-12 | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | Y | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| TABLE 20: Responsible School Leadership, Governance and Management—Collaborative School Governance Committee | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|--------------|---|--|
| Academic Goal or Objective | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective | |
| The Collaborative School Governance Committee, consisting of elected parents, students, teachers and staff, will meet nine times per year and develop an annual Comprehensive Education Plan, which guides the school’s priorities for the following year. | CSG Committee Agenda and Minutes, Comprehensive Education Plan document | 2010-11 | Y | | |
| | | 2011-12 | Y | | |
| | | 2012-13 | Y | | |
| | | 2013-14 | Y | | |
| Each year, the Collaborative School Governance Committee will meet or make substantial progress towards meeting the leadership, student leadership and governance goals in the school’s Comprehensive Education Plan. | CSG Committee Agenda and minutes, | 2010-11 | Y | | |
| | | 2011-12 | Y | | |
| | | 2012-13 | Y | | |
| | | 2013-14 | Y | | |

| TABLE 21: Responsible School Leadership, Governance and Management—Quality School Review | | | | | |
|---|--|---------|------------|--------------|---|
| Academic Goal or Objective | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Rating | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, the school will be “proficient” or “well developed” in at least 70% of the leadership, governance and management-related Quality Statements on the Annual Quality School Review. | Annual School Site Visit Report | 2010-11 | NA* | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | Proficient | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | NA** | | |
| | | 2013-14 | NA** | | |

*There was no Quality Review in 2010-11, however NYCDOE and NYSED recommended a second full five year charter renewal without conditions, so we consider this an endorsement of our leadership, governance and management and thus have deemed TRCS met the goal.

**TRCS did not receive a Quality School Review in 2012-13 or 2013-14.

| Table 22: Enrollment Stability | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|------|--|--------------|---|
| Goal | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Result (Actual Enrollment as a % of Full | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| | | | | | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---------|-------------|---|--|
| Each year, student enrollment will be within 15% of full enrollment as defined in the school's contract. This will be measured each year by an analysis of student enrollment figures in ATS. | NYCDOE Reconciliation Report, Data Obtained from ATS | | Enrollment) | | |
| | | 2010-11 | 98.4% | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | 98.4% | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | 100.4% | Y | |
| 2013-14 | 100.2% | Y | | | |

Table 23: Financial Compliance

| Goal | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Result | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
|---|--|---------|---|--------------|---|
| Each year, the school will undergo an independent financial audit that will result in an unqualified opinion and no major findings. | TRCS Audited Financial Statements | 2010-11 | Unqualified opinion, no major findings. | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | Unqualified opinion, no major findings. | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | Unqualified opinion, no major findings. | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | Unqualified opinion, no major findings. | Y | |

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| Table 24: Financial Viability | | | | |
|--|---|---------|--------------|---|
| Goal | Measure/Tool Used to Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, the school will operate on a balanced budget and maintain stable cash flow. | TRCS Monthly Financial Statements (Revenue/Expense and Cash Flow Statements), TRCS Audited Financial Statements | 2010-11 | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | Y | |

| Table 25: Parent Satisfaction | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|--------------------|---|--------------|---|
| Goal | Measure Used To Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Participation Rate | Results | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYCDOE Learning Environment Survey* in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey categories: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect. The school will only have met this goal if 50% or more families participate in the survey. | NYCDOE School Survey | 2010-11 | 60% | AE: 8.0 C: 7.9 E: 7.9 S&R: 8.6 | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | 64% | AE: 7.7 C: 7.7 E: 7.9 S&R: 8.5 | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | 63% | AE: 8.3 C: 8.5 E: 8.3 S&R: 8.5 | Y | |

*2013-14 School Survey goals for Teacher, Parent and Student Stakeholders are not applicable for 2013-14 because the survey domains have been revised.

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| Table 26: Staff Satisfaction | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|--------------------|---|--------------|--|
| Goal | Measure Used To Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Participation Rate | Results | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, teachers will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYCDOE Learning Environment Survey* in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey categories: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect. The school will only have met this goal if 50% or more teachers participate in the survey. | NYCDOE School Survey | 2010-11 | 93% | AE: 7.3 C: 6.4 E: 7.1 S&R: 7.2 | N | The efforts made by TRCS in the early years in response to information from teacher surveys have clearly resulted in increased job satisfaction by TRCS in the latter years of the term where the goal was met for teacher satisfaction. Among the measures taken were improved overall communication between administration and teaching staff and greater facilitation of communication among teaching staff. TRCS increase the number of full-staff professional development days to address school-wide goals in multiple formats and loft-talk around shared objectives. TRCS added a second curriculum meeting to monthly paid teacher meetings and created curriculum focus groups for content areas. It should be noted that while the 2014 Survey has different domains, greater than 75% of teachers expressed satisfaction with instructional core and school culture, with 74% satisfied with systems for improvement. |
| | | 2011-12 | 87% | AE:7.1 C: 6.3 E: 7.2 S&R: 7.3 | N | |
| | | 2012-13 | 76% | AE: 7.7 C: 7.5 E: 7.7 S&R: 8.2 | Y | |

*2013-14 School Survey goals for Teacher, Parent and Student Stakeholders are not applicable for 2013-14 because the survey domains have been revised.

Attachment 1: Progress Towards Charter Goals

| Table 27: Staff Satisfaction: Staff Retention | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|-------------|--------------|---|
| Goal | Measure Used To Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Return Rate | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, teachers will express satisfaction with their job by returning to the school at a rate of 75% or more (excluding teachers who retire or move out of New York City), as measured by their signing of the Staff Preference Sheet in the Spring. | Teacher Attrition Rate | 2010-11 | 97% | Y | |
| | | 2011-12 | 97% | Y | |
| | | 2012-13 | 93% | Y | |
| | | 2013-14 | 92% | Y | |

| Table 28: Student Satisfaction | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|--------------------|---|--------------|---|
| Goal | Measure Used To Determine Progress Towards Goal | Year | Participation Rate | Results | Goal Met Y/N | If not met, describe efforts to be undertaken to meet goal or objective |
| Each year, students will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYCDOE Learning Environment Survey in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey categories: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect. The school will only have met this goal if 50% or more students enrolled participate in the survey. | NYCDOE School Survey | 2010-11 | 100% | AE: 7.2 C: 5.7 E: 6.7 S&R: 6.9 | N | TRCS has responded to the information from Student Satisfaction Surveys by implementing a number of efforts. The first was creating an administrator of school culture is charged with creating proactive solutions to student satisfaction in order to change school culture from reacting to student disciplinary issues to promoting positive student behaviors. School assemblies, town hall meetings for Grades 7-12, public shout-outs for academic success, community leadership, random acts of kindness, citizenship and academic courage have shown to be successful in student engagement and promotion of positive behaviors. It should be noted that while the domains have changed in the 2014 School Survey, 76% of students expressed satisfaction with the School Culture. |
| | | 2011-12 | 99% | AE:7.2 C: 5.7 E: 6.4 S&R: 6.7 | N | |
| | | 2012-13 | 99% | AE: 7.6 C: 7.5 E: 6.7 S&R: 7.2 | Mixed | |

2013-14 School Survey goals for Teacher, Parent and Student Stakeholders are not applicable for 2013-14 because the survey domains have been revised.

| TABLE 29: Comparison of TRCS Performance Against New York City and NYS— New York State ELA | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-----|------|
| % Students Scoring at Least a Level 3 on the NYS ELA Assessment (2011-2014) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2011 | | | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | 2014 | | |
| | NYS | NYC | TRCS | NYS | NYC | TRCS | NYS | NYC | TRCS | NYS | NYC | TRCS |
| Grade 3 | 56% | 48% | 52% | 56% | 49% | 80% | 31% | 28% | 35% | NA | 30% | 44% |
| Grade 4 | 57% | 51% | 46% | 59% | 52% | 65% | 30% | 27% | 15% | NA | 31% | 38% |
| Grade 5 | 54% | 49% | 76% | 58% | 52% | 48% | 30% | 29% | 15% | NA | 28% | 15% |
| Grade 6 | 56% | 44% | 65% | 56% | 45% | 78% | 30% | 23% | 26% | NA | 25% | 30% |
| Grade 7 | 48% | 37% | 39% | 52% | 43% | 64% | 31% | 26% | 37% | NA | 27% | 28% |
| Grade 8 | 47% | 35% | 45% | 50% | 39% | 43% | 34% | 25% | 37% | NA | 29% | 41% |
| All Grades | 53% | 33% | 55% | 55% | 47% | 61% | 31% | 26% | 28% | 31% | 28% | 31% |

| TABLE 30: Comparison of TRCS Performance Against New York City and NYS— New York State Math | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-----|------|-------------|-----|------|
| % Students Scoring at Least a Level 3 on the NYS Math Assessment (2011-2014) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2011 | | | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | 2014 | | |
| | NYS | NYC | TRCS | NYS | NYC | TRCS | NYS | NYC | TRCS | NYS | NYC | TRCS |
| Grade 3 | 60% | 55% | 56% | 61% | 57% | 88% | 34% | 33% | 52% | NA | 39% | 44% |
| Grade 4 | 67% | 62% | 54% | 69% | 66% | 77% | 36% | 35% | 19% | NA | 40% | 50% |
| Grade 5 | 66% | 63% | 94% | 67% | 65% | 65% | 30% | 30% | 28% | NA | 39% | 39% |
| Grade 6 | 63% | 56% | 77% | 65% | 59% | 89% | 31% | 29% | 34% | NA | 34% | 20% |
| Grade 7 | 65% | 56% | 76% | 65% | 57% | 87% | 28% | 25% | 52% | NA | 30% | 43% |
| Grade 8 | 60% | 53% | 66% | 61% | 55% | 77% | 28% | 26% | 41% | NA | 23% | 52% |
| All Grades | 64% | 57% | 74% | 64% | 60% | 80% | 31% | 44% | 38% | 36% | 34% | 40% |

| TABLE 31: Comparison of TRCS Performance Against New York City Charter Schools and CSD 30 Charter Schools—New York State ELA | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--------|------|
| % Students Scoring at Least a Level 3 on the NYS ELA Assessment (2011-2014) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2011 | | | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | 2014 | | |
| | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS |
| Grade 3 | 51% | 55% | | 57% | 58% | 88% | 33% | 34% | 52% | 36% | 38% | 44% |
| Grade 4 | 52% | 60% | 54% | 62% | 59% | 77% | 31% | 27% | 19% | 36% | 37% | 50% |
| Grade 5 | 41% | 69% | 94% | 49% | 76% | 65% | 22% | 28% | 28% | 24% | 29% | 39% |
| Grade 6 | 45% | 60% | 77% | 48% | 67% | 89% | 15% | 34% | 34% | 22% | 38% | 20% |
| Grade 7 | 37% | 51% | 76% | 45% | 62% | 87% | 24% | 36% | 52% | 22% | 40% | 43% |
| Grade 8 | 36% | 47% | 66% | 42% | 59% | 77% | 24% | 39% | 41% | 29% | 38% | 52% |
| All Grades | 45% | 56% | 74% | 52% | 63% | 80% | 25% | 32% | 38% | 28% | 36% | 40% |

| TABLE 32: Comparison of TRCS Performance Against New York City Charter Schools and CSD 30 Charter Schools—New York State Math | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--------|------|-------------|--------|------|
| % Students Scoring at Least a Level 3 on the NYS Math Assessment (2011-2014) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2011 | | | 2012 | | | 2013 | | | 2014 | | |
| | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS | NYC | CSD 30 | TRCS |
| Grade 3 | 66% | 68% | 56% | 68% | 64% | 88% | 44% | 46% | 52% | 53% | 55% | 44% |
| Grade 4 | 72% | 75% | 54% | 78% | 76% | 77% | 43% | 39% | 19% | 54% | 53% | 50% |
| Grade 5 | 67% | 88% | 94% | 72% | 75% | 65% | 29% | 34% | 28% | 39% | 47% | 39% |
| Grade 6 | 68% | 77% | 77% | 70% | 86% | 89% | 31% | 46% | 34% | 42% | 49% | 20% |
| Grade 7 | 70% | 83% | 76% | 74% | 81% | 87% | 26% | 45% | 52% | 33% | 45% | 43% |
| Grade 8 | 69% | 74% | 66% | 73% | 83% | 77% | 34% | 40% | 41% | 39% | 37% | 52% |
| All Grades | 69% | 77% | 74% | 72% | 76% | 80% | 35% | 41% | 38% | 44% | 49% | 40% |

| TABLE 33: Comparison of TRCS Performance Against NYCDOE Peer Group | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Percentile of TRCS within Peer Group and Quartile Position within Peer Group :NYS ELA and NYS Math Assessment (Aggregate Proficiency Grades 3-8) (2011-2014) | | | | | | | | |
| | NYS ELA | | | | NYS Math | | | |
| | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 |
| Percentile Rank | 27 th | 57 th | 33 rd | 37 th | 45 th | 71 st | 44 th | 45 th |
| Quartile | 3 rd | 2 nd | 3 rd | 3 rd | 3 rd | 1 st | 3 rd | 3 rd |