

CHANNEL VIEW SCHOOL FOR RESEARCH CREDENTIALING ELIGIBILITY CONTEXT					
--	--	--	--	--	--

Higher-Need Student Population	From the NYC DOE School Performance Dashboard				
Students with Disabilities	13%				
Students Eligible for Free/Reduced Lunch	72.9%				
Economic Need Index (ENI)*	64.5%				
<small>*ENI is an estimate of the percentage of students at the school facing economic hardship based on temporary hardship, eligibility for public assistance, and census tract poverty rates.</small>					

Graduation and College Readiness					
Comparison of CVSR to Comparison Group**					
Graduation rate, 4-year			College Readiness Index,*** 4-year		
CVSR	97%		CVSR	75%	
Comparison group	88%		Comparison group	67%	

** The Comparison group is made up of students from across the city who were the most similar to the students of this school, based on factors such as incoming test scores, disability status and economic need.

***NYC's College Readiness Index indicates the percentage students who meet CUNY's standards for placing out of remediation. To meet this standard, students must achieve target scores in mathematics and English on the Regents, SAT, ACT or CUNY assessments.

Post-Secondary Enrollment^			
	2016	2017	2018
CVSR	64%	73%	67%
Comparison Group	65%	70%	71%
City	55%	57%	59%

^ Post-Secondary Enrollment looks at all students in the graduating cohort, regardless of graduation status, and includes vocational schools and public/military service

--	--

Channel View School for Research Implementation Review Scores		From the NYC OB IR Scores				
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	
Graduation rate	85%	95%	93%	97%	97%	

Learning Expeditions	2	3	3	4	4	
Effective Lessons	3	4	4	4	4	
Supporting All Students	4	3	4	4	5	
Reflecting and Structuring Revision	3	4	4	4	4	
Culture of Reading	3	4	4	4	4	
Culture of Writing	2	4	4	5	5	
Culture of Math	2	3	3	3	4	
Integrating the Arts	3	4	4	4	4	
Learning Targets	3	4	3	4	4	
Assessment for Learning	2	4	4	4	4	
Quality Assessments	2	3	4	4	4	
Communicating Student Achievement	2	4	2	4	4	
Analyzing Assessment Data	4	4	4	4	5	
Learning Community	2	4	4	4	4	
Crew	2	4	4	4	4	
Fostering Character	2	3	4	4	4	
Engaging Families	3	5	4	4	4	
Beautiful Spaces	2	4	4	4	4	
School Vision	3	4	4	5	5	
Using Data	4	5	4	4	4	
Supporting, Planning, Assessment, and Instruction	3	4	4	4	4	
Positive School Culture	3	4	4	4	4	
Professional Learning	4	5	4	4	4	
Overall Score	71	102	99	106	109	

Year	Overall Score
2013-14	71
2014-15	102
2015-16	99
2016-17	106
2017-18	109

Average Section Scores	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Curriculum	2.50	3.75	3.75	4.25	4.25

CHANNEL VIEW SCHOOL FOR RESEARCH CREDENTIALING ELIGIBILITY MKS DATA							
HS ELA Regents Annual Data				From the NYSED.GOV website			
Total Cohort Proficiency Results	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	95%	95%	95%				
District	72%	74%	75%				
State	85%	85%	84%				
HS ELA Regents Scores by Subgroups:							
Economically Disadvantaged (FRL)	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	94%	92%	92%				
District	75%	77%	77%				
State	79%	80%	78%				
Students with Disabilities	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	81%	76%	75%				
District	41%	40%	41%				
State	51%	54%	52%				
Black/African American Students	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	96%	93%	98%				
District	70%	72%	74%				
State	76%	77%	77%				
Hispanic/Latino Students	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				

CVSR	100%	94%	89%				
District	70%	71%	71%				
State	76%	77%	75%				
HS Math Regents Annual Data - Algebra Common Core Regents							
Total Cohort Proficiency Results	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	94%	89%	95%				
District	77%	78%	77%				
State	86%	85%	83%				
Economically Disadvantaged (FRL)	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	96%	88%	92%				
District	80%	82%	79%				
State	81%	80%	77%				
Students with Disabilities	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	69%	47%	70%				
District	42%	38%	37%				
State	51%	49%	47%				
Black/African American Students	2015-16	2016-17	2017-2018				
CVSR	94%	91%	95%				
District	71%	71%	72%				
State	77%	75%	73%				

Multi-Year Data Tables - Lowest Third Comparisons to New York City			From the NYC DOE School Performance Dashboard				
High School Data							
CVSR Growth and Comparison to New York City Scores							
Average Score English Regents	2015	2016	2017	2018			
no.	134	119	133	125			
CVSR	81	80	79	78			
CVSR scores are greater than city by ...							
City	4	4	5	6			
Average Score Algebra Regents							
no.	41	156	104	233			
CVSR	66	72	70	69			
CVSR scores are greater than city by ...							
City	3	5	3	4			
Middle School Data							
ELA - Average Proficiency (City Lowest 3rd)							
no.	44	50	73	80			
CVSR	2.1	2.15	2.22	2.25			
CVSR scores are greater than city by ...							
	0.12	0.09	0.1	0.1			
Math - Average Proficiency (City Lowest 3rd)							
no.	58	58	94	87			
CVSR	2.02	1.99	1.96	2.11			
CVSR scores are greater than city by ...							
City	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.2			

	QWP 2016-17	QWP 2017-18	QWP 2018-19
Conclusions about level of complexity	<p>Strengths Complexity *Application of higher order literary skills * Transfer of understanding to new contexts</p> <p>Areas to Improve Complexity *Connects to the big concepts; transfer of understanding</p>	<p>Strengths Complexity • Higher-order thinking • Application of higher order literary skills.</p> <p>Areas to Improve Complexity * Consider multiple perspectives</p>	<p>Strengths Complexity • Higher-order thinking • Multiple perspectives • Application of higher order literacy skills</p> <p>Areas to Improve Complexity *Develop higher-order thinking by narrowing research focus</p>
Conclusions about level of craftsmanship	<p>Strengths Craftmanship • Students demonstrate thoughtful ideas</p> <p>Areas to Improve Craftmanship</p>	<p>Strengths Craftmanship • Accuracy, detail, beauty</p> <p>Areas to Improve Craftmanship. Create beautiful work in conception and execution</p>	<p>Strengths Craftmanship • Accuracy, detail, and beauty •Beautiful work in conception and execution</p> <p>Areas to Improve Craftmanship *Increase use of multiple drafts and revision, focus on peer editing</p>
Conclusions about level of authenticity	<p>Strengths Authenticity *Some projects use formats from the professional world</p> <p>Areas to Improve Authenticity *Demonstrating original, creative thinking; connecting academic standards with real world issues, controversies, and local people and places; work matters to students and ideally contributes to a larger community</p>	<p>Strengths Authenticity • Connects academic standards with real world issues, controversies, and local people and places • Work matters to students and ideally contributes to a larger community</p> <p>Areas to Improve Authenticity. *Demonstrates original, create thinking of students</p>	<p>Strengths Authenticity• Demonstrates the original, creative thinking of students • Some students used formats and standards from professional world for research projects (National History Day, Individual Written Argument) • Connects academic standards with real-world issues</p> <p>Areas to Improve Authenticity * All students will use formats and standards from professional world for research projects</p>
Archived Samples of Quality Work			
1	<p>10th Grade Civil Disobedience Case Study: Example 3: Persuasive Speech: DAPL</p>	<p>10th Grade Civil Disobedience Case Study: Example 4: Persuasive Speech: Gun Control</p>	<p>10th Grade Individual Written Argument: Example 1: IWA—Punk Rock through a Historical Lens: Unified Efforts to Resolve Widespread Issues</p>
2	<p>10th Grade Genocide Paper</p>	<p>8th Grade Urban Planning Expedition: Example 1: Student Urban Renewal Plan</p>	<p>7th-12th Grades National History Day Expedition: National History Day Example 3: James Marion Sims: A Triumph for</p>
3	<p>11th grade Social Studies Frederick Douglass Literary Essay</p>	<p>12th grade Algebra 2 math essays</p>	<p>11th Grade “Who Tells Your Story?” Example 4: Hamilton Broadway Live Performance: “Theodosia Burr”</p>
Work submitted to Models of Excellence: Center for Student Work	<p>THE EYE OF THE STORM https://modelsofexcellence.eleducation.org/projects/eye-storm</p>		

<u>(Taken from NYCOpenData)</u>			
Derived from taking the sum of all students present in grades 6-12, and dividing it by the sum all students present and absent in grades 6-12 for that year	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
Attendance % - School	91%	91%	91%
Attendance % - City	90%	90%	90%
<u>(Taken from VADIR (15-16, 16-17), SSEC (17-18))</u>			
Derived from dividing the number of infractions among Middle, Junior high, Senior High, and combination Junior-Senior High Schools by the total number of students enrolled			
Infractions by Total Enrollment - School	3%	5%	2%
Infractions by Total Enrollment - District	4%	4%	2%
Infractions by Total Enrollment - City	6%	6%	3%
Infractions by Total Enrollment - State	10%	9%	3%
Disciplinary Referrals by Subgroup?	Data not available		
Habits of Scholarship **			
**CVSR does not grade habits of scholarship. However, all students do reflect on their habits of scholarship so that is information is included in Character Claim 1.			