

Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2007-08 School Year

Reader's Guide

SUNY Authorized Charter Schools

As set forth in the *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees*, the single most important factor that the Charter Schools Institute and the State University Board of Trustees consider in making renewal determinations is the school's record in generating successful student achievement outcomes. In order to determine whether a school has met that high standard, **each charter school that the State University Board of Trustees authorizes is required to enter into an accountability agreement, known as an Accountability Plan**, which ultimately becomes part of its charter.

The Charter Schools Institute closely monitors each school's progress toward achieving the goals outlined in its Accountability Plan.

In addition, as part of its annual reporting requirements, **each SUNY authorized charter school must submit an Accountability Plan Progress Report which, from its vantage point, addresses each of the goals and outcome measures contained in its Accountability Plan.** The information presented in these Progress Reports constitutes important evidence that a school is keeping its promises to its students, parents and community, and is critical to making its case for renewal at the end of its charter period. The most important parts of Progress Reports are student achievement results on state exams and other assessments. However, not all schools will have tested grade levels for a particular state exam. Each year, the state administers English language arts and mathematics tests to 3rd through 8th grade, science tests to the 4th and 8th grades, and social studies tests to the 5th and 8th grades.

Important Note: **The Accountability Plan Progress Report is authored by the charter school.** In reporting school progress toward meeting the outcome measures set forth in the Accountability Plan, schools are encouraged to build a case for the effectiveness of their program, and to lay the groundwork for writing a Renewal Application and ultimately for charter renewal. **The school's evaluation of its own progress does not necessarily reflect the conclusions of the Institute.** Further, the Institute does not affirm the completeness or accuracy of the report's data and may not endorse the school's characterization of the progress it has made toward achieving its Accountability Plan goals. Throughout the life of the school's charter, the Institute will visit each school, generating Institute School Visit Reports, and at the end of each charter period, a Renewal Report (select the <back> button in your browser to return to the school profile to see any/all available reports). These reports include detailed summaries of the Institute's observations of the school, as well as its evaluation of student performance and progress toward meeting the academic subject goals in its Accountability Plan.

**Ark Community
Charter School**

**2007-08
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 1, 2008

Mary Theresa Streck prepared this 2007-08 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Steven Axelrod	President
Bruce Backer	Vice President
Peter McDermott	Secretary
David Levow	Treasurer
Christina Francis	Parent Representative
Rosetta DeVito	Member
Ron Eglash	Member
Joseph Fama	Member
Kathleen Gormley	Member
Helen Martin	Teacher Representative
Mary Theresa Streck	Director/Principal

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Ark Community Charter School (ACCS) has been serving the needs of historically underserved elementary students in the city of Troy for seven years. We are currently under a one year charter term, with specific conditions. In this academic report, the reader will come to learn that ACCS has overwhelmingly satisfied the renewal conditions set forth by our Authorizer in March 2008.

ACCS was extremely successful in all four major subjects in 2007-08, particularly with regard to New York State assessment performance in each of these areas. In fact, on all but one of our major absolute and comparative measures across four subjects, we exceeded our expected performance measures. In the lone case where we did not exceed one conditional renewal measure, we at least made another year of significant gains. This success marks the culmination of a remarkable two year improvement, with the current organizational effectiveness in place for sustained achievement for many charter periods ahead. In this report, the reader will learn of the dividends that our significant ELA and Math program alterations of fall 2006 have paid. We did make strides in 2006-07, but knew that 2007-08 would be a more accurate indicator of longer term improvement because it gave the school a second year for our substantial changes to absorb more fully into our learning environment.

Our March 11, 2008 renewal memorandum from our Authorizer spelled out a number of academic conditions that needed to be nearly satisfied or exceeded based on the 2007-08 State assessments. Based on the table below, we are happy to report that ACCS has met four of five renewal condition questions for ELA and all measures in Math. Please refer to ELA and Math academic renewal conditions below.

2008 ELA Results versus Renewal Conditions

Question	2007 Results	Mark to beat in 2008	Result	Did ACCS meet measure, YES or NO?
Did your cohort students score higher than 75% on the January 2008 ELA test.	44% Cohort passing	75%	63%	No we did not meet or exceed this measure, but made significant progress towards 75%. (19 point gain)
Did <u>all</u> students ELA Performance Indicator (PI) beat the state's AMO?	ACCS exceeded the AMO last year as well	133 is this year's AMO set by the state	160	YES
Did your cohort students exceed the performance of the local district?	Lagged the district last year by about 8 points	58.3	63%	YES
Did your (all students) pass the ELA at a higher rate than other impoverished schools, on an analysis done by CSI	At 39% in 2006-07, we were categorized as 'about the same as expected'	In 2007-08 at 60%, we have far exceeded our 2006-07 mark, we are confident that will move us into the 'higher than expected' category	60%	YES
Did your COHORT students get more than half the way to 75% passing versus where they were in 2007?	41%	58% (needed 17 point gain)	60% (19 points better)	YES

2008 Math Results versus Renewal Conditions

Question	2007 Results	Mark to beat in 2008	Result	Did ACCS meet measure, YES or NO?
Did your cohort students score higher than 75% on the March 2008 Math test.	73%	75%	89%	YES
Did <u>all</u> students Math Performance Indicator (PI) beat the state's AMO?	ACCS exceeded the AMO last year as well	102 is this year's AMO set by the state	190	YES
Did your cohort students exceed the performance of the local district?	Exceeded the Troy District's performance in 2007	69%	89%	YES
Did your (all students) pass the Math at a higher rate than other impoverished schools, on an analysis done by CSI	Met this measure last year		<u>88%</u>	YES
Did your COHORT students get more than half the way to 75% passing versus where they were in 2007?	68%	72%	89%	YES

In the following sections, we will show statistical evidence that we had another successful year in 2007-08, and are now one of the highest performing charter schools in the Capital District. We are exceeding all of our Math, Science and Social Studies measures, and all but one of our ELA measures. In ELA, we easily eclipsed the AMO mark set by the state, and are now outperforming the Troy school district for the first time. In what is easily the most difficult assessment for particularly NYS' urban schools, we have the highest school wide and cohort ELA passing rate in our history. We continuously have in our sights our absolute mark of 75%. What seemed like distant goals years ago, now seem much more attainable since undergoing changes twenty four months ago. Historical data presented in tables throughout this document will reflect the term of our most recent charter, which began July 1, 2006 and ended June 30, 2008.

INTRODUCTION

Mission Statement

The Ark Community Charter School's continuing mission is to create within the city of Troy a community that fosters the academic, social and spiritual growth of our members in an environment that is both supportive and challenging. In this community everyone is celebrated, respected, and heard; all are intellectually engaged, socially concerned, ethically responsible, and culturally open-minded.

Key Design Elements

Strong Academic Support- Low Teacher/Student Ratio

Academic success for all students is the vision of all stakeholders at ACCS - the board, leadership team, faculty, students and parents. All other Key Design Elements support this vision. Strong academic support is evident in the board's monthly meetings, in the weekly meetings of the leadership team and faculty, in the low teacher/student ratio and in the ongoing communications between staff and parents.

By design, ACCS primarily serves students from low-income families. Our enrollment lottery is open to all students with preference given to children from families who qualify for free or reduced lunch. We understand that students from low-income families need strong academic support and this support is evident at all organizational levels at ACCS. The ACCS Board of Trustees meets monthly from September to June and at each meeting the principal reports to the board on the school's progress. As achievement data becomes available, the principal and leadership team provide ongoing analysis and related action plans.

The ACCS Leadership Team (Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Coordinators and Counselor) meets weekly to review school progress. They review and analyze student achievement data, school climate issues, academic intervention services, and plan for teacher support and ongoing professional development. The Curriculum Coordinators review teacher lesson plans weekly and meet formally with them bi-weekly to support instruction. Coordinators are in the classrooms daily offering teaching strategies as needed.

The faculty meets weekly for 1 ½ hours to discuss student progress and issues that support student achievement. Meetings are devoted to professional development, team meetings, curriculum integration with specials teachers, committee meetings, etc. During these meetings, teachers are encouraged to share instructional strategies that work in their classrooms.

ACCS follows a long tradition of progressive education that holds the child at the center of the education process. Teachers blend child-centered instruction with curriculum-centered instruction. In this balance, the teachers respect the child's prior knowledge as the foundation on which new learning occurs while exposing students to the same content in the same period of time. Each classroom is staffed with a highly qualified, certified teacher and one teacher assistant/aide. Individual student needs are met in the classroom through differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and small group instruction. Additional support

is provided by the AIS support team both in the classroom and in a resource room. A certified ESL teacher provides support in the classroom and in a resource room to all students who qualify for ESL instruction.

The ACCS Leadership Team and teachers are in continual dialogue with parents and count on their partnership to reach academic success for their children. Each week the school publishes a school newsletter that provides families with important information about the school. The newsletter contains a message from the principal along with the school's monthly calendar of events and class news articles submitted by the teachers. The teachers are in constant communication with parents regarding student achievement and parents are well aware of academic progress long before the quarterly reports are issued.

Longer School Day – Enrichment Programs

ACCS provides 50 additional minutes to the school day compared to the local school district. This additional time allows for increased instructional time and provides the flexibility to integrate high quality art, music and movement programs into our curriculum. ACCS offers space and support for after-school and summer programs that provide additional academic support and enrichment.

As of September 2008, ACCS will increase the school day by five minutes to a total of seven hours and 15 minutes. Currently, the local school district provides a school day of six hours and 25 minutes. ACCS provides an additional 50 minutes per day. This additional time allows us to increase instructional time and provides the flexibility to integrate high quality art, music and movement programs into our curriculum. ACCS provides space for the Ark After-School Program which employs ACCS staff to extend the school day and school year in tutoring and enrichment programs. ACCS provides space for the weekly Sage Reading Clinic. This program follows the school year and Sage teachers are matched with ACCS students for additional academic support.

Small School

ACCS is an intentionally small school community with a student population capped at 245 students. The small school size creates a more personalized and successful learning environment.

ACCS offers students a personalized learning environment where they are well-known by the leadership team and by their teachers. The leadership team and the teachers talk about how students are doing, and compare information across classes and over the years. Teachers conference regularly with their students and respond to student needs immediately. When a student experiences difficulty, teachers meet with the student and/or parents to resolve the problem and create action plans.

Safe Environment – Responsive Classroom Training

ACCS creates a school culture that fosters an academic learning environment. In this culture students' thoughts and feelings are respected and students work collaboratively with classmates

and other members of the community. ACCS staff are trained in the principles of Responsive Classroom.

ACCS promotes a climate of learning where students are responsible for their own learning and the learning environment of others. The teachers spend the first six weeks of school establishing and reinforcing school and classroom rules based on the Responsive Classroom approach. All new teachers are required to attend an initial weekly-long Responsive Classroom training institute before beginning the school year. Throughout the school year, ACCS works with community organizations to provide programs on health topics such as safe touch and bullying. ACCS has implemented Second Step, a research based anti-violence program that integrates academics with social and emotional learning. Students learn and practice vital social skills such as empathy, emotion management, problem solving, and cooperation. These essential life skills help students in the classroom, on the playground, and at home.

Families as Partners

ACCS families are respected collaborators in the educational process. Staff listens carefully to parents and requires their active partnership in implementing an effective educational plan for their children. The school has an open-door policy for parents/guardians, who have formal representation on the ACCS Board of Trustees.

ACCS is committed to parent participation from the board level to the classroom level. A parent representative is elected yearly to the ACCS Board of Trustees. Parents are encouraged to volunteer in the school and lines of communication are established through phone calls, newsletters, daily homework sheets to be signed by parents, daily behavior notebooks/charts, invitations to chaperone field trips, invitations to performances and conferences as needed.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

(This enrollment summary details enrollment for our two year renewal period of 2006-08)

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
2006-07	44	42	32	23	21	22	17	201
2007-08	45	42	35	25	21	17	15	200

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will read, write, listen, and speak for information and understanding, for literary response and expression, for critical analysis and evaluation, and for social interaction.

Background

ACCS uses the Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street Program (Reading Street) which is aligned with the NYS Learning Standards, provides direct, systematic instruction across the grades in the five essential elements of reading, and meets the criteria for Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR). All classrooms use a literacy block, and the instruction within that time is consistent in pacing and is organized in ways that effectively promotes high literacy gains in low performing students. Reading Street offers structure and guidance for the reading block and strong support for students reading on multiple reading levels. For ELA Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in grades 1-6, ACCS staff use Sidewalks, a supplemental, intervention program that is directly integrated with the core Reading Street program. The "Interactive Strategies Approach" is used for kindergarten. This program incorporates sight word practice, reading, writing, letter-sound practice, blending, letter-identification, etc.

Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street – Three Tier Program

Tier I is the core classroom instruction for all children. It consists of a core reading program and benchmark testing at least three times a year to determine children’s instructional needs. A validated Baseline Group Test helps teachers determine how students should be grouped for instruction. Ongoing progress monitoring tracks student learning and enables teachers to differentiate instruction. Results of Day 5 Assessments and validated Unit Benchmark Tests help teachers make regrouping decisions after Unit 2 and at the end of each subsequent unit.

Tier II is supplemental small-group instruction for Strategic Intervention in addition to the regular instruction in the core reading program. It is designed to prevent struggling readers from falling behind. Daily Strategic Intervention instruction is provided in the Differentiated Instruction section of the Teacher’s Editions in Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street. It

supports and enhances core classroom instruction by providing re-teaching of core concepts, more teacher modeling and feedback, more scaffolding, multiple opportunities for practice, and more time on task for Tier II students.

Frequent progress monitoring ensures adequate progress and learning. Progress monitoring of priority skills happens daily and weekly in the core program. In grades 1 and 2 assessment is also differentiated for these children; they are tested on the same skills as on-level children, but using simpler text. Progress for fluency and retelling is monitored more frequently for children in Tier II (every two weeks) than for on-level or advanced students (once per unit). Children can exit Tier II when they reach on-level benchmarks for priority skills. Reading Street also provides significant support for the development of Oral Vocabulary (Amazing Words) and building of concepts. Research indicates this kind of built-in intervention provides a significant instructional advantage for children in this tier.

Tier III instruction for Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street consists of an intensive intervention program, Sidewalks, that is parallel to the core program in concepts and vocabulary, but more slowly paced in skill instruction. Student Readers contain four selections per week, or about 16 to 20 pages of text. Children in Tier III require more instructional time than students in Tiers I and II. The instruction in the Pearson Scott Foresman intensive intervention program is used in addition to a regular classroom reading program. It is possible that some children may be in the core program, receiving Strategic Intervention in the classroom, and receiving intensive intervention as a pull-out program.

A comprehensive list of ELA assessments can be found on page 15 – ELA Action Plan. There were no significant changes to the ELA curriculum in the 2007-08 school year.

Writing

In addition to the Scott Foresman embedded writing program, ACCS uses the Houghton Mifflin Write Source writing program. The Write Source program reflects the latest and best research on writing and learning and provides everything students need to become better writers, thinkers, and learners. The program covers the writing process and the six traits of writing to help students become focused writers and readers. It integrates mechanics, usage, and grammar throughout every unit. Strategies for developing skills including listening, making oral presentations, and note taking are also emphasized. All classrooms engage in two writing workshop blocks each week beyond the writing that happens in all the content areas. For writing Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in grades 1-6, ACCS staff uses the “Struggling Learners” component of the writing program found embedded in each chapter. The kindergarten uses the writing component of the Scott-Foresman program.

Ongoing assessment and diagnosis are coupled with strategic intervention to meet the individual needs of students, including frequent and timely student assessments integrated throughout the program to demonstrate student understanding and guide and monitor instruction. Writing samples from across the curriculum are assessed using the NYS, Scott Foresman, and teacher created rubrics.

The staff employs a common language and knowledge that supports strategies that promote scientifically based reading instruction and participates in ongoing professional development provided by the ACCS Curriculum Coordinators and professional conferences. As a result of this ongoing support, ACCS staff possesses the special knowledge and training needed to effectively teach students to read, write, listen, and speak for information and understanding, for literary response and expression, for critical analysis and evaluation, and for social interaction.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English language arts examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 6th grade in January 2008. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

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 been enrolled for less than one year.

**2007-08 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	22	0	0	0	22
4	21	0	0	0	21
5	15	0	0	0	15
6	14	0	0	0	14
All	72	0	0	0	72

Results

The overall percentage of students in at least their second year performing at Levels 3 & 4 is **63%**.

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.

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
3	All Students	0	41	55	5	59	22
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	33	54	0	67	13
4	All Students	0	24	71	5	76	21
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	19	73	8	81	12
5	All Students	0	40	53	7	60	15
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	42	52	6	58	16
6	All Students	0	64	36	0	36	14
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	62	38	0	38	18
All	All Students	0	40	56	4	60	72
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	41	56	3	63	59

Evaluation

Based on the table above, we have not yet met this outcome measure. This is the only measure in ten renewal conditions we did not meet this year. ACCS students made a (20) point gain in both cohort and general population scores compared to 2006-07. Last year, our cohort students were 44% proficient on the NYS ELA, and our general population 39% proficient. The move ahead to 63% and 60% respectively is to us a clear sign that the changes we made in fall 2006 really needed a second year to show up in our results.

Additional Evidence

Not one student tested at ACCS received a score of a 1. This is not a claim we could make in prior years. The fact that every remaining non-proficient student is receiving a (2) supports our contention that we are closer to 75% than ever before. Finally, we have analyzed all students receiving a (2) and our closer look shows that a majority are in the higher (2) range.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4				
Grade	2006-07		2007-08	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	54	13	67	13
4	15	13	81	12
5	38	13	58	16
6	63	16	38	18
All	44	55	63	59

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) 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 all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state’s learning standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s English language arts AMO, which for 2007-08 is 133. The PI 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 PI is 200.

Results

Grades 3-6 surpassed the AMO of 133, with a PI of **160**.

Calculation of 2007-08 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3-6	0	40	56	4	72

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathbf{PI} &= 40 + 56 + 4 = 100 \\
 &+ 56 + 4 = 60 \\
 \mathbf{PI} &= \mathbf{160}
 \end{aligned}$$

Evaluation

We met this outcome measure in 2007-08. This is the second consecutive year that our overall PI exceeded the AMO in New York State. Our absence of ANY students scoring a 1 on the ELA Assessment was a contributing factor to our high score, since a score of 1 does not factor into the AMO/PI formula whatsoever.

English Language Arts Performance Index (PI) and Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) by School Year

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07	3-6	76	13	47	38	1	123	122
2007-08	3-6	72	0	40	56	4	160	133

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local Troy City School District.

Method

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the local school district, as well as between the total result of 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. In the table below, cohort students in grades 3, 4, 5 and 6 at Ark Community Charter School will be compared with their same grade counterparts in Troy.

Results

2007-08 State English Language Arts Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

School or Cohort	Students tested	2008 Proficiency
Ark 6 th Grade Cohort	13	38%
Troy City Schools 6th	292	61%
Ark 5 th Grade Cohort	12	58%
Troy City Schools 5th	271	65%
Ark 4 th Grade Cohort	16	81%
Troy City Schools 4th	285	53%
Ark 3rd Grade Cohort	18	67%
Troy City 3rd	309	55%
Total Ark Cohort	59	63%
Troy Schools	1157	58%

Evaluation

We met this measure in 2007-08. The table above shows that on the ELA Assessment given in 2007-08, ACCS is now exceeding the Troy City Schools' overall performance on the ELA. This is the year we expected to exceed the district's performance, and we were successful.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	54	55	67	55
4	15	50	81	53
5	38	56	58	65
6	63	48	38	61
All	44	52	63	58

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school's actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of poverty data, the 2007-08 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2006-07 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

This is an analysis performed by The Charter Schools Institute (CSI) for schools with accountability plans from 2005 and later. Results from this analysis were distributed to schools this past year and represent scores from the January 2007 tests, not the 2008 tests, which make up this report. We expect the 2008 CSI analysis to be available to schools after this report is filed. After per CSI requirements, in the absence of current year regression analysis, the school should provide the most recent results. On November 27th of 2007, CSI released regression results to schools, based on January 2007 scores. In that year, when our ELA results were twenty points lower than our current scores, our regression results category for ELA was “about the same as expected.” Given the latest 2008 results being much higher, we expect to vault into at least the next category, which is “higher than expected to a small degree.”

English Language Arts Comparative Performance

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3-6	89.4%	76	39.5	43.4	-0.29
2007-08	3-6		72	Not available	Not available	Not available

Goal 1: Growth Measure

Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state English language arts exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year’s state English language arts exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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 towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2007-08 and also have a state exam score in 2006-07. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2006-07 and 75 percent proficient in 2007-08. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2006-07, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2006-07 to 2007-08

	Cohort Size	Class Cohort Proficiency % (NYS ELA, January 2007)	Goal of at least 1/2 difference between 2007 ELA and (75)	Class Cohort Proficiency % (NYS ELA, January 2008)	Difference Between Years	Goal Met "Yes" or "No"
Grade 4	16	62.5%	6.5	81%	18.5	YES
Grade 5	12	16%	29.5	58%	42	YES
Grade 6	13	38%	18.5	38%	0	NO
All	41	41%	17	60%	19	YES

Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. Our 4-6th grade students that were tested in two consecutive ELA Assessments needed seventeen points of improvement to show growth towards 75% passing, and they exceeded that mark. We believe this is a very important value-added measure that clearly allows a school to show real growth for students who may be on a two year path to proficiency.

ACTION PLAN FOR ELA 2008-09

In order to reach our target goal in ELA, ACCS will implement the following action plan:

A. ELA Grades K-6: Using Scott Foresman Reading Street

1. Teachers will administer their grade level baseline test during the first full week of school. After grading the test and completing an item analysis for each student, teachers will meet with curriculum coordinators to discuss the results. Students will be grouped based on these results.
2. In grades 1-6, the teachers will administer spelling tests weekly.
3. In grades 1-6, the teachers will administer running records/Fresh Reads on a three week rotation to inform instruction.
4. Teachers in grades 1-6 will administer Scott Foresman selection tests biweekly. Every five to six weeks, teachers in grades K-6 will administer a unit benchmark test to assess skills and strategies taught in the unit. These test questions mirror the NYS ELA test. Teachers will meet with the ELA Curriculum Coordinator to discuss the results, lessons, planning, pacing, and most importantly, student progress. Students who have not mastered the skills will be grouped and re-taught by the teacher, TA,

AIS support teacher, or in after school tutoring sessions. Scott Foresman provides an immediate intervention plan to re-teach any concept.

5. In grades K-3, the teachers will administer the Scott Foresman Word List in February and June.
6. In grades K-6, the teachers will administer an end of the year test during the 2nd week of June. After grading the test and completing an item analysis for each student, teachers will meet with curriculum coordinators to discuss the results. These test results along with other assessments will be used to review student grade level progress for the year and to determine AIS grouping for the next school year.
7. All testing results will be used to inform instruction and as one component in determining students report card grades.

B. DIBELS (K-2)

In grades K-2, the teachers will administer benchmark tests in October, February, and May. All students scoring below benchmark level will be regrouped and re-taught targeted skills by the teacher, TA, and AIS teachers. All students in the intensive intervention group will be progress monitored every 10 days. The students in the strategic intervention group will be progress monitored every 30 days. The teacher will meet with the ELA Curriculum Coordinator to identify strategies and interventions.

C. Basic Reading Inventory (BRI) – Grades 3-6

1. Teachers will administer a BRI during the first week of November, the last week of January, the first week of April, and the third week of June to determine a student's reading level.
2. After scoring the BRI, teachers will meet with the ELA Curriculum Coordinator to discuss results and plan appropriate strategies for students. Results are one component in determining students' report card grades.

D. Test Preparation using results from NYS ELA Test

1. ELA Curriculum Coordinator will meet with each teacher to review NYS ELA test in August. Teachers will review these results with the students and use it as a teaching tool to prepare for the next test in January.
2. In October, the teacher will administer the previous year's ELA test. Upon correction of the test, teachers will meet with the ELA Coordinator to discuss the test results and determine strengths and areas of need in preparing for the upcoming NYS assessments. Additional ELA support will be determined at this time.

E. Placement of New Students

The Scott Foresman ELA Baseline Test will be administered to each student upon entry into a grade.

F. Criteria for Inclusion in AIS

1. Student scores at a level 1 or 2 on state test
2. Student's score on Terra Nova at the 30th percentile or less in First and Second Grades
3. Student scores at less than 75% performance on the report card

G. Curriculum Team

1. The curriculum team will meet with each teacher on a regular basis (biweekly) to discuss students' individual progress.
2. On Monday and Tuesday of each week, the curriculum team will meet to review the results of all posted material. (Monday-ELA Tuesday-Math).
3. The curriculum team will review lesson plans weekly.
4. The curriculum team will report all formative assessments to Leadership Team at weekly team meetings.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will understand the concepts of and become proficient with the skills of mathematics; communicate and reason mathematically; and become problem solvers by using appropriate tools and strategies; through the integrated studies of number sense and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and probability.

Background

ACCS uses the Pearson Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley Mathematics Program which is aligned with the NYS Learning Standards, and provides direct, systematic instruction across the grades. All classrooms use a daily math block. Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley offers structure and guidance for the mathematics block and strong support for students performing at multiple levels. For mathematics Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in grades K-6, ACCS staff uses the "reteaching" component of the mathematics program found at the end of each chapter.

Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley Mathematics promotes mathematical proficiency by focusing on the development of both mathematics skills and essential understandings. This is accomplished through an articulation of essential outcomes and conceptual understandings for both teacher and student; questioning strategies that develop higher order-thinking skills embedded into the student and teacher materials; and the development of mathematical communication as a means of building a deep understanding of important mathematics.

Ongoing assessment and diagnosis are coupled with strategic intervention to meet the individual needs of students, including frequent and timely student assessments integrated throughout the program to demonstrate student understanding and guide and monitor instruction.

The staff employs a common language and knowledge that supports strategies that promote scientifically based math instruction and participates in ongoing professional development provided by the ACCS Curriculum Coordinators and professional conferences. As a result of this ongoing support, ACCS staff possesses the special knowledge and training needed to effectively teach students to understand the concepts of and become proficient with the skills of mathematics; communicate and reason mathematically; and become problem solvers by using appropriate tools and strategies; through the integrated studies of number sense and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and probability.

A comprehensive list of mathematics assessments can be found on page 24 – Math Action Plan. There were no significant changes to the math curriculum in the 2007-08 school year.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State mathematics examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 6th grade in January 2008. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

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 been enrolled for less than one year.

**2007-08 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	21	0	0	0	21
4	21	0	0	0	21
5	13	0	0	1	14
6	14	0	0	0	14
All	69	0	0	0	70

Results

The overall percent of grade 3-6 students in at least their second year performing at Levels 3 & 4 is **89.1%**.

² 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

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
3	All Students	0	9.5	81	9.5	90.5	21
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	12	76	12	88	17
4	All Students	0	5	52	43	95	21
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	6	44	50	94	16
5	All Students	0	23	54	23	77	13
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	30	50	20	70	10
6	All Students	0	7	43	50	93	14
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	50	50	100	12
All	All Students	0	10.1	59.4	30.4	89.8	69
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	10.9	56.4	32.7	89.1	55

Evaluation

As shown in the table above, we met this outcome measure. Our cohort group exceeded 75%, as did ‘all students’ in each grade, regardless of cohort status.

Additional Evidence

Our overall 89% cohort proficiency rate this year improves upon our cohort passing rate of 73% in 2006-07.

Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4				
Grade	2006-07		2007-08	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	77	13	88	17
4	85	13	94	16
5	54	13	70	10
6	75	16	100	12
All	73	55	89.1	55

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) 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 all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state's learning standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year's English language arts AMO, which for 2007-08 is 102. The PI 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 PI is 200.

Results

The math aggregate PI score of Ark Community Charter School is 190.

Calculation of 2007-08 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3-6	0	10.1%	59.4%	30.4%	69

$$\begin{array}{rcccccc} \mathbf{PI} & = & 10.1 & + & 59.4 & + & 30.4 & = & 100 \\ & & & & + & 59.4 & + & 30.4 & = & 90 \\ & & & & & & \mathbf{PI} & = & \mathbf{190} \end{array}$$

Evaluation

This outcome measure has been met. As seen in the table above, our students' PI of 190 exceeded the AMO mark of 102 by a very wide margin.

Additional Evidence

This is the second consecutive year during this two year charter that our school has significantly surpassed the state AMO.

**Mathematics Performance Index (PI) and
Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) by School Year**

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07	3-6	76	8	23	62	8	163	86
2007-08	3-6	69	0%	10.1%	59.4%	30.4	190	102

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the local school district, as well as between the total result of students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for the corresponding grades in the school district.

Results

89.1% of the grade 3-6 students in at least their second year scored proficient in math compared to 70% in the local district.

**2007-08 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Ark Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students Troy City	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	88.2	17	82.2	316
4	93.8	16	70.5	288
5	70	10	60.3	270
6	100	12	63.5	296
All	89.1	55	70	1170

Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. Seen in the table above, we are considerably outperforming the district in 2007-08, as we did in 2006-07 (See below).

Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4				
Grade	2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	77	73	88	82
4	85	61	94	71
5	54	55	70	60
6	75	52	100	64
All	73	60	89.1	70

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school's actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of poverty data, the 2007-08 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2006-07 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

This is an analysis performed by The Charter Schools Institute (CSI) for schools with accountability plans from 2005 and later. Results from this analysis were distributed to schools this past year and represent scores from the January 2007 tests, not the 2008 tests, which make up this report. We expect the 2008 CSI analysis to be available to schools after this report is filed. After per CSI requirements, in the absence of current year regression analysis, the school

should provide the most recent results. On November 27th of 2007, CSI released regression results to schools, based on January 2007 scores. In that year, when our Math results slightly lower than they are now, we were still higher than other impoverished schools. Given our performance at 88% for all students, we could easily expect to vault into the next higher category, similar to what we expect in ELA.

2006-07 Mathematics Comparative Performance

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3-6	89.4%	76	69.6	62.2	.4
2007-08	3-6			Not available	Not available	Not available

Evaluation

In 2006-07, the CSI evaluation of our Math scores placed us in the category ‘higher than expect by a small degree.’ Considering our significantly higher scores in 2007-08, we anticipate exceeding this measure by a significant margin.

Goal 2: Growth Measure

Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year’s state mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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 towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2007-08 and also have a state exam score in 2006-07. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2006-07 and 75 percent proficient in 2007-08. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2006-07, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2006-07 to 2007-08

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2006-07	Target	2007-08	
4	16	77%	78%	94%	YES
5	10	85%	86%	70%	NO
6	12	54%	65%	100%	YES
All	38	68%	72%	89%	YES

Evaluation

In 2007-08, we met this outcome measure. Our students easily exceeded 75%, with a group cohort proficiency of 89%.

ACTION PLAN FOR Math 2008-09

In order to reach our target goal in Mathematics, ACCS will implement the following action plan:

A. Mathematics Grades K-6: Using Scott Foresman Mathematics Program

1. Teachers will administer their grade level baseline test during the first full week of school. After grading the test and completing an item analysis for each student, teachers will meet with curriculum coordinators to discuss the results. Students will be grouped based on these results.
2. During Mathematics instruction, teachers in Grades K – 2 will follow the recommended Scott Foresman program and NYS Mathematics standards for their grade level.
3. Using the Scott Foresman program and NYS standards, teachers (Grades 3 – 6) will be assigned concepts and lessons to be taught before March, as per NYS recommendations, to prepare their students for the NYS test.
4. Teachers K - 6 will administer Scott Foresman test prep activities daily. These activities will reinforce previously learned mathematics concepts.
5. Students in Kindergarten will be administered chapter tests as an assessment of mathematics concepts.
6. In grades 1-6, students will be tested throughout a chapter of study using quizzes that assess the concepts (performance indicators) taught. Students who do not master a concept will be grouped and re-taught the skill by the teacher, TA, or AIS support teacher or in after-school tutoring sessions. Scott Foresman provides an immediate intervention plan that can be used for re-teaching a concept.

7. In grades 1- 2, students will be administered chapter tests and also Cumulative Review tests after chapters 3, 6, and 9 to assess mastery and retention of concepts previously learned and determine students who need additional instruction.
8. In grades 3 – 6, students will be administered chapter tests and benchmark tests following chapters 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 to assess mastery of and retention of concepts previously learned to determine students who need additional instruction.
9. All testing results will be used to inform instruction and as one component in determining students' report card grades.
10. Teachers K - 6 will administer the Cumulative test (Final Exam) for Chapters 1 – 12 during the second week in June. After grading this test, teachers will complete an item analysis for each student. These results along with other assessments given throughout the school year will be used to review students' grade level progress for the year. Determinations made at this time will be used when forming AIS groupings for the upcoming school year.
11. Teachers will meet with the Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator to discuss lessons, planning, pacing and most importantly students' progress.

B. Mathematics: Test Preparation using results from NYS Mathematics test

1. The Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator will meet in August with teachers to review the results of the NYS Mathematics test. Teachers will use these results as a teaching tool to prepare their students for the upcoming spring test.
2. In October, teachers will administer a practice NYS Mathematics test using the previous year's test. Teachers will meet with the Coordinator to discuss the test results and determine an appropriate plan to prepare their students for the upcoming NYS assessment. Additional mathematics support will be determined and assigned at this time, if needed.

C. Placement of New Students

The Scott Foresman Mathematics Baseline test will be administered to each student upon entry into a grade.

D. Criteria for Inclusion in AIS

1. Students scoring at a level 1 or 2 on the NYS tests.
2. Students scoring in Grades 1 and 2 at the 30th percentile or less on the Terra Nova test.
3. Students receiving scores of less than 75% performance on their report card.

E. Curriculum Team

1. The curriculum team will meet with each teacher on a regular basis (biweekly) to discuss students' individual progress.
2. On Monday and Tuesday of each week, the curriculum team will meet to review the results of all posted material. (Monday-ELA Tuesday-Math).
3. The curriculum team will review lesson plans weekly.
4. The curriculum team will report all formative assessments to Leadership Team at weekly team meetings.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will understand and apply scientific concepts, principles, and theories pertaining to the physical setting and living environment and recognize the historical development of ideas in science.

Background

ACCS's science curriculum is based on the New York State Core Curriculum in Science. All classrooms engage in two science blocks each week, as well as time integrated with the arts. Science instruction provides students with opportunities to interact directly with the natural world and gives them the skills they need to explain the world that surrounds them. This approach allows students to practice problem-solving skills, develop positive science attitudes, learn new science content, and increase their scientific literacy.

The elementary science program emphasizes a hands-on, inquiry-based approach to learning. Younger students learn effectively when they are actively engaged in the discovery process. Middle school science prepares our students to explain, both accurately and with appropriate depth, the big ideas about our physical setting and our living environment. Students learn to communicate their thoughts, use appropriate scientific language, and demonstrate understanding of science process skills and procedures.

Multiple assessments are used to evaluate student knowledge and to inform instruction:

1. *Classroom Assessments*: Students will demonstrate that they can perform at standard through classroom work, homework, tests and quizzes.
2. *Performances and Exhibitions*: Performances and exhibitions are demonstrations of student knowledge and/or skill and are assessed using rubrics and checklists.
3. *Portfolios*: Student Portfolios are collections of artifacts, documenting student work over time and are assessed using rubrics and checklists.

The staff employs a common language and knowledge that supports strategies that promotes hands-on science instruction and participates in ongoing professional development provided by the ACCS Curriculum Coordinators and professional conferences. As a result of this ongoing support, ACCS staff possesses the special knowledge and training needed to effectively teach students to understand and apply scientific concepts, principles, and theories pertaining to the physical setting and living environment and recognize the historical development of ideas in science.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State science examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th grade in spring 2008. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	0	10	38	52	91	21
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	11	39	89	18

Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. 89% of our cohort students (16 of 18) passed the NYS 4th grade Science Test. Additionally, (19 out of 21) total 4th grade students passed, or 91%. We were pleased to exceed this measure in 2008, as we fell just short in 2007. (See below)

**Science Performance
by Grade Level and School Year**

Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4				
Grade	2006-07		2007-08	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	69	13	89	18

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

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

Results

Comparative science results are not publicly available for science as they are for ELA and Math. We are not able to confirm for certain how 4th grade students performed in Troy with regard to Science in 2008.

**2007-08 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All Troy District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	89	18		

SOCIAL STUDIES**Goal 4: Social Studies**

Students will use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of major ideas, eras, themes, developments, and turning points in the history of the United States and New York.

Background

ACCS's social studies curriculum is based on the New York State Social Studies Core Curriculum. All classrooms engage in two social studies blocks each week, as well as time integrated with the arts. Through explorations of history, geography, economics, government,

and civics, students learn about the people, places, eras, and events near and far that shaped our world.

Multiple assessments are used to evaluate student knowledge and to inform instruction:

4. *Classroom Assessments*: Students will demonstrate that they can perform at standard through classroom work, homework, tests and quizzes.
5. *Writing Samples*: Writing samples from across the curriculum are assessed using the NYS, Scott Foresman, and teacher created rubrics.
6. *Performances and Exhibitions*: Performances and exhibitions are demonstrations of student knowledge and/or skill and are assessed using rubrics and checklists.
7. *Portfolios*: Student Portfolios are collections of artifacts, documenting student work over time and are assessed using rubrics and checklists.

ACCS staff participates in ongoing professional development provided by the ACCS Curriculum Coordinators and professional conferences. As a result of this ongoing support, ACCS staff possesses the special knowledge and training needed to effectively teach students use to a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of major ideas, eras, themes, developments, and turning points in the history of the United States and New York.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State social studies examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in 5th grade in November 2007. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

The overall percent of grade 5 students in at least their second year performing at Levels 3 & 4 on the NYS social studies test is **85%**.

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Social Studies Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
5	All Students	0	2	11	2	87%	15
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	2	10	1	85%	13

Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. 85% of our cohort students (11 of 13) passed the NYS 5th grade Social Studies Test. Additionally, (13 out of 15) total 5th grade students passed, or 87%.

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State social studies exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

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

Results

We are not able to assess this measure since official results have not been posted, and we have no way of determining how the local school district performed on 5th grade Social Studies during 2007-08. All we can do at this point is report on our success versus our absolute measure of 75% cohort proficiency.

2007-08 State Social Studies Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	85%	13		

Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

Method

Since *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 the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards which indicate each school's status under the state's NCLB accountability system. For a school's status to be "Good Standing" it must not have failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years.

Results

We are a school in good standing.

Evaluation

This measure has been met.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing