

**Bronx Success Academy
CHARTER SCHOOL 1
("BSA1")**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY
PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 21, 2011
By Amanda Kramer

Bronx Success Academy Charter School 1
510 E 141st St
Bronx, NY 10454
T: 347-286-7950

Amanda Kramer prepared this 2010-11 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
John Rowan	Board Chair
Nicole Agnew	Member
Kelli Coleman	Member
Shaun Gordon	Member
Ellen Gustafson	Member
Jake Hoffman	Member
Alexander Kassan	Member
Jonathan Keidan	Member
Josh Koplewicz	Member
Susan Kreisman	Member
Annette Marquez	Member
Justin Muzinich	Member
Michael Naft	Member
Amanda Schreiber	Member
Russ Valdez	Member

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Harlem Success Academy Charter School 1 (“BSA1”) is to provide New York City elementary students, particularly those from economically-disadvantaged neighborhoods, with the knowledge, skills, character, and disposition to meet and exceed New York State standards and give them the resources to lead and succeed in the school, college, and life.

The school opened in August 2010 and served Kindergarten and First Grade during the 2010-2011 school year.

School Design Elements

A. Focus on Student Achievement

- All staff members are continually focused on how their work is fostering student achievement.
- The goal is to prevent the achievement gap from arising in the first place.
- The ultimate goal for all students is college graduation.

B. Curriculum

- A research-based, results-driven curriculum is used.
- The curriculum includes and goes beyond New York State standards.
- Students receive 100 minutes of daily reading instruction, 30 minutes of daily writing instruction, 80 minutes of daily mathematics, and daily exploratory-based science instruction totaling 4 and a half hours each week.

C. Student Performance Data

- Assessments are given monthly in all core subjects.
- Assessment data is produced and analyzed in real time so that teachers and school leaders can augment instruction and provide extra tutoring to ensure all students are achieving at a high level.

D. More Instructional Time

- The school day runs from 8:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m. Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays and 8:00 a.m. until 2:30 p.m. on Wednesdays. (Teachers use Wednesday afternoons for professional development and collaboration.)
- There are 188 days of instruction each year.
- Struggling students receive one-on-one and small group tutoring.
- High-performing students participate in enrichment activities.

E. School Leaders with the Power to Lead

- The Principal has the power to hire and fire staff.
- Non-instructional operations are handled by the school operations team and Success Charter Network (“SCN”), allowing the Principal and other instructional leaders to regularly observe teaching and focus solely on student achievement.
- The school's budget is set by the Principal in consultation with the Board of Trustees and SCN's finance team. This allows the budget to reflect real student and school needs.

F. Highly-Qualified, Highly-Trained Staff

- Top notch educators are recruited from around the country.
- Regular professional development is implemented to improve the instructional capacity of the staff.
- School leaders regularly observe, coach, and provide feedback to teachers to help improve their instruction.

G. Strong School Culture

- Students and staff are required to go above and beyond expectations in all circumstances.
- Excellent behavior is explicitly taught modeled, expected, and rewarded.
- Values and good character are a central part of daily instruction.
- There is an emphasis on college for all students.
- Principles of *ACTION* taught and modeled and constantly reinforced by all.
 - Agency: Students, parents, and all school personnel have a sense of ownership and personal responsibility.
 - Curiosity: Student exploration and curiosity drive instruction.
 - Try and Try: Students work hard – even if they do not succeed with their first attempt. They learn the importance of persistence.
 - Integrity: The value of honesty is consistently taught and modeled.
 - Others: Students are taught to have empathy and respect others.
 - No Shortcuts: There are no shortcuts to success. Hard work is mandatory.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2006-07	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2007-08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2009-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2010-11	88	104	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	192

Note: Per October 2010 BEDS Report

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing and comprehending the English language.

Background

Believing that all children can succeed, BSA1 goes above and beyond state standards. The early elementary literacy curriculum in kindergarten and first grade is modeled on an enhanced version of Success For All (SFA), which has a proven track record in urban schools and has been implemented in over 1,000 schools around the United States. As such, consultants from the Success For All Foundation will train teachers in strategies for teaching literacy. In upper grades, a comprehensive balanced literacy program will be used, developed in-house by the SCN Instructional Development and Literacy teams.

Activities in literacy help children develop both decoding and comprehension skills in order to become successful readers. Teachers model reading skills. Students then practice these skills independently and in small groups leveled homogeneously.

In order to ensure that scholars' comprehension needs are met, BSA1 has built in additional time to every school day for independent reading, guided reading, and writer's workshop. At the heart of the literacy program is 100 minutes of daily, uninterrupted reading instruction for grades 1 through 5. Kindergartners learn literacy through KinderCorner, SFA's standards-aligned kindergarten program. KinderCorner integrates literacy throughout the day into varying blocks that are suitable yet challenging to kindergartners' developmental needs.

Every eight weeks, students are assessed and progress to the next instructional reading level when ready; thus children are assigned to appropriate reading levels based on reading performance, not age or grade.

BSA1 employs one lead teacher in each classroom. A lead teacher typically has at least three years of classroom experience, New York State teaching certification, and a Master's degree. Each grade level also has assistant teachers who have less classroom experience. The school also employs specialty teachers such as science teachers, special education teachers (who work as independent contractors), art teachers, chess teachers, dance teachers, and athletic coaches.

BSA1 enforces specific protocols for how schools collect, distribute, and analyze data. These protocols work to help teachers and school leaders freely access information in real-time. In a fast-paced and constantly changing school environment, having data at one's fingertips empowers the staff to better decide how to expend time and resources so as to maximize student achievement.

BSA1 views its teachers as Olympic athletes who must constantly train and improve their skills. To that end, we provide professional development for teachers so they can develop skills, acquire knowledge in their content areas, and improve their pedagogical techniques. That way teachers are prepared to "win the race" that is educating children.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State English Language arts examination.¹

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in third grade in April 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required 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. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	657
4	654
5	654
6	654
7	652
8	652

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. BSA1 did not administer the ELA test in 2010-11 because in that year, its highest grade was first grade.

**2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					

¹ In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school’s Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan’s standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

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.

6					
7					
8					
All					

Results

BSA1 did not administer the ELA test in 2010-11 because in that year, its highest grade was first grade.

**Charter School Performance on 2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
5	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
6	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
7	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
8	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
All	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		

Evaluation

BSA1 did not administer the ELA test in 2010-11 because in that year, its highest grade was first grade. Therefore, we are unable to evaluate BSA1’s performance with respect to state test results.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 has not yet administered the ELA test in 2010-11 or in previous years. Therefore, we cannot comment on performance trends in ELA.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11			
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11

	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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.

As SED has not yet determined this year’s AMO, schools need not calculate their Performance Index and may omit reporting on this measure.

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 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.

Results

BSA1 has not yet administered state ELA tests so we cannot compare its performance with that of the district at this time.

**2010-11 State English Language Arts 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
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

Evaluation

BSA1 has not yet taken state ELA tests. Therefore, we cannot evaluate its performance with respect to the tests.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 has not yet taken state ELA tests.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	-	-	-	-	-	-		
4								
5								
6								
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
All								

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by 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 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

BSA1 has yet to administer state ELA tests so we cannot comment on its Effect Size at this point.

2009-10 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Free Lunch Eligible Students	Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:

Note: The table above is drawn from an electronic mail from the Charter Schools Institute sent on October 3, 2011.

Evaluation

BSA1 has not yet administered state ELA tests so we cannot evaluate its performance with respect to the tests.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 is scheduled to administered its first round of state ELA tests in 2012-13 so we cannot comment on its Effect Size at this time.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size

		Free Lunch				
2006-07						
2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						
2010-11						

Goal 1: Value Added Measure

On the current year’s state English language arts exam, 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. 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.

Each student, beginning in the second grade, will take the DRA, or a similar reading assessment, and at least 75% of students will increase in reading performance by a minimum of one grade level equivalent each 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 of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. 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

BSA1 did not administer state ELA tests in 2010-11. Therefore, we cannot comment on results at this point.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2009-10 to 2010-11

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4					N/A
5					N/A
6					N/A
7					N/A
8					N/A
All					N/A

Additional Evidence

BSA1 did not administer state ELA tests.

**Cohort Performance on State English Language Arts Exam
Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year**

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08			
2008-09			
2009-10			
2010-11			

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

BSA1 has not yet administered state ELA tests so we cannot observe whether it successfully achieved ELA goals.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	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 exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	N/A
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	N/A
--		--

Action Plan

Though BSA1 lacks state test data, expertise we gain at the Success Charter Network will allow us to apply best practices to help guide BSA1 to success on the ELA test in 2012-2013.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will show competency in their understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

Background

BSA1 uses the Investigations math program. Some of its key elements are described below:

- **Problem Solving** – The Investigations math program offers students a chance to solve real world, contextualized mathematics problems using both conceptual understanding as well as procedural and computational fluency. Students learn problem-solving strategies by solving daily word problems in a program we call Cognitive Guided Instruction (CGI). CGI requires cooperative learning and critical thinking. Under the guidance of the teacher, students employ problem-solving strategies to math problems that are posed in various ways within the same topic. Students work together and individually to determine the math concept addressed in the problem, and then use their familiarity with procedures and number facts to solve the problem accurately and quickly.
- **Assessment** – The Investigations math program contains diagnostic assessment tools to determine the progress of students with respect to program topics as well as state and national standards. BSA1 has also interim assessments that are aligned to NY State and Common Core standards. These ensure that teachers have the tools necessary to get all students to successfully master the math skills tied to New York state and the Common Core.
- **Conceptual Understanding** – Investigations math places an emphasis on fact fluency and computational procedures, but also offers open-ended exploration and interactive learning components to each lesson to let students make sense of mathematics. This conceptual framework helps build on ideas and observations from previous experiences. Students are then able to apply their thinking to new situations and unfamiliar problems. The Investigations program uses daily word problems to give students meaning, understanding, and application to the math they learn.
- **Differentiation** – the Investigations program has a differentiated instructional program that allows teachers to routinely deliver formative assessments in each lesson and provide additional activities and homework that are in line with student understanding of the topic. For students who are struggling, re-teaching activities are provided to help students fully understand the material by delivering the information in a different way. For students who have internalized the lesson, there are additional activities designed so students can further analyze that lesson's topic. In addition, teachers are provided with extensive resources to encourage teaching to different modalities, including Smart Board integrated virtual manipulatives as well as hands-on manipulatives.
- **Computational Fluency** – BSA1 supplements Investigations with math facts practice because we recognize the importance of computational fluency. Students use the procedural and computational practice found in Investigations and reinforced with other math activities to teach students to answer math facts with accuracy and speed.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State mathematics examination³.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd grade in May 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required 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. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	656
4	655
5	653
6	653
7	651
8	652

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. BSA1 did not administer the math test in 2010-11 because in that year, its highest grade was first grade.

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁴			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					

³ In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school’s Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan’s standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

⁴ 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

4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All					

Results

BSA1 did not administer the math test in 2010-11 because in that year, its highest grade was first grade.

**Charter School Performance on 2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
5	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
6	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
7	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
8	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
All	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		

Evaluation

BSA1 did not administer the math test in 2010-11 because in that year, its highest grade was first grade. Therefore, we are unable to evaluate BSA1’s performance with respect to state test results.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 has not yet administered the math test in 2010-11 or in previous years. Therefore, we cannot comment on performance trends in math.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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 Mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s mathematics AMO.

As SED has not yet determined this year’s AMO, schools need not calculate their Performance Index and may omit reporting on this measure.

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

BSA1 did not administer the math test in 2010-11 because in that year, its highest grade was first grade.

**2010-11 State Mathematics 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
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

Evaluation

BSA1 has not yet taken state math tests. Therefore, we cannot compare its performance with that of the district at this time.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 has not yet taken state math tests. Therefore, we cannot evaluate its performance with respect to these.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	-	-	-	-	-	-		
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

The chart below displays how the charter school students in each grade performed compared to students in public schools in New York State with the same grade and a similar population of free-lunch-eligible students. The results show an effect size that is higher than expected to a large degree.

BSA1 has yet to administer state math tests so we cannot comment on its Effect Size at this point.

2009-10 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Free Lunch Eligible Students	Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:

Note: The table above is drawn from an electronic mail from the Charter Schools Institute sent on October 3, 2011.

Evaluation

BSA1’s third grade outperformed its expected overall comparative performance by a very wide margin. This is further testament to BSA1’s effective math instruction.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 has not yet taken state math tests.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07						
2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						
2010-11						

Goal 1: Value Added Measure

On the current year's state mathematics exam, 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. 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 of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. 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

BSA1 has yet to administer state math tests so we cannot comment on its Effect Size at this point.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2009-10 to 2010-11

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4					N/A
5					N/A
6					N/A
7					N/A
8					N/A
All					N/A

Evaluation

BSA1 has not yet administered state math tests. Therefore, we cannot evaluate its performance with respect to these.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 did not administer state math tests.

**Cohort Performance on Mathematics Exam
Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year**

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	N/A		
2008-09	N/A		
2009-10	N/A		
2010-11	N/A		

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Since 2010-2011 was the first year BSA1 administered the math test, we are not able to fully realize growth over time. However, we are confident that BSA1 will continue to post results that meet or exceed the goal of getting 75% of second year students to perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	N/A
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	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 exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	N/A
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	N/A

Action Plan

Though BSA1 lacks state test data, expertise we gain at the Success Charter Network will allow us to apply best practices to help guide BSA1 to success on the math test in 2012-2013.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
 Students will understand and apply scientific principles at a proficient level.

Background

The school’s curriculum is unique in its attention to science, including unprecedented daily instruction. The school uses a discovery-based, experiential approach to science, guided by the most influential authorities on elementary science education today, the American Association for the Advancement of Science Benchmarks and the National Resource Council National Science Education Standards. Taught by specialized science teachers, students have hands-on experience with objects, materials, and organisms to understand the natural world. The curriculum provides students with a solid foundation in discovery-based science to ensure that they can excel in middle and high school science classes.

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

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was first grade.

Results

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was first grade.

**Charter School Performance on 2010-11 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						N/A
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year						N/A
8	All Students						N/A
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year						N/A

Evaluation

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was first grade.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was first grade.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A
8		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A
All		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A

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

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was first grade.

**2010-11 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 District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4				
8				

Evaluation

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was first grade.

Additional Evidence

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was first grade.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4								
8								
All								

Summary

BSA1 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	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 examination.	N/A
Comparative	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 exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	N/A

Action Plan

While progress cannot yet be measured quantitatively, the school remains confident that the program and curriculum described here and in the charter will lead to academic achievement that meets the goals outlined in the Accountability Plan. In the event that data were to arise that indicated that the school were not on track to meet its goals, specific and targeted interventions would be undertaken immediately.

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB

The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

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

Though BSA1 lacks state test data to allow us to comment on BSA1's academic standing, we are confident that our rigorous and well-conceived instructional program will allow BSA1 to exceed achievement goals.

Evaluation

Though BSA1 lacks state test data to allow us to evaluate BSA1's academic standing, we are confident that our rigorous and well-conceived instructional program will allow BSA1 to exceed achievement goals.

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following sections are for optional goals; data tables are provided for commonly used optional measures.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 94 percent.

Method

Student attendance is tracked by teachers each day and recorded in our PowerSchool database by the school office staff.

Results

2010-11 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	97%
2	--
3	--
4	--
5	--
6	--
7	--
8	--
Overall	97%

Evaluation

The attendance rate target was met during the 2010-2011 school year.

Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2006-07	--
2007-08	--
2008-09	--
2009-10	--
2010-11	97%

Note: Includes Kindergarten students