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.

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School

2007-08 Accountability Plan Progress Report

8/1/2008
Mr. Kay Madati – Board President
856 Quincy Street
Brooklyn, New York 11221
(p) 718.246.5681
(f) 718.246.5864

Dr. Thomas DeMarco prepared this 2007-08 Accountability Plan Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Introduction

The State University of New York's Board of Trustees ("SUNY") authorized Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School ("Brooklyn Excelsior") in March 2002. After taking a planning year, the school opened its doors to 206 K-4 students in the fall of 2003. Brooklyn Excelsior was located in a temporary facility during its first year of operation. The following year the school moved into its permanent facility located at 856 Quincy Street in Brooklyn, New York. In the fall of 2007, Brooklyn Excelsior added the 8th grade and served 698 students during the 2007-08 school year in grades K-8.

Brooklyn Excelsior has improved its performance over the course of its initial charter. Following are some highlights in regards to the school's performance:
- Brooklyn Excelsior recently received a five-year renewal without conditions from the Charter Schools Institute (CSI).
- The school was recognized by CSI for being 1 of 6 schools (out of 15 that applied) to receive a full-term renewal in 2007-08.
- Brooklyn Excelsior was named a "rapidly improving" school for the 2006-07 school year by the New York State Education Department.

We are pleased with Brooklyn Excelsior's progress and will work to ensure all students continue to grown and learn.

Brooklyn Excelsior's student body is comprised of 96% black and 4% Hispanic. Ninety-three percent of the students qualified for the National School Lunch Program.

The mission of Brooklyn Excelsior is:

> *"Working in partnership with parents and community, Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School will offer a challenging character-based education by providing a strong curriculum and an atmosphere of high expectations."*

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2003-04	38	40	47	44	43					212
2004-05	113	98	75	76	74	50				486
2005-06	98	97	98	74	67	67	49			550
2006-07	77	97	98	97	70	69	70	41		619
2007-08	81	75	101	102	102	74	61	63	39	698

Note: Enrollment for years 2003-04 through 2006-07 is based on enrollment at the end of the school year.
Enrollment for 2007-08 is based on the enrollment submitted on the BEDS report on October 1, 2007.

English Language Arts

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Language Arts.

Background
The English Language Arts ("ELA") curriculum provides students with the skills, strategies, and knowledge necessary for success in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing. Indeed, a student's mastery in all areas of ELA is a key component for learning in every content area. By interacting with a wide variety of texts, students develop their ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and make connections to the world around them.

Early reading instruction focuses on the building blocks of reading – phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency. These building blocks lay the foundation for the intellectual processes necessary for students to remember, understand, analyze, evaluate, and apply the ideas they encounter while reading.

In all grade levels, students read and view a variety of high-quality classic and contemporary texts, informational texts, and media (print and non-print). Students engage in the writing process to demonstrate their thinking and individual voice, producing works that include narrative, persuasive, expository, and expressive texts. Through writing and explicit instruction, students learn proper English language conventions and usage, including spelling, vocabulary, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and penmanship.

The ELA curriculum also provides students with speaking, listening, and viewing instruction and practice to help foster the critical communication skills necessary in today's world.

I.   **Absolute Measure:** Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of third through eighth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) ELA assessment.

Method
The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 8th 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 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			Total Enrolled*
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	97	0	0	0	97
4	102	0	0	0	102
5	72	0	0	0	72
6	54	0	0	0	54
7	59	0	0	0	59
8	37	0	0	0	37
All	421	0	0	0	421

*Total Enrolled based on the total number of students enrolled on the date of the ELA exam.

Results

Overall, Brooklyn Excelsior had 71% of students in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 on the 2007-08 administration of the ELA exam. Notably, in grades 3, 5, and 7, more than 75% of students were identified as proficient.

**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	1%	23%	69%	7%	76%	97
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	1%	22%	70%	7%	77%	83
4	All Students	8%	21%	66%	5%	71%	102
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	9%	20%	66%	5%	71%	90
5	All Students	0%	8%	82%	10%	92%	72
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	8%	82%	10%	92%	59
6	All Students	0%	50%	50%	0%	50%	54
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	49%	51%	0%	51%	53
7	All Students	0%	25%	75%	0%	75%	59
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	25%	75%	0%	75%	59
8	All Students	0%	51%	49%	0%	49%	37
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	51%	49%	0%	49%	37
All	**All Students**	**2%**	**26%**	**67%**	**5%**	**72%**	**421**
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	**2%**	**27%**	**67%**	**4%**	**71%**	**381**

Evaluation

The absolute measure was not met. Of the students tested who were enrolled in at least their second year, 71% of students performed at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA exam.

Additional Evidence

The percentage of students enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 has increased by over 200% since 2004-05. While the absolute measure was not met, the school came very close to meeting the goal. We believe that the year-to-year trends show positive growth in ELA. Further, we intend to continue improving so that we can ultimately meet the measure of having 75% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 on the ELA exam.

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							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
3			63%	51	59%	80	77%	83
4	23%	35	60%	55	69%	52	71%	90
5			65%	46	48%	44	92%	59
6			50%	40	60%	50	51%	53
7					41%	32	75%	59
8							49%	37
All	23%	35	60%	192	57%	258	71%	381

II.   **Absolute Measure:** Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYSTP ELA assessment will meet the Annual Measurable Objective 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 langue 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

During the 2007-08 school year, only 2% of students in grades 3-8 performed at level 1 on the ELA exam. A majority of the students (67%) performed at Level 3, with 26% of students performing at Level 2. The school had a PI of 170 for the 2007-08 school year.

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	
3-8	2%	26%	67%	5%	421

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met the measure of exceeding the state's AMO of 133. The school's PI was 170; therefore, the school exceeded the goal by 37 points.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior exceeded the state's AMO in 2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08. The school's PI remained stable during the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years, but it increased during the 2007-08 school year. Further, the percentage of students performing at Level 1 has decreased from 6% to 2%; the percentage of students performing at Level 2 has decreased from 34% to 26%; and the percentage of students performing at Level 3 has

increased from 55% to 67% since 2005-06. This indicates that more students are performing at Level 3 with less students performing at Levels 1 and 2.

English Language Arts Performance Index (PI) and
Annual Measureable 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		
2005-06	3-6	256	6%	34%	56%	4%	153	122
2006-07	3-7	354	3%	43%	51%	3%	151	122
2007-08	3-8	421	2%	26%	67%	5%	170	133

III. **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
The percentage of students enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 was 71% for Brooklyn Excelsior; the percentage of students in District 16 performing at or above Level 3 was 46%. Brooklyn Excelsior outperformed the local District as an aggregate as well as at each grade level.

2007-08 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 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	77%	83	52%	919
4	71%	90	56%	920
5	92%	59	63%	828
6	51%	53	33%	828
7	75%	59	45%	854
8	49%	37	29%	874
All	**71%**	**381**	**46%**	**5223**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met the comparative measure. The school exceeded the District's aggregate performance by 25 percentage points. Most notably, the 7th grade class of

students in at least their second year outperformed the district by 30 percentage points.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior did not meet this measure during the 2004-05 school year; however, the following three years Brooklyn Excelsior's second year students outperformed the local district.

English Language Arts Performance of charter School and Local District
By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2nd Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3			63%	44%	59%	48%	77%	52%
4	23%	46%	60%	44%	69%	50%	71%	56%
5			65%	43%	48%	43%	92%	63%
6			50%	30%	60%	29%	51%	33%
7					41%	28%	75%	45%
8							49%	29%
All	23%	46%	60%	40%	57%	40%	71%	46%

IV. **Comparative Measure:** Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State 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 and 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

Brooklyn Excelsior's Effect Size was higher than expected to a small degree for 2006-07. The school's predicted Effect Size was 47.4. The school's actual Effect Size was 54.2, thus performing higher than expected.

2006-07 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3 & 4		Difference Between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		100	56.0	50.4	5.6	0.38
4		73	67.1	50.8	16.3	1.09
5		70	45.7	50.7	-4.9	-0.34
6		70	54.3	42.5	11.8	0.70
7		41	41.5	36.5	5.0	0.31
All	77.8%	354	54.2	**47.4**	**6.9**	**0.44**

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
Higher than expected to a small degree

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The Effect Size was 0.44, which is higher than expected to a small degree. Notably, grade 4's Effect Size was 1.09, which is higher than expected o a large degree; and grade 6's Effect Size was 0.70 which is higher than expected to a medium degree.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has performed better than predicted each year. In 2005-06, the school's Effect Size was 0.57, and in 2006-07 the school's Effect Size was 0.44 – both of which are higher than expected.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06	3-6	73%	255	59.6	48.9	**0.57**
2006-07	3-7	78%	354	54.2	47.4	**0.44**
2007-08	3-8				**n/a**	**n/a**

V. **Value-Added Measure:** Each year, each grade-level cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the 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 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

Brooklyn Excelsior had six cohorts; of the six cohorts tested, four cohorts achieved their target. The aggregate of all cohorts also achieved its target.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2006-07	**Target**	**2007-08**	
4	90	54%	65%	72%	Yes
5	58	71%	73%	91%	Yes
6	52	46%	61%	50%	No
7	59	53%	64%	75%	Yes
8	37	43%	59%	49%	No
All	**296**	**54%**	**65%**	**70%**	**Yes**

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior did not meet this measure. Four out of the six cohorts tested achieved their target; and the aggregate of the cohorts achieved their target. In order to meet the measure, all cohorts needed to meet their target. While two cohorts did not meet their target, there was still an increase (4% grade 6, 6% grade 8) in the percentage of students performing at or above Level 3.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior's cohort of students performing at or above Level 3 on the ELA exam have improved since 2006-07. In 2006-07, five cohorts were tested and one cohort met its target. During the 2007-08 school year, four of six cohorts met their target. This is a substantial improvement over the previous year's results.

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
2006-07	4-7	1	5
2007-08	4-8	4	6

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Brooklyn Excelsior's student performance has increased since the 2006-07 administration of the ELA exam. The improvements made over the 2007-08 school year demonstrate that students are learning and achieving more.

Brooklyn Excelsior nearly met its first absolute measure: 71% of students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3. The school did meet its second absolute measure and its first comparative measure. The results for the 2007-08 regression analysis are not yet available, so the data reported is for the 2006-07 school. Brooklyn Excelsior met the measure during the 2006-07 school year. The Value-Added Measure was not met, but the school came very close to meeting the measure: four out of the six cohorts tested met their targets.

We recognize that the school needs to continue improving and increasing student performance. Since three of the five measures were met, we know that the accountability plan goal of having all students proficient in ELA has not been met. We will continue working actively to this end. See below for the initiatives we will put in place during the 2008-09 school year to increase student proficiency.

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	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measureable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved
Value-Added	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 exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior recognizes that the goal of having all students proficient in ELA has not been met. As a means to continue increasing student learning, the school identified specific areas of focus for each grade and created grade-level action plans to specifically address the areas in need of improvement.

Grade Level	Area of Focus	Action Plan
Kindergarten	Phonics	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to instructional strategies of phonemic awareness, phonics and fluency **2**: Model instructional strategies of phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. **3**: Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4**: Pre/Post test students on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5**: Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers **6**: Use PGA skill areas to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
1st Grade	Vocabulary and Word Structure	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to vocabulary and word structure. **2**: Model instructional strategies of phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. **3**: Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4**: Pre/Post test students on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5**: Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers **6**: Use PGA skill areas to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
2nd Grade	Information and Understanding	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and text resources.

		2: Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. **3**: Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4**: Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5**: Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers **6**: Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
3rd Grade	Information and Understanding	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and text resources. **2**: Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. **3**: Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4**: Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5**: Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers **6**: Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
4th Grade	Information and Understanding	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and text resources. **2**: Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. **3**: Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4**: Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5**: Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers **6**: Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
5th Grade	Analysis and Evaluation	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to comprehension, diagramming sentences and text resources. **2**: Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. **3**: Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4**: Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5**: Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers **6**: Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
6th Grade	Language Usage /Grammar	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and text resources. **2**: Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. **3**: Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4**: Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5**: Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers. **6**: Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
7th Grade	Writing /Grammar	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to daily editing, response journals, and other passages to promote writing and grammar.

		2: Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. **3:** Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4:** Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5:** Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers. **6:** Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
8th Grade	Language Usage /Grammar	**1:** Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and text resources. **2:** Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. **3:** Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. **4:** Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. **5:** Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers. **6:** Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.

Mathematics

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Mathematics.

Background

To prepare students for mathematical skills they will need in everyday life, as well as for the rigors of high school and post-high school mathematics, a strong mathematics curriculum that emphasizes computational and procedural skills, problem solving, communicating, reasoning and proof, making connections, and using representations is implemented.

As students gain fluency in computational and procedural skills, they develop a deeper understanding of the mathematical concepts and reasoning required for problem solving. Students learn to represent and communicate ideas through the use of signs, symbols, models, graphs, mathematical terms, and through writing. Students investigate and analyze problems and possibilities using logical thinking, reasoning, and proofs. Connections among mathematical ideas, as well as connections to other subject areas are explored. Mathematical thinking, problem solving, and reasoning skills and strategies are refined in topic areas.

I.   **Absolute Measure:** Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of third through eighth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Mathematics assessment.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 8th 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 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			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	94	0	0	0	94
4	101	0	0	0	101
5	71	0	0	0	71
6	54	0	0	0	54
7	57	0	0	0	57
8	37	0	0	0	37
All	**414**	0	0	0	**414**

*Total Enrolled based on the total number of students enrolled on the date of the math exam.

Results

All students and students enrolled in at least their second at Brooklyn Excelsior performed above 75%, thus meeting the measure. The composite score for all grades was 89% of

students performing at Level 3 or 4.

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%	2%	72%	26%	98%	94
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	1%	75%	24%	99%	81
4	All Students	0%	10%	47%	43%	90%	101
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	10%	50%	40%	90%	89
5	All Students	0%	0%	69%	31%	100%	71
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	0%	69%	31%	100%	58
6	All Students	0%	13%	74%	13%	87%	54
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	13%	74%	13%	87%	53
7	All Students	4%	21%	57%	18%	75%	57
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	4%	21%	57%	18%	75%	57
8	All Students	3%	24%	68%	5%	73%	37
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	3%	24%	68%	5%	73%	37
All	**All Students**	**1%**	**10%**	**63%**	**26%**	**89%**	**414**
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	**1%**	**10%**	**64%**	**25%**	**89%**	**375**

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met the absolute measure of having 75% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 on the math exam. Brooklyn Excelsior not only met the goal, but the students exceeded the goal by 14 percentage points. In grade 5, 100% of students performed at Level 3 or 4; in grade 3, 99% of second year students performed at Level 3 or 4.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has seen improvements year over year. In 2004-05, 66% of students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3 on the math exam. The school improved its performance each year, ultimately having 89% of second year students perform at or above Level 3 on the 2007-08 math exam.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
3			86%	49	95%	78	99%	81
4	66%	32	76%	54	88%	52	90%	89
5			54%	46	81%	43	100%	58
6			68%	40	80%	49	87%	53
7					48%	31	75%	57
8							73%	37
All	66%	32	71%	189	83%	253	89%	375

II.   Absolute Measure: Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYSTP Mathematics assessment will meet the Annual Measurable Objective 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, 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

Brooklyn Excelsior had all but 11% of its students perform at Level 3 or 4. Only 1% of the student body performed at Level 1 and 10% performed at Level 2.

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	
3-8	1%	10%	63%	26%	414

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The school's PI for the 2007-08 school year was 189, exceeding the AMO by 87 points.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has exceeded the State's AMO each year since 2005-06. Most notably, in 2006-07 and 2007-08 the percentage of students performing at Level 4 has increased by over 100%. The percentage of students performing at Level 3 improved from the 2006-07 to 2007-08 school year; and the percentage of students performing at Level 2 decreased 7 percentage points from 2006-07 to 2007-08.

Mathematics Performance Index (PI) and
Annual Measureable 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		
2005-06	3-6	262	7%	23%	60%	10%	163	86
2006-07	3-7	349	1%	17%	59%	23%	181	86
2007-08	3-8	414	1%	10%	63%	26%	189	102

III.   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 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
The percentage of Brooklyn Excelsior students enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 was greater than the local district in every grade tested and as an aggregate.

2007-08 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 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	99%	81	83%	913
4	90%	89	75%	911
5	100%	58	68%	836
6	87%	53	52%	830
7	75%	57	56%	848
8	73%	37	41%	871
All	89%	375	63%	5209

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. In every grade, the percentage of second year students performing at or above Level 3 was higher than that of the local district. Notably, grade 5 outperformed District 16's grade 5 by 32 percentage points.

Additional Evidence
Students enrolled in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior have outperformed the local district every year. Brooklyn Excelsior continues to increase the percentage of students enrolled in at least their second year identified as proficient.

Mathematics Performance of charter School and Local District
By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2nd Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3			86%	59%	95%	72%	99%	83%
4	66%	65%	76%	54%	88%	59%	90%	75%
5			54%	46%	81%	58%	100%	68%
6			68%	34%	80%	42%	87%	52%
7					48%	35%	75%	56%
8							73%	41%
All	66%	65%	71%	48%	83%	54%	89%	63%

IV. **Comparative Measure:** Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State 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 and 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
Brooklyn Excelsior's students performed better than predicted in every grade and as a composite on the math assessment. The school's predicted performance level was 64.1; their actual performance level was 81.9, thus performing better than expected to a large degree.

2007-08 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3 & 4		Difference Between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		98	94.9	76.0	18.9	1.26
4		73	83.6	67.8	15.8	0.99
5		69	81.2	62.9	18.3	0.95
6		69	81.2	55.3	25.9	1.23
7		40	50.0	45.7	4.3	0.20
All	77.8	349	81.9	64.1	17.8	1.02

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
Higher than expected to a large degree

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The predicted performance level was 64.1, with the school achieving a performance level of 81.9. The difference between the actual and predicted was 17.8, thereby producing a large Effect Size of 1.02. The school, therefore, performed higher than expected to a large degree.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has performed better than predicted on the State math assessment each year that the comparative performance analysis has been completed. Notably, the school increased the Effect Size from 2005-06 to 2006-07.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06	3-6	73.3%	262	69.8	57.3	0.63
2006-07	3-7	77.8%	349	81.9	64.1	1.02
2007-08	3-8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

V. **Value-Added Measure:** Each year, each grade-level cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Mathematics exam and seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the 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 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
Four of the six cohorts achieved their target scores. While two did not achieve their target scores, grade 4 had 92% of its students perform at or above Level 3, and grade 7 had 75% of its students identified as proficient. The aggregate of all cohorts met their taget—87% of students in the cohort performed at Level 3 or above.

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	89	94%	95%	92%	No
5	57	86%	87%	100%	Yes
6	52	85%	86%	87%	Yes
7	57	77%	78%	75%	No
8	37	51%	63%	73%	Yes
All	292	82%	3%	87%	Yes

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior did not meet the measure. Four of the six cohorts achieved their target score, with five of the six cohorts performing above 75%. Grade 4, while not meeting its target score, still had a large percentage of students perform at Levels 3 and 4 – 92%. While the grade did not increase to 95%, the results remain positive. Grade 7 did not meet its target scores of 78%, but the grade still had 75% of students perform at or above Level 3. Grade five, notably, had 100% of its students perform at Levels 3 and 4.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior's math scores have increased substantially in the past years. Due to this, many students were already performing at Level 3 or above on the State math assessment. In 2006-07 all cohorts met their targets; in 2007-08, 4 of the six cohorts met their targets with five of the cohorts performing above 75%.

Cohort Performance on State 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
2006-07	3-7	5	5
2007-08	3-8	4	6

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Brooklyn Excelsior met four of the five measures. The school met both of its absolute measures and both of its comparative measures. While the school did not meet the value-added measure, five of the six cohorts had 75% or more of its students performing at Level 3 or above.

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	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measureable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved
Value-Added	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 exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior recognizes that the goal of having all students proficient in mathematics has not been met. As a means to continue increasing student learning, the school identified specific areas of focus for each grade and created grade-level action plans to specifically address the areas in need of improvement.

Grade Level	Area of Focus	Action Plan
Kindergarten	Computation	**1:** Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to computation number sense and operations and the use of math manipulatives to increase concrete understanding **2**: Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on the PGA in computation and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3:** Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers and differentiate instruction based on PGA

		skill areas **4**: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans **5**: Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6**: Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
1st Grade	Computation	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to computation number sense and operations and the use of math manipulatives to increase concrete understanding **2**: Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on the PGA in computation and analyze data on skill weaknesses. **3**: Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers and differentiate instruction based on PGA skill areas **4**: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans**.** **5**: Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6**: Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
2nd Grade	Number Sense and Operations	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to number sense and operations. **2**: Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3**: Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. **4**: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans**.** **5**: Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6**: Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
3rd Grade	Measurement and Geometry	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team todiscuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and using geometry and measurement in problem solving **2**: Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3**: Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. **4**: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. **5**: Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6**: Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
4th Grade	Measurement, Number Sense, and Operations	**1**: Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and other objects to increase capacity and familiarity with measurement tools and integrate daily two step word problems **2**: Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3**: Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers.

		4: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans**.** **5:** Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6:** Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
5th Grade	Measurement and Geometry	**1:** Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and other objects to increase capacity and familiarity with measurement tools and using geometry in problem solving **2:** Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3:** Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. 4: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. **5:** Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6:** Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
6th Grade	Measurement	**1:** Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and other objects to increase capacity and familiarity with measurement tools. **2**: Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3:** Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. **4**: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans**.** **5:** Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6:** Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
7th Grade	Word Problems/ Comprehension	**1:** Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to integrating appropriate process and vocabulary to solve word problems. **2:** Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3:** Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. **4:** Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. **5:** Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6:** Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
8th Grade	Word Problems/ Comprehension	**1:** Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to integrating appropriate vocabulary to solve word problems. . **2**: Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses **3:** Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. **4**: Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans**.**

		5: Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. **6:** Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training and professional development in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.

Science

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Science.

Background

An engaging science curriculum that encourages students to actively participate in scientific inquiry while developing scientific literacy is implemented at Brooklyn Excelsior. When participating in inquiry, students describe objects and events, ask questions, construct explanations, test those explanations against current scientific knowledge and communicate their ideas to others. This includes engaging all students with relevant, real-world activities that develop students' knowledge, communication skills and scientific process skills.

Through a wide range of content, students are given the opportunity to work extensively in a variety of inquiry-based settings, including investigative, collaborative and technological, with appropriate materials, measuring devices, and scientific instruments in order to develop the scientific thinking skills, behaviors, and science content knowledge needed for future success in any endeavor. Across all grade levels, students' scientific knowledge is developed in the areas of The Nature of Science, The Living Environment, Physical Science, and Earth and Space Science.

I. **Absolute Measure:** Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of students in each grade tested, who are enrolled in at least their second year, will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Science assessment.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2008. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled scare. 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

Fourth grade and eighth grade students enrolled in at least their second at Brooklyn Excelsior performed above 75%, thus meeting the measure. The composite score for grades 4 and 8 was 90% of second year students performing at Level 3 or 4.

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%	3%	18%	79%	97%	96
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	4%	16%	80%	96%	86
8	All Students	0%	24%	60%	16%	76%	37
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	24%	60%	16%	76%	37
All	All Students	0%	9%	29%	62%	91%	133
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	10%	29%	61%	90%	123

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met the absolute measure of having 75% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 on the science exam. Brooklyn Excelsior not only met the goal, but the students exceeded the goal by 15 percentage points with 90% of second year students performing at Level 3 or 4.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has seen improvements year over year. In 2004-05, 48% of fourth grade students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3 on the science exam. The school improved its performance each year, ultimately having over 95% of fourth grade students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 for two consecutive years. The 2007-08 school year was the first year Brooklyn Excelsior served eighth grade students. As such, the 2007-08 results are the only results available.

Science Performance
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
4	48%	23	80%	50	98%	54	97%	86
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	76%	37
All	48%	23	80%	50	98%	54	90%	123

II. **Comparative Measure:** Each year in each grade tested, the percent of 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 students in the respective grade 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

The State science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2008; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

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 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	97%	86	n/a	n/a
8	76%	37	n/a	n/a
All	90%	123		

Evaluation

The State science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2008; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

Additional Evidence

The State science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2008; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

Science Performance of charter School and Local District
By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2nd Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	48%	51%	80%	60%	98%	57%	97%	n/a
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	76%	n/a
All	**48%**	**51%**	**80%**	**60%**	**98%**	**57%**	**90%**	**n/a**

Summary of the Science Goal

The State science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2008; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

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	Achieved
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior met its absolute measure in science. Results for the comparison district are not yet available; therefore, we are unable to determine whether this goal was met.

Social Studies

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Social Studies.

Background
The Social Studies curriculum was designed with the goal of providing all students with a common and core Social Studies curriculum that gives them the building blocks of knowledge and skills. The curriculum is robust in the study of United States history from the earliest grades. It includes the examination of historical documents so students can demonstrate their understanding of the major themes, developments, and turning points in our nation. The curriculum emphasizes the study of United States and World Geography, developing geographic principles that allow students to comprehend and reason through current events on a national and international level. Students learn World History, including eras, themes, and significant events that are central to understanding the experiences of other times and other nations.

The curriculum builds a strong knowledge of economic principals so students understand the impact of economic forces both internationally and personally in their daily lives. Additionally, the curriculum is comparative in examination of world cultures. This creates a point of reference by which students compare the freedoms of American life with non-democratic societies both historically and today. Our students will be reminded of the rights and liberties they enjoy with due reason to participate in and protect those liberties.

I.   **Absolute Measure:** Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of students in each grade tested, who are enrolled in at least their second year, will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Social Studies assessment.

Method
The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 5th grade in November 2007 and 8th grade in June 2008. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled scare. 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
Brooklyn Excelsior's grade 5 students had 95% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 or 4 on the State social studies exam. The grade 8 students had 68% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at Level 3 or 4 on the state assessment. All together, 85% of second year students performed at Level 3 or 4.

**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	1%	3%	82%	14%	96%	73
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	2%	3%	85%	10%	95%	60
8	All Students	0%	32%	60%	8%	68%	37
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	32%	60%	8%	68%	37
All	**All Students**	**1%**	**13%**	**75%**	**12%**	**87%**	**110**
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	**1%**	**15%**	**76%**	**9%**	**85%**	**97**

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met the measure of having over 75% of second year students perform at Level 3 or 4 on the State social studies assessment. In fact, 85% of Brooklyn Excelsior's second year students performed at Level 3 or 4 on the assessment.

Additional Evidence

The percentage of students performing at or above Level 3 on the grade 5 social studies has increased 46.7 percentage points since 2004-05. Nearly all students enrolled in at least their second year performed at Level 3 or 4 on the State assessment. Results for students in grade 8 are only available for the 2007-08 school year as the school did not serve eighth grade students prior to 2007-08. Year over year analysis for eighth grade students, therefore, is not available.

**Social Studies Performance
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
5	48.3%	29	88.9%	45	86.7%	45	95.0%	60
8	n/a						68%	**37**
All	48.3%	29	88.9%	45	86.7%	45	85%	97

II. **Comparative Measure:** Each year in each grade tested, the percent of 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 students in the respective grade 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

The State grade 5 social studies assessment was administered in November 2007 and the grade 8 assessment was administered in June 2008. Data for the local district has not yet

been published. Therefore, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to determine whether this measure was met.

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 2ⁿᵈ Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	95%	60	n/a	n/a
8	68%	37	n/a	n/a
All	**85%**	**97**		

Evaluation

The State grade 5 social studies assessment was administered in November 2007 and the grade 8 assessment was administered in June 2008. Data for the local district has not yet been published.

Additional Evidence

The State grade 5 social studies assessment was administered in November 2007 and the grade 8 assessment was administered in June 2008. Data for the local district has not yet been published for the 2007-08 school year. Therefore, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to determine whether this measure was met.

Social Studies Performance of charter School and Local District
By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2ⁿᵈ Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4							
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
5	48%	44%	89%	53%	87%	52%	95%	n/a
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	68%	n/a
All	**48%**	**44%**	**89%**	**53%**	**87%**	**52%**	**85%**	**n/a**

Summary of the Social Studies Goal

The State social studies assessment was administered in November 2007 and June 2008; however, assessment results for the local district are not yet available. Brooklyn Excelsior met the absolute measure, but the school is unable to report on the comparative measure.

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	Achieved
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.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior's students performed favorably on the state social studies assessment. The school will continue working until all students perform at or above Level 3 on the exam. Due to the positive results, the school will continue implementing the social studies program as done in past years.

Additional Required Academic Measure

I.   **NCLB 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
Brooklyn Excelsior's accountability status for the 2007-08 school year is in "good standing."

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The school was deemed in "good standing" for the 2007-08 school year.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has been deemed a school in "good standing" each year of its charter.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2004-05	Good Standing
2006-06	Good Standing
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing