Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2009-10 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 SUNY 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 SUNY 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, up through 2009-10, 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

2009-10 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 3, 2010

By Corey Martin
President, Board of Trustees

856 Quincy Street
Brooklyn, NY 11221
Ph: (718) 246-5681
Fax: (717) 246-5864

Dr. Thomas DeMarco prepared this 2009-10 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Corey Martin	President and Interim Treasurer Executive Committee
Stephanie Cuba	Vice President Executive Committee Human Resources and Training Committee
Erika Humphrey	Secretary Executive Committee Student Curriculum, Performance, and Assessment Committee
Kay Madati	Trustee
Carol Schulhof	Trustee Student Curriculum, Performance, and Assessment Committee
Omar Wasow	Trustee Human Resources and Training Committee
New Board Member TBD	Student Curriculum, Performance, and Assessment Committee

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. The school currently serves more than 700 students in grades K-8. The school is an extremely popular public school choice for families, as demonstrated by the fact that it continues to be at its allowed enrollment capacity, and currently has a waiting list of over 1,400 students.

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.

This mission has guided the operation of the school since its inception. We have worked and will continue to work to ensure that our curriculum is challenging and rigorous, so that we provide all students opportunities to master the core subjects of English language arts (ELA), Math, Science, and Social Studies. As part of our efforts to make certain each student receives a well-rounded education, Brooklyn Excelsior provides instruction in the arts and physical education. In 2009-10, Brooklyn Excelsior organized its first international trip for students. Fifteen students in grades 5 through 8 traveled with their parents to Panama, where they learned history, geography, economics and language first-hand. The middle school trip also makes an annual trip to Philadelphia for a "hands-on" study of American history, and other after-school and summer learning opportunities. Integrating character education into the school curriculum through the school's Moral Focus program is a key component of the academic program for our students.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2005-06	98	97	98	74	67	67	49	n/a	n/a	550
2006-07	77	97	98	97	70	69	70	41	n/a	619
2007-08	78	74	94	94	100	71	53	54	38	656
2008-09	88	80	80	103	109	97	68	45	50	720
2009-10	86	81	80	80	104	101	94	61	41	728

*Enrollment for 2009-10 is based on the school's enrollment on October 7, 2009.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts
Students will be proficient in English language arts.

Background
Developing reading proficiency and strong literacy skills in elementary and middle school grades is essential to ensuring that students are on a college-readiness trajectory.[1] The ELA curriculum is designed to produce highly literate students who are proficient readers and strong writers. The curriculum enables students to read, comprehend, write, and respond thoughtfully to what they encounter in the classroom and the world around them through its reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing components.

The curriculum emphasizes the five components of reading instruction as outlined by the National Reading Panel. Students who master the ELA curriculum are prepared to read for deep meaning and understanding, write and speak effectively to communicate ideas and information while using appropriate language conventions, listen actively and critically as they encounter new information and ideas, and generate new ideas based on what they encounter both inside and outside the classroom.

In grades K-2, the curriculum focuses on and supports the process of learning to read. Decoding, word recognition, and building vocabulary are important as students begin to develop understanding and fluency. In grades 3-5, the curriculum supports a transition from learning how to read to reading in order to learn; learning shifts to understanding that texts have specific purposes and students learn to read with those purposes in mind. Students are introduced to informational text in addition to a variety of literary texts. Reliance on the basal reader decreases and additional resources like novels, newspapers, magazines, and web-based resources are used to support reading instruction. Finally, in grades 6-8, the curriculum focuses on extending reading and comprehension skills, developing deep evaluation and analysis skills and the ability to make connections within and between texts.

The ELA curriculum supports learning in language conventions, mechanics, spelling, and writing. In the earliest grades, students learn how to write words and sentences using appropriate mechanics and grammar and begin to use the writing process to convey information and narrative through written text. In middle grades, the curriculum develops in students a deeper understanding of writing through a focus on prewriting strategies, organizational formats, drafting, revising, proofreading, and publishing. The curriculum ensures that students learn to write for different purposes; writing includes narratives, stories, poems, interpretive responses, essays, and descriptive pieces. In later grades, the curriculum continues to extend students' writing skills through narrative, expository, persuasive, and technical writing, and technology enhances students' ability to write, revise, edit, and publish their work. Grammar, punctuation, spelling, and writing conventions are taught as part of language arts for students in all grades.

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.

[1] ACT, Inc., *Reading Between the Lines: What the ACT Reveals About College Readiness in Reading* (Iowa City, IA, 2006).

In 2009-10, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State English language arts examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in April 2010. 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, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

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.

2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[2]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	79	0	0	0	79
4	100	0	0	0	100
5	100	0	0	0	100
6	92	0	0	0	92
7	60	0	0	0	60
8	40	0	0	0	40
All	**471**	0	0	0	471

Results

Of students in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior, 89% achieved a Scale Score of 650 or above on the 2009-10 NYS ELA exam.

Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students	84%	79
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	85%	75
4	All Students	93%	100
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	92%	91

[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.

5	All Students	96%	100
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	96%	92
6	All Students	92%	92
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	94%	82
7	All Students	97%	60
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	97%	59
8	All Students	48%	40
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	48%	40
All	All Students	**89%**	**471**
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	**89%**	**439**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. With 89% of students in at least their second year achieving a Scale Score of 650 or higher, Brooklyn Excelsior exceeded the measure by 14 percentage points.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has seen steady gains in its ELA proficiency scores over the past five years and has met the goal for the past two years. In 2004-5, just 23% of Brooklyn Excelsior students scored at or above Level 3; that number increased to 60% in 2005-6, held approximately even at 57% in 2006-7, increased to 71% in 2007-8, to 84% in 2008-9 and 89% in 2009-10. These numbers indicate that Brooklyn Excelsior has demonstrated consistent improvement and high performance.

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 of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	59%	80	77%	83	84%	83	85%	75
4	69%	52	71%	90	88%	85	92%	91
5	48%	44	92%	59	92%	86	96%	92
6	60%	50	51%	53	95%	65	94%	82
7	41%	32	75%	59	66%	44	97%	59
8			49%	37	61%	49	48%	40
All	**57%**	**258**	**71%**	**381**	**84%**	**412**	**89%**	**439**

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

Method
The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state's learning standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a

Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year's English language arts AMO, which for 2009-10 is 155.[3] 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 achieved a Performance Index of 158, exceeding the AMO by 3 points.

Calculation of 2009-10 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	38	53	7	471

PI	=	38	+	53	+	7	=	98
			+	53	+	7	=	60
						PI	=	**158**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The school achieved a Performance Index of 158, 3 points higher than the AMO.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently met this measure for the past five years. In 2005-6, it exceeded the AMO by 31 points. In 2006-7, the school's Performance Index exceeded the AMO by 29 points. The school exceeded the AMO by 37 points in 2007-8, by 39 points in 2008-9, and by 3 points in 2009-10. Because of the recent changes in proficiency scores, it is difficult to draw trends between this year's Performance Index and previous years. However, we understand that the New York State Department of Education is reviewing the AMOs and we expect to make adjustments based on this additional guidance.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07	3-7	354	3%	43%	51%	3%	151	122
2007-08	3-8	421	2%	26%	67%	5%	170	133
2008-09	3-8	465	1%	15%	75%	9%	183	144
2009-10	3-8	471	3%	38%	53%	7%	158	155

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.

[3] With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

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
Sixty percent of Brooklyn Excelsior students scored at or above Level 3 on the NYSTP ELA exam, compared to 31% of students in the local district. Brooklyn Excelsior students also exceeded district students in every grade level, except 8th grade.

2009-10 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	69%	75	38%	908
4	68%	91	42%	887
5	71%	92	39%	900
6	63%	82	19%	636
7	47%	59	21%	685
8	15%	40	19%	816
All	**60%**	**439**	**31%**	**4832**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The percent of students in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior who performed at or above Level 3 on the NYSTP ELA exam is 29 percentage points higher than the percent of students from the local school district who did so. In addition, Brooklyn Excelsior students outperformed local district students in grades K-7.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently outperformed the local district in ELA over the past five years. In addition, from 2005-6 to 2008-9, Brooklyn Excelsior not only outperformed the local school district in the aggregate, but also in each grade level cohort.

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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	59%	48%	77%	52%	84%	64%	69%	38%
4	69%	50%	71%	56%	88%	63%	68%	42%
5	48%	43%	92%	63%	92%	71%	71%	39%
6	60%	29%	51%	33%	95%	57%	63%	19%

7	41%	28%	75%	45%	66%	59%	47%	21%
8			49%	29%	61%	43%	15%	19%
All	**57%**	**40%**	**71%**	**46%**	**84%**	**60%**	**60%**	**31%**

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 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

Results
Brooklyn Excelsior achieved an Effect Size of 1.64, which is higher than expected to a large degree.

2008-9 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		99	83.8	59.0	24.8	1.61
4		107	88.8	59.8	29.0	2.00
5		96	91.7	67.1	24.6	1.79
6		69	95.6	63.8	31.8	2.13
7		44	65.9	59.7	6.2	0.37
8		50	62.0	43.8	18.2	1.08
All	91.2	465	84.3	**60.0**	**24.3**	**1.64**

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

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. In 2008-9, the predicted percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 was 60.0%. Brooklyn Excelsior achieved 84.3%, 24.3 percentage points higher than expected. The Effect Size was 1.64, which is higher than expected to a large degree.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently met this measure. In 2005-6, it achieved an Effect Size of 0.57, higher than expected to a medium degree. In 2006-7, the school's Effect Size was 0.44, higher than expected to a small degree. The school achieved an Effect Size of 1.47 in 2007-8 and 1.64 in 2008-9, higher than expected to a large degree in both years. In addition, in 2008-9, Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure as an aggregate and in every grade level cohort. The Effect Size was higher than expected to a large degree in all grades except grade 7, which achieved an Effect Size higher than expected to a small degree.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3-7	78%	354	54.2	47.4	**0.44**
2007-08	3-8	87%	422	71.3	49.6	**1.47**
2008-09	3-8	91%	465	84.3	60.0	**1.64**
2009-10	3-8				n/a	n/a

Goal 1: Growth Measure
Each year through 2008-09, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's state English language arts exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's state English language arts exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-09, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10.

Method
This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be 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
Brooklyn Excelsior achieved its target in the aggregate. Four of six cohorts also achieved this measure.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4	90	84%	85%	92%	Yes

5	92	88%	89%	96%	Yes
6	82	94%	95%	94%	No
7	59	95%	96%	96%	Yes
8	40	65%	70%	48%	No
All	**365**	**87%**	**88%**	**89%**	**Yes**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior did not meet this target. The school achieved its target performance in four of six cohorts, with one of those cohorts being the aggregate. While grade 6 did not see a positive change, it maintained its level of performance with 94% scoring proficient in 2008-9 and in 2009-10.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has come close to meeting this measure for the past several years. In 2007-8, 4 of 6 cohorts met their target, with one of those cohorts being the aggregate. The two cohorts that did not meet their target (grades 6 and 8) saw positive growth. In 2008-9, 5 of 6 cohorts met their target proficiency level, with one of those cohorts being the aggregate.

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
2008-09	4-8	5	6
2009-10	4-8	4	6

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal
Brooklyn Excelsior met 4 of 5 Accountability Plan goals in ELA. The school achieved both absolute measures and both comparative measures, but did not meet its value-added measure. While the school met the value-added measure in the aggregate, 2 of 5 grade level cohorts did not meet the measure.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 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 Measurable 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
Growth	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 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	Comprehension	1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to fluency and vocabulary development. 2. Model instructional strategies of fluency, vocabulary and word structure, and concepts of print; as well as phonics and comprehension. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused, differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. 6. More focus on higher order thinking questions and wait time during read alouds and discussions. Writing will be incorporated into this by allowing for written responses as well as verbal responses.
Grade 1	Comprehension	1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to comprehension, vocabulary and word structure. 2. Model instructional strategies of comprehension and vocabulary and word structure through the use of graphic organizers and use of context clues. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused, differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. 6. More focus on higher order thinking questions and wait time during read alouds and discussions. Writing will be incorporated into this by allowing for written responses as well as verbal responses.
Grade 2	Competencies	1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to comprehension. 2. Model instructional strategies of comprehension with

		a focus on sequencing, identifying themes, and differentiating between fact and opinion. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use NWEA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused, differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from NWEA reports and formative assessment. 6. More focus on higher order thinking questions and wait time during read alouds and discussions. Writing will be incorporated into this by allowing for written responses as well as verbal responses.
Grade 3	Competencies	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 50th percentile levels on NWEA-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. 7. Use guided reading small group instruction to promote comprehension skills and strategies.
Grade 4	Competencies	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 50th percentile levels on NWEA-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. 7. Use guided reading small group instruction to promote comprehension skills and strategies.
Grade 5	Competencies	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 50th percentile levels on NWEA-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. 7. Use guided reading small group instruction to promote comprehension skills and strategies.
Grade 6	Competencies	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 50th percentile levels on NWEA-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. 7. Use guided reading small group instruction to promote comprehension skills and strategies.
Grade 7	Information and Understanding	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 information and understanding. 2. Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50th percentile levels on NWEA-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 information and understanding 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.
Grade 8	Literary Response and Expression	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 50th percentile levels on NWEA-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 2: Mathematics
Students will be proficient in mathematics.

Background
The school's mathematics curriculum is designed to ensure that all students complete Algebra I by eighth grade. Students who successfully complete Algebra I prior to entering high school are much more likely to complete Algebra II and other more advanced mathematics prior to graduating high school, which means they will be "more than twice as likely to graduate from college" than students who don't complete it.[4] The math curriculum focuses on algebraic awareness as early as kindergarten, and includes these specific categories of learning: Number Sense and Operations, Algebra and Functions, Measurement, Geometry, Data Analysis and Probability, and Problem Solving. Educational objectives support learning within these categories.

The mathematics curriculum ensures that students develop problem solving skills while learning to become effective as mathematical communicators. It engages students in thinking, reading, and writing about mathematics to help them understand the foundational concepts necessary for success in more complex mathematical coursework. Traditional math algorithms are taught alongside more conceptual ways of solving problems. In middle grades, the curriculum begins a transition to more advanced mathematical topics and extends students' basic arithmetic knowledge. As part of this transition, students develop abstract reasoning as well as symbolic manipulation skills. Conceptual ideas are integrated through lab activities that provide exploratory opportunities for students to explicitly connect abstract ideas to concrete examples.

Goal 2: 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, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State mathematics examination.

Method
The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in May 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. 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, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

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.

[4] National Mathematics Advisory Panel, *Foundations for Success: The Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2008).

2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[5]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	79	0	0	0	79
4	100	0	0	0	100
5	100	0	0	0	100
6	92	0	0	0	92
7	60	0	0	0	60
8	40	0	0	0	40
All	**471**	0	0	0	471

Results
Of students in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior, 98% scored at or above a Scale Score of 650. In addition, 98% or 99% of students scored at or above a scale score of 650 in each individual grade cohort.

Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students	99%	79
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	99%	75
4	All Students	98%	100
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	98%	91
5	All Students	98%	100
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	98%	92
6	All Students	99%	92
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	99%	82
7	All Students	98%	60
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	98%	59
8	All Students	98%	40
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	98%	40
All	All Students	**98%**	**471**
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	**98%**	**439**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. Students exceeded the 75% proficiency target by 23 points in the aggregate. In addition, each grade level cohort exceeded the target by 23-24 percentage points.

[5] 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

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has shown consistent improvement over the past five years and has met its Accountability Plan goal for the past four. In 2005-6, 71% of Brooklyn Excelsior students in at least their second year scored at or above Level 3. In 2006-7, the school met this measure with 83% of students scoring at or above Level 3. Eighty-nine percent scored at or above Level 3 in 2007-8, 95% did so in 2008-9, and 985 did so in 2009-10.

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 a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	95%	78	99%	81	99%	83	99%	75
4	88%	52	90%	89	100%	85	98%	91
5	81%	43	100%	58	96%	85	98%	92
6	80%	49	87%	53	100%	65	99%	82
7	48%	31	75%	57	95%	44	98%	59
8			73%	37	71%	49	98%	40
All	**83%**	**253**	**89%**	**375**	**95%**	**411**	**98%**	**439**

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, which for 2009-10 is 135[6]. 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 achieved a Performance Index of 179, exceeding the AMO by 44 points.

Calculation of 2009-10 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
? - ?	1	21	49	30	471

PI	=	21	+	49	+	30	=	100
			+	49	+	30	=	79
						PI	=	**179**

[6] With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. With a Performance Index of 179, the school exceeded the AMO by 44 points.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently met this measure. For the past 4 years, Brooklyn Excelsior has exceeded the AMO by at least 80 points. In 2009-10, Brooklyn Excelsior exceeded the AMO by 44 points. We understand that the New York State Education Department is currently reviewing the AMOs and expect to make adjustments based on their guidance.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07	3-7	349	1%	17%	59%	23%	181	86
2007-08	3-8	414	1%	10%	63%	26%	189	102
2008-09	3-8	463	0%	5%	50%	46%	197	119
2009-10	3-8	471	1%	21%	49%	30%	179	135

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
Of students in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior, 79% scored at or above Level 3 in 2009-10, compared to 41% of students in the local district.

2009-10 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	63%	75	41%	682
4	82%	91	58%	680
5	77%	92	48%	673
6	87%	82	31%	659
7	88%	59	34%	655
8	73%	40	27%	658

All	**79%**	**439**	**41%**	**4854**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The percent of students at Brooklyn Excelsior scoring at or above Level 3 was 79%, exceeding the local school district by 38 percentage points. In addition, Brooklyn Excelsior outperformed the local school district in every grade level.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently met this measure over the past 5 years, each year outperforming the local school district not only as an aggregate, but also in each grade level cohort. Since 2006-7, Brooklyn Excelsior has scored at least 20 percentage points higher in the aggregate than the local school district.

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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	95%	72%	99%	83%	99%	90%	63%	41%
4	88%	59%	90%	75%	100%	81%	82%	58%
5	81%	58%	100%	68%	96%	79%	77%	48%
6	80%	42%	87%	52%	100%	64%	87%	31%
7	48%	35%	75%	56%	95%	69%	88%	34%
8	-	-	73%	41%	71%	61%	73%	27%
All	**83%**	**54%**	**89%**	**63%**	**95%**	**74%**	**79%**	**41%**

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 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

Results
Brooklyn Excelsior achieved an Effect Size of 1.34, which is higher than expected to a large degree.

2008-9 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	99.0%	87.1%	11.9	1.23
4		107	99.1%	78.0%	21.1	1.61
5		95	95.8%	78.3%	17.5	1.23
6		69	100%	67.7%	32.3	1.82
7		44	95.5%	72.1%	23.4	1.26
8		50	72.0%	60.0%	12.0	.59
All	**91%**	**463**	**95.2%**	**76.0%**	**19.3**	**1.34**

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

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. With an Effect Size of 1.34, Brooklyn Excelsior students scored higher than expected to a large degree.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently met this measure. In 2005-6, the school achieved an Effect Size of 0.63, higher than expected to a medium degree. Since 2006-7, the school has achieved Effect Sizes higher than expected to a large degree. In addition to achieving an aggregate effect size of 1.34 in 2008-9, Brooklyn Excelsior achieved an Effect Size that was larger than expected in each grade except grade 8, where it achieved an Effect Size that was larger than expected to a medium degree.

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	87.0%	414	89.6	68.5	1.33
2008-09	3-8	91.2%	463	95.2	76.0	1.34
2009-10	3-8				n/a	n/a

Goal 2: Growth Measure
Each year through 2008-09, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's state mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's state mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-09, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10.

Method
This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be 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
Brooklyn Excelsior met its target achievement level in two of six cohorts. It did not achieve its target as an aggregate.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4	90	100%	100%	98%	No
5	92	98%	99%	98%	No
6	82	98%	99%	99%	Yes
7	59	100%	100%	98%	No
8	40	95%	96%	98%	Yes
All	**365**	**98%**	**99%**	**98%**	**No**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior did not meet this measure. Two of six cohorts met this measure.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior met its target performance in 2 of 6 cohorts. However, all grades met their absolute goals and each grade level showed 95% of students or more scoring at or above a Scale Score of 650. Brooklyn Excelsior met its target in 5 of 6 cohorts in 2008-9, including the aggregate cohort.

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
2006-07	2006-07	3-7	5
2007-08	2007-08	3-8	4
2008-09	2008-09	3-8	5
2009-10	2009-10	3-8	2

Summary of the Mathematics Goal
Brooklyn Excelsior met 4 of 5 Accountability Plan goals in mathematics. While the school met both of its absolute measures and both comparative measures, it did not meet its value added measure.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State	Achieved

	examination.	
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.	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
Growth	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 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	Statistics and Probability	1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to statistics and probability. 2. Model instructional strategies on number sense and number systems daily through the use of morning meeting calendar studies. (Focus on numbers 1-31) 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. 6. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary by measurement topics.
Grade 1	Statistics and Probability	1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to statistics and probability. 2. Model instructional strategies on addition and subtraction with a focus on strategies to solve word problems. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused differentiated instruction.

		5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. 6. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary by measurement topics.
Grade 2	Measurement	1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to measurement systems. 2. Model instructional strategies on measurement focusing on defining various units of measurement, converting units, and estimating units. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor student progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use NWEA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from NWEA reports and formative assessment. 6. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary by measurement topics.
Grade 3	Measurement	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. 7. Use of hands on manipulatives (fraction strips, geoboards, money, shapes, etc.) to guide directed instruction.
Grade 4	Measurement	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. 7. Use of hands on manipulatives (fraction strips, geoboards, money, shapes, etc.) to guide directed instruction.
Grade 5	Measurement	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. 7. Use of hands on manipulatives (fraction strips, geoboards, money, shapes, etc.) to guide directed instruction.
Grade 6	Measurement	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.
Grade 7	Measurement	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 related to measurement and 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 measurement 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.
Grade 8	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.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
Students will be proficient in Science.

Background

As the Association for the Advancement of Science and the National Council on Science explain, developing college-ready and scientifically literate students involves teaching a mixture of content knowledge, practices and skills of scientists, and information on the nature of science. The curriculum is designed to develop content knowledge about the results of scientific discoveries regarding the natural world, such as how electrical current flows, how sound and light waves are similar and different, and what role the ocean plays in weather. The teaching of practices and skills of scientists requires that students participate in the scientific process of inquiry and discovery through conducting investigations, using instruments, and applying mathematical skills that model the process used by scientists to learn about the universe. The curriculum provides students with the opportunity to participate in the scientific process, in addition to read, write, discuss, and experiment with science through high level thinking and problem solving. It also ensures that students use the scientific processes and skills through lab work and investigations. Categorically, the curriculum includes study in Life Science, Physical Science, and Earth and Space Science.

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

Of students in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior, 89% scored at or above Level 3.

Charter School Performance on 2009-10 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	1%	5%	15%	79%	94%	100
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	1%	4%	14%	80%	94%	91
8	All Students	3%	23%	63%	13%	75%	40
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	3%	23%	63%	13%	75%	40
All	All Students	**1%**	**10%**	**29%**	**60%**	**89%**	**140**
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	**2%**	**10%**	**29%**	**60%**	**89%**	**131**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. Of students in at least their second year, 89% scored at or above Level 3, exceeding the goal by 14 percentage points. In addition, Brooklyn Excelsior met the goal in each grade level cohort, with 94% of grade 4 students and 75% of grade 8 students scoring at or above Level 3.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently met this measure over the past 5 years. In 2005-6, 80% of students scored at or above Level 3. In 2006-7, 98% did so. Ninety percent scored at or above Level 3 in 2007-8, 88% did so in 2008-9, and 89% did so in 2009-10.

Science Performance
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	80%	50	98%	54	97%	86	96%	84
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	76%	37	73%	49
All	**80%**	**50**	**98%**	**54**	**90%**	**123**	**88%**	**133**

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
The state science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2010; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district. At this time, we are unable to determine if this goal was met.

2009-10 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	94%	91	n/a	n/a
8	75%	40	n/a	n/a
All	**89%**	**131**	**n/a**	**n/a**

Evaluation
The state science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2010; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district. At this time, we are unable to determine if this goal was met.

Additional Evidence
The state science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2010; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district. At this time, we are unable to determine if this goal was met.

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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	98%	57%	97%	63%	96%	75%	94%	n/a
8	n/a	22%	76%	31%	73%	33%	75%	n/a
All	**98%**	**47%**	**90%**	**53%**	**88%**	**55%**	**89%**	**n/a**

Summary of the Science Goal
Brooklyn Excelsior achieved its Absolute goal in Science. However, since assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district we are unable to determine at this time if the comparative measure was met.

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.	Data not yet available

Action Plan
Brooklyn Excelsior's students performed favorably on the state science 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.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 4: Social Studies
Students will be proficient in Social Studies.

Background
The social studies curriculum ensures that students are prepared for life as informed citizens of the United States and the world. Social studies content is organized through areas of study including geography; economics; world history; U.S. history; civics and government; and people, cultures, and civilizations. Educational Objectives support learning in these areas, which correspond with the National Council for Social Studies definition for social studies and include development of the content, knowledge, and skills needed by students to be successful in high school and college. Students develop and utilize critical thinking skills to make connections between the past and present and between cultures that are familiar and those that are not, as well as between social studies and other disciplines including science, mathematics, and ELA. The social studies curriculum does not simply reinforce rote memorization of facts, dates, and events, but requires students to make connections, inferences, arguments, and conclusions about the relationships between important events, places, and people, and the development of societies and cultures as well.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State social studies examination.

Method
The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in 5th grade in November 2009 and 8th grade in June 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results
Eighty-eight percent of Brooklyn Excelsior students in at least their second year scored at or above Level 3 on the NYSTP Social Studies exam.

Charter School Performance on 2009-10 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%	1%	66%	32%	98%	100
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	1%	1%	68%	30%	98%	92
8	All Students	20%	15%	60%	5%	65%	40
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	20%	15%	60%	5%	65%	40
All	**All Students**	**6%**	**5%**	**64%**	**24%**	**88%**	**140**
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	**7%**	**5%**	**66%**	**22%**	**88%**	**132**

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. With 88% of students in at least their second year scoring at or above Level 3, the school exceeded the absolute measure by 13 percentage points.

Additional Evidence
Brooklyn Excelsior has consistently achieved this measure over the past five years, with at least 85% of students scoring proficient every year since 2005-6.

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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	87%	45	95%	60	96%	85	98%	92
8	n/a	n/a	68%	37	67%	49	65%	40
All	**87%**	**45**	**85%**	**97**	**86%**	**134**	**88%**	**132**

Goal 4: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State social studies exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

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

Results
The state grade five social studies assessment was administered in November 2009 and the grade eight assessment was administered in June 2010. Data for the local district has not yet been published. Therefore, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to determine whether this measure was met.

2009-10 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	98%	92	n/a	n/a
8	65%	40	n/a	n/a
All	**88%**	**132**	n/a	n/a

Evaluation
The state grade five social studies assessment was administered in November 2009 and the grade eight assessment was administered in June 2010. Data for the local district has not yet been published. Therefore, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to determine whether this measure was met.

Additional Evidence
The state grade five social studies assessment was administered in November 2009 and the grade eight assessment was administered in June 2010. Data for the local district has not yet been published. 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 at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
5	87%	52%	95%	68%	96%	74%	98%	n/a
8	n/a	14%	68%	16%	67%	19%	65%	n/a
All	**87%**	**7%**	**85%**	**8%**	**86%**	**47%**	**88%**	**n/a**

Summary of the Social Studies Goal
Brooklyn Excelsior achieved its absolute measure in Social Studies. However, because data for the local district has not yet been published, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to determine whether this measure was met.

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.	Data not yet available

Action Plan
Brooklyn Excelsior's students performed favorably on the state social studies assessment. We understand that the NYSTP will not include a social studies assessment in future years. However, we believe that social studies is an important element of achieving our school's mission and will continue working to ensure all students are proficient. Due to the positive results on the 2009-10 NYSTP social studies assessment, Brooklyn Excelsior will continue implementing the social studies program as done in past years.

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB
Under the state's NCLB Accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

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
Brooklyn Excelsior's accountability status for the 2009-10 school year is in "good standing."

Evaluation
Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The school was deemed in "good standing" for the 2009-10 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
2005-06	Good Standing
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	Good Standing
2009-10	Good Standing