

Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2005-06 School Year

Reader's Guide

SUNY Authorized Charter Schools and Accountability

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 the 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 their annual reporting requirements **all SUNY authorized charter schools must submit an Accountability Plan Progress Report which, from their vantage point, addresses each of the goals and outcome measures contained in their Accountability Plans**. 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 exam. Each year the state administers ELA and math tests to grades 3-8, science tests to grades 4 and 8, and social studies tests to grades 5 and 8.

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.

V. ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT 2005-06



Girls Preparatory Charter School of New York

Accountability Plan 2005-06

Charter Period 2005 -- 2009

ACADEMIC GOALS

English Language Arts

Goal I: Students will become proficient readers of the English language.

Measure 1 (Absolute): Student performance on the New York State ELA Exams.

For the 2007-08 through 2008-09 school years, 75 percent of third through fifth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year at GPCS will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English Language Arts (ELA) examination.

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State ELA exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Measure 2 (Optional): Student Performance on E-CLAS-2

- For the 2005-06 through 2008-09 school years, 75% of kindergarten students will perform at or above Level 2 on all relevant sub-tests for the spring administration of ECLAS2.

Name of Test: Early Childhood Literary Assessment System **Subtest:** Phonics and Phonemic Awareness

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*
Kindergarten	4/11/06 through 4/26/06	41	41		90.24% of Students Attained or Exceeded Benchmark (BM = 2)
					BM = 2: 90.24%
					BM = 1: 0%
					BM = 0: 9.76%

Name of Test: Early Childhood Literary Assessment System (ECLAS-2)

Subtest: Spelling

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*
Kindergarten	4/11/06 through 4/26/06	41	41		80.49% of Students Attained or Exceeded Benchmark (BM = 2)
					BM = 2: 80.49%
					BM = 1: 2.44%
					BM = 0 : 17.07%

- For the 2005-06 through 2008-09 school years, 75% of first grade students will perform at or above Level 4 on all relevant sub-tests for the spring administration of ECLAS2.

Name of Test: Early Childhood Literary Assessment System (ECLAS-2) **Subtest:** Reading Comprehension

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*
1 st Grade	4/11/06 through 4/26/06	44	1 student has IEP for 80% Grade Level	44		75% of Students Attained or Exceeded Benchmark (BM=4)
						BM = 6: 34.09%
						BM = 5: 4.55%
						BM = 4: 36.36%
						BM = 3: 6.82%
						BM = 0: 18.18%

Name of Test: Early Childhood Literary Assessment System (ECLAS-2)

Subtest: Reading Accuracy

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*
1 st Grade	4/11/06 through 4/26/06	44	1 student has IEP for 80% Grade Level	44		81.82% of Students Attained or Exceeded Benchmark (BM=4)
						BM = 6: 36.36%
						BM = 5: 4.55%
						BM = 4: 40.91%
						BM = 3: 4.55%
						BM = 2: 2.27%
						BM = 0: 11.36%

Name of Test: Early Childhood Literary Assessment System (ECLAS-2)

Subtest: Sight Words

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*
1 st Grade	4/11/06 through 4/26/06	44	1 student has IEP for 80% Grade Level	44		79.55% of Students Attained or Exceeded Benchmark (BM=4)
						BM = 8: 15.91%
						BM = 7: 4.55%
						BM = 6: 9.09%
						BM = 5: 9.09%
						BM = 4: 40.91%
						BM = 3: 9.09%
						BM = 2: 4.55%
						BM = 0: 6.82%

Name of Test: Early Childhood Literary Assessment System (ECLAS-2)

Subtest: Decoding

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*
1 st Grade	4/11/06 through 4/26/06	44	1 student has IEP for 80% Grade Level	44		50% of Students Attained or Exceeded Benchmark (BM=4)
						BM = 6: 22.73%
						BM = 5: 9.09%
						BM = 4: 18.18%
						BM = 3: 15.91%
						BM = 2: 4.55%
						BM = 0: 15.91%

3. For the 2006-07 through 2008-09 school years, 75% of second grade students will perform at or above Level 6 on all relevant sub-tests for the spring administration of ECLAS2.

Not yet applicable.

Analysis Measure 2 (Optional): Student Performance on E-CLAS-2

We have met the goals for all relevant subtests with the exception of the “Decoding” subtest taken by our first graders. The results in the other subtests demonstrate that our students are making substantial progress. In examining these results we find that overall the kindergarten cohort slightly outperformed the first grade cohort. Nonetheless, the results were strong and promising for both cohorts. It appears that the tutoring program we implemented in Spring 2006 for our weaker readers has been effective. In examining why the first grade results did not meet our goal for the Decoding subtest, we realized that our reading curriculum did not adequately prepare our students’ basic phonics skills. This is something that our teachers noticed during the first half of the school year and led us to institute a tutoring program in the Spring of 2006 for our weaker readers using “Recipe for Reading.” The program proved to be successful for the students that attended tutoring and for this reason; we have decided to add “Recipe for Reading,” which is a multi-sensory phonics rich program based on the principles of Orton-Gillingham, beginning in the 2006-2007 school year for all students. This summer, our teachers are receiving training so that we can add the “Recipe for Reading” program this fall.

Measure 3 (Comparative): Student performance as compared to students in similar schools and home districts on NYS ELA exams

Each year, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year at GPCS and performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of Community School District 1.

Each year the school will exceed its expected level of performance on the State ELA exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.
Not yet applicable.

Measure 4 (Optional): Student proficiency on NCE for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills

For the 2006-07 through 2008-09 school years, grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous spring on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills

(ITBS), a nationally-normed reading test, and an NCE of 50 (i.e., grade level) in the current spring. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least some increase in the current year.

Name of Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) **Subtest:** Reading Comprehension

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score NCE	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*	Other
1 st Grade	Week of 5/8/2006	44	1 student has IEP for 80% Grade Level	41 (3 Students' scores were not reported)	52.49	41.46% at or above Grade Equivalent (GE = 1.8)	AVG GE: 1.905

Name of Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) **Subtest:** Word Analysis

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score NCE	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*	Other
1 st Grade	Week of 5/8/2006	44	1 student has IEP for 80% Grade Level	44	54.48	52.27% at or above Grade Equivalent (GE = 1.8)	AVG GE: 2.04

Name of Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) **Subtest:** Word Analysis

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score NCE	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*	Other **
Kindergarten	Week of 5/8/2006	41	40 (1 student's score was not reported)	63.35	80% at or above Grade Equivalent (GE = .8)	AVG GE: 1.295

Analysis Measure 4 (Optional): Student proficiency on NCE for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills

We have met our goal for all relevant subtests for both kindergarten and first grade, as all measured NCEs were above 50. The kindergarten results were stronger than our first grade results confirming that this cohort is our strongest. The average Grade level Equivalence (GE) for all cohorts was above the grade equivalent corresponding to the time of year when the tests were administered, i.e., 1.8 for first grade and .8 for kindergarten. We attribute this performance to the fact that our reading block consists of 45 minutes each day when students meet with a teacher in a 1:5 student teacher ratio. This provides a good deal of individualized attention which has been good for all of our students (and certainly for our kindergarteners); unfortunately, many of our first graders require even more intensive instruction on reading comprehension. The percentage of first graders performing at or above Grade Level Equivalent was less than 50%.

To more effectively meet the needs of our first grade cohort, we have decided to add “Recipe for Reading,” to the current curricula we use starting in the 2006-2007 school year. As mentioned above, we used this program for the students we tutored in the Spring and they made very significant progress. We plan to continue tutoring the weaker readers in the fall and all of our teachers will receive training in “Recipe for Reading” this summer.

Measure 4a: Student gains on New York State ELA Exam

For the 2008-09 school 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 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year’s State ELA exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least some increase in the current year.

Not yet applicable.

Mathematics

Goal II: GPCS students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts.

Measure 1 (Absolute): Student performance on the New York State Math Exams.

For the 2007-08 through 2008-09 school year, 75 percent of third through fifth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index on the State mathematics exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Not yet applicable.

Measure 2 (Comparative): Student performance as compared to students in similar schools and home districts on the NYS Math exam.

Each year, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year at GPCS, and performing at or above Level 3 on the State Mathematics exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of Community School District 1.

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

Not yet applicable.

Measure 3 (Optional Value-Added): Student proficiency on NCE for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills

Optional Outcome Measure

For the 2006-07 and 2008-2009 school years, grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous spring on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS), a nationally-normed mathematics test, and an NCE of 50 (i.e., grade level) in the current spring. If a

grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least some increase in the current year.

Name of Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) **Subtest:** Mathematics

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score NCE	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*	Other **
1 st Grade	Week of 5/8/2006	44	1 student has IEP for 80% Grade Level	44	34.34	15.91% at or above Grade Equivalent (GE =1.8)	AVG GE: 1.33

Name of Test: Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) **Subtest:** Mathematics

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score (NCE)	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining*	Other **
Kindergarten	Week of 5/8/2006	41	41	48.59	30% at or above Grade Equivalent (GE = .8)	AVG GE: 0.695

Analysis Optional Outcome Measure

We are not pleased with our math results. In both cohorts, it is clear to us that our math program needs to be strengthened. The Saxon math curriculum we used this year seems to be working better for the kindergarteners than for the first grade. The Saxon curriculum seems unable to compensate for the inadequate instruction some of our first graders may have received before enrolling at our school. We have been looking for a way to strengthen our math program adding to Saxon a program that will ensure that our students have experience with higher order math thinking in addition to the skills that we feel Saxon teaches well. To address this, we will be using the Stern Structural Math curriculum as an addition to the Saxon math curriculum beginning in the 2006-2007 school year. Our teachers have been trained in the Stern curriculum so as to ensure its effective implementation in the fall and we will add continuing professional development in Math to improve instruction.

Measure 3b: Student proficiency on NCE for the Iowa Test of Basic Skills --same

Required Outcome Measure

For the 2008-09 school 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 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, the cohort is expected to show at least some increase in the current year

Not yet applicable.

Goal III: GPCS students will demonstrate proficiency relevant to achievement in science

Measure 1(Absolute): Student performance on the NYS Science Examination

For the 2008-09 school year, 75 percent of fourth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year at GPCS will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York Science examination.

Not yet applicable.

Measure 2 (Comparative): Student performance as compared to students in similar schools and home districts on the NYS Science exam.

Each year, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year at GPCS and performing at or above Level 3 on the State Science exam in each tested grade, will be greater than that of Community School District 1.

Not yet applicable.

Additional Required Academic Measure

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

ORGANIZATIONAL GOALS

Parent and Student Satisfaction

Goal V: Parents will express high satisfaction with the school.

Each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school’s program, based on the school’s Parent Survey in which at least two-thirds of *all* parents¹ provide a positive response to the survey items.

Parent Survey Form with Results

Total Surveys Received: 71

Students Enrolled: 85

Date Administered: May, 2006

1. The quality of education at Girls Prep is:						(Select one of the following)	
Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Comment	Responses	
34	28	8	1	0	0	71	
47.9%	39.4%	11.3%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%		

2. The quality of discipline at Girls Prep is:						(Select one of the following)	
Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Comment	Responses	
27	29	10	3	1	1	71	
38.0%	40.8%	14.1%	4.2%	1.4%	1.4%		

3. The quality of service at Girls Prep is:						(Select one of the following)	
---	--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------	--

¹ All parents include those who do not respond to the survey.

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Comment	Responses
33	17	11	5	0	5	71
46.5%	23.9%	15.5%	7.0%	0.0%	7.0%	

4. The culture of "hallway courtesy" is: (Select one of the following)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Comment	Responses
25	29	10	4	0	3	71
35.2%	40.8%	14.1%	5.6%	0.0%	4.2%	

5. Overall communication with parents at Girls Prep is: (Select one)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Comment	Responses
32	25	11	1	0	2	71
45.1%	35.2%	15.5%	1.4%	0.0%	2.8%	

6. Communication with my child's teacher is: (Select one of the following)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Comment	Responses
44	15	11	1	0	0	71
62.0%	21.1%	15.5%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	

7. As a parent I feel welcome at Girls Prep: (Select one of the following)

Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	No Comment	Responses
37	19	12	0	0	3	71
52.1%	26.8%	16.9%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	

- 8. What I like most about Girls Prep:**
(Response are a sample)
- Curriculum
 - Teacher's style and caring attitude
 - School culture
 - Principal's high visibility/ morning greeting
 - Discipline and sisterhood
 - Nutrition and emphasis on exercise
 - School/home communication
 - Teaching strategies

- 9. What I like least about Girls Prep:**
(Response are a sample)
- Five-story walk-up
 - Lateness policy/late pass issuance
 - Lack of structured recess
 - Lack of communication about half-days
 - Lack of "Girls Prep" after-school activities

10. Overall grade:

A+	A	A-	B	B-	C	D	F	No Comment	Responses
20	22	13	8	0	1	0	0	7	71
28.2%	31.0%	18.3%	11.3%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%		

1. Education		
Positive	Fair	Poor/NR
82%	1.18%	18.82%

4. "Hallway Courtesy"		
Positive	Fair	Poor/NR
75%	4.71%	15.39%

7. Feel Welcome		
Positive	Fair	Poor
80%	0.00%	20 %

2. Discipline		
Positive	Fair	Poor/NR
78%	3.53%	18.47%

5. Overall Communication		
Positive	Fair	Poor/NR
80%	1.18%	18.82%

10. Grade		
Positive	Fair	Poor
74%	1.18%	24.72%

3. Service		
Positive	Fair	Poor/NR
72%	5.88%	22.12%

6. Communication with Teacher		
Positive	Fair	Poor/NR
82%	1.18%	18.82%

Analysis:

We have met the goals in each individual question on our parent survey. Including those parents who did not respond, more than two-thirds of parents expressed satisfaction with the school (i.e. responded "Excellent, Very Good or Good," to questions one through seven and/or gave Girls Prep an overall grade of B or better on question ten), as indicated by the percent of positive responses in the "Response Analysis" for all relevant questions. In analyzing the results, we find that responding parents were overwhelmingly enthusiastic in their evaluation of all aspects of the school. The most frequent complaint about Girls Prep was the five story walk-up; however, parents only have to make the lengthy ascent if they bring their child late to school. In order to maintain and improve this level of parent contentment, we will continue to encourage parent involvement in the coming year and to keep the lines of communication open between parents and the school.