GRAND CONCOURSE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

2012-13 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 16, 2013

By Ira Victor

116-118 E 169th Street
Bronx, NY 10452
Phone: (718) 590-1300
Fax: (718) 590-1065

Grand Concourse Academy Charter School's Principal, Ira Victor, prepared this 2012-13 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Joyce Higginson-Davis	Chair
Howard Banker	Treasurer
Linda Manley	Secretary
Rebecca Kramnick	Trustee
Jeanette Engels	Trustee
Ms. Arlene Hall-Waisburd	Parent Representative

Ira Victor has served as the schoolleader since 2004.

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Grand Concourse Academy Charter School (GCACS) is to create a challenging learning environment that addresses and meets the learning needs of students in New York City, especially those at risk of academic failure.

In a concentrated effort to prepare our students for entry into the very best middle and high schools in New York City, GCACS will seek to foster a sense of strong character, ethics, and personal responsibility, as well as high expectations for academic success.

GCACS will place a strong emphasis on the CORE subject areas, as well as offering focused enrichment in music, art, critical thinking skills, and foreign languages. The Grand Concourse Academy Charter School will diligently seek to prepare students to meet and/or exceed New York State performance standards in English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, and Social Studies. In addition, GCACS students will demonstrate advanced skills in the arts and will begin developing conversational skills in Spanish. The school will align and adjust student learning to the State performance standards, and use a variety of assessments to measure student progress in skills and content learning.

GCACS will support and encourage professional development opportunities aligned to the instructional program and will diligently seek and encourage active parental involvement and participation in the academic goals of the student. In addition, the school will seek to involve and engage a variety of community organizations and community leaders as partners to enhance the academic success of every student.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
2007-08	56	56	77	98	32	21	340
2008-09	50	61	75	75	96	24	381
2009-10	52	52	54	75	73	92	398
2010-11	77	78	52	52	74	63	396
2011-12	63	90	78	53	45	51	380
2012-13*	63	78	105	72	41	33	392

*As of BEDS Day 2012

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts
All students at the Grand Concourse Academy Charter School (GCACS) will become proficient in reading and writing of the English Language.

Background

Grand Concourse Academy Charter School utilizes Scott Foresman Reading as its primary reading component of our English Language Arts Curriculum. We believe strongly that our core language arts instruction, with internal assessments driving differentiation, remediation, and enrichment, has been the driving factor behind the multi-subject successes we have had in Mathematics, Science and Social Studies. It is apparent that Grand Concourse Academy Charter School has placed the teaching of literacy at the forefront of their instructional goals, and ensures that all of the elements of language arts are addressed with the dedication and intensity they warrant. In the past seven years of NYS Testing in ELA and Mathematics, our instructional program has prepared our student body to make GCA one of the higher performing charter schools in New York State.

In 2011-12, we supplemented the Scott Foresman Reading Street Program with the Reading Unwrapped Program in the K-2 grades on a trial basis. In 2012-13, we continued with Reading Unwrapped and anticipate continued reading skill improvement as our younger students benefit from the continued practice the program provides. As teacher become more familiar with the materials, students should arrive in grade 3 ready to tackle content and comprehension tasks.

Teachers are provided a wide-ranging array of professional development (PD) opportunities, from individual mentoring with an administrator or colleague, to intensive differentiated group PD during pre-service sessions for training on the use of our core subjects paced curriculum, to on-going PD and weekly sharing of best practices by colleagues and specialists and administrators, to continuous monthly half-day workshops provided by publishers, college professors and consultant specialists. These professional development opportunities are designed to establish the high level of importance Grand Concourse Academy Charter School places on the acquisition and mastery of English Language Arts and Mathematic skills. Additionally, all classroom teachers are trained, guided and supported in consistently and successfully using all available assessment data to drive instruction, by adjusting their teaching strategies and approaches, modifying their instructional groupings and tweaking their instructional planning.

Our team revised and upgraded our paced curriculum guides (pacing charts) to include a stronger word acquisition skill-based program. We integrated content-based vocabulary throughout all phases of the core and the enrichment curriculums including art, music, technology, and physical education. We also revised and updated our assessment program to ensure that it aligns with New York State standards and correlates closely with our instructional program. An assessment coordinator position was added to develop, implement and evaluate all phases of the instructional program. This position functions in conjunction with our instructional team.

Research led us to believe that the most efficient and expedient way to determine how best our students learn the skills needed for mastery while acquiring them in an instructional style that supports their learning is to empower teachers to be primary stakeholders by providing the following: the necessary time for adequate and appropriate team planning, the authorization/time for thoughtful peer/parent-based-shared decision making, the availability/options for selection of resources, staffing and materials, as well as involvement of staff in the selection of professional development experiences that supports individual pedagogical growth.

Thus in 2012-13, we created Professional Learning Teams (PLT) on each grade level that will empower teachers to utilize all available resources, staffing models, student/adult ratio, materials and approaches, to address the academic and social needs of all their students. These teams will allow staff to connect with the key instructional stakeholders, exchange best practices, and revise scheduling for at-risk and gifted students as needed. The PLT will empower teachers to provide students with appropriate and flexible support that will result in learning. Teachers will share accountability with administration for their decisions as well as their results. The entire GCA Community will share in our successes.

Staffing changes were necessary in 2012-13, which resulted in the hiring of several replacement teachers who exhibit the talent, drive and dedication required at GCACS. The newly hired teachers will benefit from the PLTs and will be mentored by our experienced veteran teachers. Appropriate PD will be provided as well. A Vice Principal position was created to replace coordinators, who should be using their talents with direct student instruction. We also hired an Instructional Specialist/Staff Developer (.6) who supports the transition to the Common Core Curriculum. We have upgraded our hiring policy to include a new career ladder position to replace the former Teacher Assistant position in Grades 2 through 5. These positions will be called Level 1 Teacher positions. They are newly certified teachers who have not had lead teacher experiences. They will be work alongside seasoned, experienced Level 2 teachers and will be supported by the Staff Developer and VP/Facilitator while they are gaining professional experience to make independent instructional decisions. Pre-Service Professional Development spanned 7 days and covered topics including the newly adopted reading and math programs, PLTs, utilization of data to drive instruction and content delivery, Common Core Standards, classroom design and center development.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.[1]

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 5th grade in April 2013. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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 not enrolled in at least their second year.

2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[2]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	72	0	0	0	72
4	37	0	0	0	37
5	33	0	0	0	33
All	142	0	0	0	142

Results

33 percent of GCACS students enrolled in at least their second year achieved proficiency on the 2012-13 NYS English Language Arts exam.

Performance on 2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	33%	72	34%	70
4	32%	37	31%	36
5	33%	33	32%	31
All	32%	142	33%	137

[1] Because of the state's new 3-8 testing program, aligned to its high school college and career readiness standards, the Institute is no longer using Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores. Please report results for previous years using the state's published results for scoring at proficiency.
[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.

Evaluation

GCACS did not meet this measure. 33 percent of students in at least their second year achieved proficiency on the NYS ELA exam, falling short 42 percent from the target measure.

Additional Evidence

Historically, GCACS has performed well on the NYS assessment but fell short this year on the more difficult exam based on Common Core State Standards. We have reflected on our programs and have a solid action plan to improve student performance going forward.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	69%	36	77%	52	34%	70
4	95%	58	86%	42	31%	36
5	98%	59	96%	50	32%	31
All	90%	153	84%	144	33%	137

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) 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 enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the current year's English language arts AMO. The PLI 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 PLI is 200.[3]

Results

The table below shows that GCACS students scored a performance level index (PLI) of 88.

[3] In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

English Language Arts 2012-13 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
142	15%	52%	31%	2%

PI	=	52	+	31	+	2	=	85
				31	+	2	=	33
						PLI	=	88

Evaluation

TBD

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[4]

Results

The table below shows that GCACS students in at least their second year exceeded all Bronx District 9 students on the ELA exam. 33 percent of GCACS student in their second year performed at proficiency while only 12 percent of Bronx District 9 students performed at proficiency.

2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All Bronx District 9 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	34%	70	12%	2952
4	31%	36	10%	2763
5	32%	31	13%	2682
All	33%	137	12%	8397

[4] Schools can acquire these data when the State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The SED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

Evaluation

This measure has been met by GCACS. Each grade of GCACS students in at least their second year had a higher percent of students performing at proficiency on the ELA exam compared to Bronx District 9 students. Overall, GCACS had 33 percent of all students in at least their second year scoring proficiently, exceeding Bronx District 9 by 21 percent.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows a consistent pattern of GCACS exceeding the ELA performance of Bronx District 9. Since 2010-11 GCACS has exceeded the local district by at least 21 percent.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	58%	31%	46%	28%	34%	12%
4	57%	33%	67%	35%	31%	10%
5	61%	29%	66%	32%	32%	13%
All	**59%**	**31%**	**59%**	**32%**	**33%**	**12%**

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.[5]

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

[5] The Institute will begin using ***economically disadvantaged*** instead of ***eligibility for free lunch*** as the demographic variable in 2012-13. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2012-13 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2011-12 results (using free-lunch eligible percentage), the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

The table below shows that the effect size of GCACS is 1.20 for all grades. Grade three had an effect size of 0.55, grade four 1.53 and grade five 1.58.

2011-12 **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		**53**	**47.2**	**38.4**	**8.8**	**0.55**
4		**45**	**66.6**	**42.5**	**24.1**	**1.53**
5		**51**	**66.7**	**40.5**	**26.2**	**1.58**
6						
7						
8						
All	**82.0%**	**149**	**59.7**	**40.4**	**19.4**	**1.20**

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

Evaluation

This measure has been met by GCACS. The effect size exceeds 0.3 by a large degree. In addition, each grade individually exceeded its predicted percent of students scoring at levels three and four on the NYS ELA exam by at least 8.8.

Additional Evidence

GCACS has a consistent history of effect sizes higher than 1.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2009-10	3-5	84.80	239	52.3	35.0	1.15
2010-11	3-5	79	187	56.7	40.1	1.01
2011-12	3-5	82	149	59.7	40.4	1.20

Goal 1: Growth Measure[6]
Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Results - TBD

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Over the years, GCACS has been successful in meeting the ELA goal of having GCACS students become proficient in the 'reading and writing of the English language.' This year the new NYS ELA exam based on the CCSS proved to be a real challenge for many of our students; however, GCACS did outperform the NYS, NYC and local district. We have developed strategies and made changes to improve student outcomes going forward.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of 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 English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2011-12 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	N/A

[6] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

Action Plan

Going forward, we will enhance our educational structure by refining our curriculum to align it with the CCSS, create more time to focus on teaching, learning, and instruction, and refine business and operational structures in order to minimize outsourcing.

At the heart of these improvements is a shift in our instructional leadership structure. Our teachers are GCACS's most valuable asset and we therefore seek ways to elevate and further professionalize their role. To this end, GCACS will transition away from a traditional model of hierarchical leadership and embrace a culture of Shared Decision Making. It is widely accepted that empowering teachers to be primary stakeholders and decision-makers increases student skill mastery. As previously discussed in this renewal application, GCACS began empowering teachers to have more input in guiding curriculum and sharing decision-making, and sharing accountability for student achievement in 2012 by developing Professional Learning Teams. Beginning in the 2013-2014 school year, teachers will have even more control over the choices that affect their classrooms. To do this, we will add a layer of support and move away from a top-down leadership model. We have reached a point in our evolution where we can restructure in order to enable even more participation in a collaborative framework that includes staff and other stakeholders. Our goal is to empower our staff to guide our students toward the acquisition of 21st century skills, and to master the CCSS. This paradigm shift will retain many valid features that have proven effective over the past ten years.

Professional Learning Teams (PLT) at GCACS has laid the foundation for this shift in organizational structure. PLTS on each grade level have enabled teachers to utilize all available resources, staffing models, student/adult ratio, materials and approaches, to address the academic and social needs of all students. These PLTs are comprised of the collective expertise of all disciplines, enabling the entire GCA Community to take part in our successes. The table below describes the structure of GCACS's PLTs.

Professional Learning Team Members		
Leadership Support	Assigned Resources	Available Resources
Principal	Dean of Achievement	Parents and Guardians
Classroom Teacher (Team Leaders)	Reading Support Teacher	ELA and Content Area Coaches
	Math Support Teacher	ESL Teacher
	Writing Support Teacher	Special Education teachers
	Title 1 Teacher (Grades 1 to 5) or Classroom Assistant (K)	Guidance Counselor
	Classroom Assistant	Business Liaison

To ensure that GCACS teachers have the resources needed to make informed and effective decisions going forward, we plan to make the following three changes: (1) Restructure our leadership team to reflect an increased focus on instruction, (2) Empower teachers to become primary decision makers, and (3) Provide increased opportunities for job-embedded professional development. What follows is a description of each change.

1) Restructuring Instructional Leadership. Changes to the staffing plan will eliminate the positions of Assistant Principal and replace these roles with two content area Instructional Coaches and a Dean of Achievement. Going forward, GCACS intends to shift away a traditional hierarchical structure and toward a Shared Decision-Making culture that provides teachers with more autonomy to make instructional decisions. The creation of formal Instructional Coach positions will increase the amount and depth of professional development opportunities for GCACS faculty. These enhancements will have a direct impact on instruction and student learning outcomes. This new organizational structure will result in increased support for teachers, creating a learning-centered environment where teachers have the requisite tools to drive student academic achievement. In our next charter term, GCACS will transition our leadership team from an oversight-based model to a coaching model. Our principal's position will remain largely unchanged; he will continue to be involved in both instruction and business/operations matters. GCACS will add two instructional leadership positions to our leadership team. The formal titles of "Assistant Principal," which currently apply to two staff members, will be dissolved. In their place, we will hire an ELA Instructional Coach and a Content Area Instructional Coach. In addition to the two Instructional Coach positions, GCACS will also add a third leadership position: Dean of Achievement.

The Dean of Achievement ("DOA") position is an instructional position that includes administrative responsibilities to support the principal, so he can increase time spent on instructional responsibilities. As an administrative position, the DOA will be responsible for promoting student achievement (Student of the Month, Response to Intervention, After School Program). The DOA will also address all obstacles that interfere with student achievement (lateness, self-esteem, parent negligence, behavior management). The DOA will be the instructional point person for foreign language instruction, English as a Second Language, adult education, and standardized testing.

Dean of Achievement

- Title 1 Services K-5 after identification of students at risks during PLT meetings
- Parent Outreach on a continual basis to engage in the academic process and to address any parental concerns
- Behavior Modification for those students who might need additional support for socialization
- Response to Intervention (RTI) - Review & Evaluate the continuous revisions and fluidity of support groupings
- Observing at-risk students in small group instructional sessions to ensure adherence to mandates
- Standardized Testing Compliance for State mandates
- Professional Development for staff who might need support with small group instruction, Common Core Standards and implementation
- PLT Meetings
- Pacing for Interim Practice Assessments
- Scheduling in class groups and support
- Enrichment Subjects

GCACS designed the Instructional Coach roles to be focused purely on supporting teachers, while the Dean of Achievement will manage all data collection, facilitate data analysis, and oversee all administration associated with student standardized testing. In our second charter term, we realized that our Assistant Principal positions were fulfilling too many administrative duties

associated with standardized testing and were not allowed maximum time to observe and coach teachers. To resolve this issue, we will restructure our organization so that two full time employees are fully devoted to teacher support. Our Coaches will be "Tier 2," highly effective master teachers with demonstrated expertise in their focus area, and will demonstrate the ability to transfer knowledge to teachers and staff with flexibility, and within a nonjudgmental coaching model. Coaches will create criterion-referenced cyclical content area assessments, score assessments, analyze data, and provide support for teachers in creating follow-up lessons and activities in each specific content area.

Content Area Coach

- Mathematics (K-5)
- Professional Development for staff who might need support with Mathematics, Science, Common Core Standards and implementation
- PLT Meetings
- Curriculum Design for Mathematics and Science
- Interim Math Assessments aligned to enVISION Math
- In-Class Coaching to provide support and promote professional growth
- Science Curriculum (K-5)
- Pacing of Mathematics and Science Curriculum
- Arts Curriculum (K-5)

English Language Arts Coach

- Literacy (K-5)
- Reading, Writing, Listening, Speaking
- Professional Development for staff who might need support with all areas of English Language Arts, Social Studies, Common Core Standards and implementation
- PLT Meetings
- Curriculum Design for all areas of English Language Arts
- Interim ELA Assessments
- In-Class Coaching
- Social Studies through Literacy Curriculum (K-5)
- Pacing of all English Language Arts and Social Studies

This restructuring of our instructional leadership also aligns with our recent move toward Professional Learning Teams (detailed in Section 1). In order to fill the new Instructional Coach and Director of Achievement positions, GCACS will recruit from within our staff as well as conduct a competitive search. We anticipate that this new organizational structure will result in more support for GCACS teachers, improved instructional practices, and increases in student achievement. Furthermore, investing in the development of our teachers ensures the long-term sustainability of GCACS's instructional program. As our project budget indicates, GCACS is fully capable of supporting the salary requirements of these three positions.[7]

2) Empowering Teachers. Currently GCACS promotes a culture of collaboration via our PLTs. Our

[7] Please see Renewal Exhibit no.18 *Budget Projection for the Term of the New Charter*

teachers have responded favorably to the support offered by the PLTs. In our next charter term, we will seek to increase the horizontal leadership that PLTs promote. GCACS instructional leadership will continue to work with teachers throughout the school year, providing informal and formal feedback on teacher work. These evaluations will assign our teachers to one of two following categories, Tier 1: Intern Teacher, Tier 2: High Impact Teacher. All teachers, regardless of tier, will be directly involved in instructional decision-making and the creation of intervention and enrichment activities. Tier 2 teachers will be given more autonomy to design instruction, whereas a Tier 1 teacher who is developing skills, will receive more instructional decision making support from a GCACS Instructional Coach. A description of each Tier is below; salary scale will be commensurate with the appropriate tiers.

Tier 1 - Intern Teachers: Are newly certified intern teachers. Intern teachers are expected to make professional growth within a two year probationary period. Tier 1 teachers will work under the guidance of successful, experienced Tier 2 teachers, and will be supported by the Coaches and Dean while they are gaining professional experience to make independent instructional decisions. Tier 1 teachers are not bound by time and program constraints, materials, and resources. A mentor will be assigned to all Tier 1 teachers.

Tier 2 - High Impact Teachers: Are teachers appointed to a high stakes assignments and assume the role of major decision-makers and stakeholders for their students, guide and mentor colleagues, and assume more leadership responsibilities. Tier 2 teachers are not bound by time and program constraints, materials, and resources. They exhibit great professional initiative to ensure student achievement. They achieve consistent, repeated results on a highly effective level and are key stakeholders in maintaining our status and standing.

3). Job-embedded Professional Development. GCACS will continue to facilitate traditional professional development workshops for our faculty in areas of development that pertain to our entire faculty. Our Instructional Coaches will lead these workshops. In order to address the unique development needs of different teachers, GCACS Instructional Coaches will run job-embedded coaching cycles with our teachers. Instructional Coaches will infuse differentiated professional development by providing teachers with immediate and specific feedback relevant to their own practice. Coaches will also model lessons and strategies for teachers in a classroom setting. GCACS teachers will engage in one-on–one meetings with coaches as needed.

Pre-Service Professional Development will span a minimum of seven days and cover topics including the reading and math programs, PLTs, utilization of data to drive instruction and content delivery, classroom design, center development, and groupings in order to meet mandated Common Core State Standards.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 1: Mathematics
All students at the Grand Concourse Academy Charter School will become proficient in Mathematics.

Background

Grand Concourse Academy implements a both a direct instruction and constructivist approach in the teaching of Mathematics with a school wide use of the researched-based series, Scott Foresman Mathematics, and all of its manipulative and classroom supports. As with ELA, our in house monthly assessments drive our instruction, student grouping, and re-teaching when a topic was not mastered by the whole group or individual students. In our six years of NYS assessments in Mathematics, we have never missed our 75% absolute proficiency measure. To supplement the current math program, Scott Foresman, we added the *enVisionMATH* program in 2011-12, which is aligned to the Common Core Standards. *enVisionMATH Common Core* was written specifically for the Common Core State Standards and is based on critical foundational research and proven classroom results. *enVisionMATH Common Core* provides the same strong development of conceptual understanding through daily Problem-based Interactive Learning and step-by-step Visual Learning, bar diagrams, and solid and effective intervention.

We schedule an extended Mathematics instructional block with two adults in each classroom. During that time, we adhere to a strict schedule of pacing, which addresses the first one hundred days of instruction to align with the New York State Mathematics Assessment. During the second instructional block, teachers use a constructivist approach to the learning of mathematics, focusing on hand-on applications, discovery activities and the development of alternative solutions.

In 2010-11, changes were made to the Mathematics program. Our team revised and updated our Assessment Program to ensure that it aligns with New York State standards and correlates closely with our instructional program. An assessment coordinator position was added to develop, implement and evaluate all phases of the instructional program.

We have increased our pedagogical support services by forming a new instructional team comprised of: the Principal, two Vice Principals, two Instructional and P.D. Coordinators, and an Assessment Coordinator as well as outside consultants. One of the vice principals is assigned the content areas of Mathematics and Science for which they are responsible for being the point person. The Instructional Coordinator was added in 2011-12 and is a certified content specialist who works alongside the classroom teacher during the 1.5 hour math block each day. Students have the benefit of two certified teachers during the math block every day. Focused professional development activities were implemented throughout the school year to maximize student learning. We discontinued departmentalization and revised our instructional model to include two additional certified teachers, during the literacy and math block, in all classes in grades 3, 4, and 5. We continue to reflect on our programs and make refinements as needed to best serve our scholars.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics examination for grades 3-8.[8]

Method
The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 5th grade in April 2013. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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 not enrolled in at least their second year.

2012-13 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[9]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	72	0	0	0	72
4	36	0	0	0	36
5	33	0	0	0	33
All	141	0	0	0	141

Results

The table below shows that 51 percent of GCACS students in at least their second year performed at proficiency on the NYS Mathematics exam.

Performance on 2012-13 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	49%	72	50%	70
4	44%	36	43%	35
5	64%	33	65%	31
All	51%	141	51%	136

[8] Because of the state's new 3-8 testing program, aligned to its high school college and career readiness standards, the Institute is no longer using Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores. Please report results for previous year's using the state's published results for scoring at proficiency.
[9] 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.

Evaluation

This measure has not been met by GCACS. 51 percent of GCACS second year students performed proficiently on the Mathematics exam, falling 24 percent short of the target measure.

Additional Evidence

In 2010-11 as well as 2011-12 99 percent of GCACS students in their second year achieved proficiency on the NYS mathematics exam.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	100%	35	100%	52	50%	70
4	98%	58	100%	42	43%	35
5	100%	59	98%	50	65%	31
All	99%	152	99%	144	51%	136

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) 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 enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the current year's mathematics AMO. The PLI 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 PLI is 200.[10]

Results

The table shows that GCACS had a performance level index (PLI) of 148 on the 2012-13 Mathematics exam.

[10] In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

Mathematics 2012-13 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
141	3	46	39	12

PI	=	46	+	39	+	12	=	97
				39	+	12	=	51
						PLI	=	148

Evaluation - TBD

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.[11]

Results

The table below shows that 51 percent of all GCACS students in at least their second year achieved proficiency on the NYS Mathematics exam, while only 14 percent of all Bronx district 9 students performed at proficiency.

2012-13 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All Bronx District 9 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	50%	70	14%	3048
4	43%	35	14%	2856
5	65%	31	13%	2770
All	**51%**	136	**14%**	8674

[11] Schools can acquire these data when the State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The SED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

Evaluation

GCACS has met this measure. GCACS exceeded Bronx district 9 by 37 percent on the amount of students performing at proficiency on the mathematics exam. Each GCACS grade individually exceeded Bronx District 9 by at least 29 percent.

Additional Evidence

Since 2010-11, GCACS has exceeded the local district by at least 33 percent of students scoring at proficiency on the NYS Mathematics exam.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	74%	39%	60%	36%	50%	14%
4	91%	43%	86%	47%	43%	14%
5	88%	45%	86%	46%	65%	13%
All	86%	42%	76%	43%	51%	14%

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.[12]

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small degree is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2012-13 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2011-12 results (using free-lunch eligible percentage), the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

[12] The Institute will begin using ***economically disadvantaged*** instead of ***eligibility for free lunch*** as the demographic variable in 2012-13. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

Results

The table below shows that GCACS had a 1.32 effect size on the Mathematics comparative performance for 2011-12.

2011-12 **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		**53**	**60.4**	**46.2**	**14.2**	**0.75**
4		**45**	**86.7**	**55.3**	**31.4**	**1.68**
5		**51**	**86.2**	**53.4**	**32.8**	**1.61**
6						
7						
8						
All	**82.0%**	**149**	**77.2**	**51.4**	**25.8**	**1.32**

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

Evaluation

This measure has been met by GCACS. Our overall comparative performance was higher than expected to a large degree. Additionally, each individual grade exceeded its percent of students predicted to score at levels three and four by at least 14.2.

Additional Evidence

Since 2009-10, GCACS has had an effect size exceeding 0.3.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2009-10	3-5	84.80	242	72.3	45.3	1.46
2010-11	3-5	79.00	189	84.6	50.5	1.80
2011-12	3-5	82.00	149	77.2	51.4	1.32

Goal 1: Growth Measure[13]
Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2011-12 scores are ranked by their 2012-13 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (mean growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Results -TBD

Summary of the of the Mathematics Goal
Although, 75% of second year students did not score at levels 3 and 4 on the NYS mathematics exam based on the CCSS, we did outperform the state, New York City and the local district. We have made many adjustments to our program and strive to see improved student performance as our teachers and students become more familiar with the new testing format and the CCSS. As students experience instruction based on the CCSS beginning in Kindergarten, they will likely use that breadth of knowledge and achieve better scores in grades 3-8 and beyond.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of 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 mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2011-12 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	N/A

[13] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

Action Plan

Please refer to the ELA Action Plan. The second coach will be the following position to support the math program, among other duties.

Content Area Coach

- Mathematics (K-5)
- Professional Development for staff who might need support with Mathematics, Science, Common Core Standards and implementation
- PLT Meetings
- Curriculum Design for Mathematics and Science
- Interim Math Assessments aligned to enVISION Math
- In-Class Coaching to provide support and promote professional growth
- Science Curriculum (K-5)
- Pacing of Mathematics and Science Curriculum
- Arts Curriculum (K-5)

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
All students at Grand Concourse Academy Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

Background

Students will develop science competency with a combination of our McGraw Hill Science Series, Scott Foresman Deluxe Hands-On Science Kits, trade books, and science-related field trip experiences. In 2010-11, we set up a new Science Laboratory where students receive hands-on instruction and conduct science experiments. In 2011-12, teachers implemented a Learn by Doing Science model, in which at least one science lesson each week is hands-on and utilizes manipulatives.

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th grade in spring 2013. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at proficiency.

Results

100 percent of grade 4 students in at least their second year at GCACS performed at levels 3 and 4.

Charter School Performance on 2012-13 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100%	36	TBD	

Evaluation

This measure has been met by GCACS. 100 percent of all fourth grade students performed at levels 3 and 4, while 98 percent of second year students achieved the same outcome.

Additional Evidence

GCACS grade 4 students have achieved this measure for the many years it has administered the exam.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	98%	58	98%	42	100%	37

Goal 3: Comparative Measure
Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

Results

2013 district scores are not yet available.

2012-13 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100	37	TBD	

Evaluation - TBD

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	98%	71%	98%	72%	100%	TBD

Summary of the Science Goal

Grand Concourse Academy Charter School achieved the absolute science measure with 100 percent of grade 4 cohort students scoring at performance levels 3 and 4 on the 2012 NYS Science exam.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved

Action Plan

Our science program has proved to be very successful over the years and we will continue, making only small refinements as needed.

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 is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as a local-assistance-plan school.

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 state proficiency standards. 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 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Results

Grand Concourse Academy Charter School continued at the status of "Good Standing" for academic year 2012-2013.

Evaluation

This measure has been met by GCACS. Every year that GCACS has been in operation, we have been awarded a status of "Good Standing."

Additional Evidence

Since GCACS opened in 2004-2005 we have been awarded a status of "Good Standing" in that and each subsequent academic year.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2010-11	Good Standing
2011-12	Good Standing
2012-13	Good Standing