

**Harlem Success Academy
CHARTER SCHOOL 3
("HSA3")**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY
PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 21, 2011

By Amanda Kramer

141 E 111th St, 3rd Floor
New York, NY 10029
T: 646.747.6700

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

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Joel Greenblatt	Board Chair
Ben Appen	Member
Robert Azeke	Member
Bryan Binder	Member
Kathryn Croft	Member
Diana Elghanayan	Member
Scott Friedman	Member
Julie Greenblatt	Member
Josh Hirsch	Member
Jason Peralta	Member
John Rennie	Member

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Harlem Success Academy Charter School 3 (“HSA3”) is to provide New York City elementary students, particularly those from economically-disadvantaged neighborhoods, with the knowledge, skills, character, and disposition to meet and exceed New York State standards and give them the resources to lead and succeed in the school, college, and life.

The school opened in August 2008 and served Kindergarten through Third Grade during the 2010-2011 school year.

School Design Elements

A. Focus on Student Achievement

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

B. Curriculum

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

C. Student Performance Data

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

D. More Instructional Time

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

E. School Leaders with the Power to Lead

- The Principal has the power to hire and fire staff.
- Non-instructional operations are handled by the school operations team and Success Charter Network (“SCN”), allowing the Principal and other instructional leaders to regularly observe teaching and focus solely on student achievement.

- The school's budget is set by the Principal in consultation with the Board of Trustees and SCN's finance team. This allows the budget to reflect real student and school needs.

F. Highly-Qualified, Highly-Trained Staff

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

G. Strong School Culture

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

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2006-07	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2007-08	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2008-09	N/A	N/A	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	199
2009-10*	76	103	70	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	249
2010-11*	136	128	132	68	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	464

* Per annual October BEDS Report.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

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

Background

Believing that all children can succeed, Harlem Success 3 (HSA3) goes above and beyond state standards. The early elementary literacy curriculum in kindergarten and first grade is modeled on an enhanced version of Success For All (SFA), which has a proven track record in urban schools and has been implemented in over 1,000 schools around the United States. As such, consultants from the Success For All Foundation will train teachers in strategies for teaching literacy. In upper grades, a comprehensive balanced literacy program will be used, developed in-house by the SCN Instructional Development and Literacy teams.

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

In order to ensure that scholars' comprehension needs are met, HSA3 has built in additional time to every school day for independent reading, guided reading, and writer's workshop. At the heart of the literacy program is 100 minutes of daily, uninterrupted reading instruction for grades 1 through 5. Kindergartners learn literacy through KinderCorner, SFA's standards-aligned kindergarten program. KinderCorner integrates literacy throughout the day into varying blocks that are suitable yet challenging to kindergartners' developmental needs.

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

HSA3 employs one lead teacher in each classroom. A lead teacher typically has at least three years of classroom experience, New York State teaching certification, and a Master's degree. Each grade level also has assistant teachers who have less classroom experience. The school also employs specialty teachers such as science teachers, special education teachers (who work as independent contractors), art teachers, chess teachers, dance teachers, and athletic coaches.

HSA3 enforces specific protocols for how schools collect, distribute, and analyze data. These protocols work to help teachers and school leaders freely access information in real-time. In a fast-paced and constantly changing school environment, having data at one's fingertips empowers the staff to better decide how to expend time and resources so as to maximize student achievement. HSA3 also constantly seeks out more efficient ways to raise student test scores by carefully examining high-stakes tests like the New York State English Language Arts Test. Dissecting these tests helps teachers determine how best to quickly teach students how to ace these tests, giving the teachers more time to focus on teaching those skills that transcend the binary math-reading school day.

HSA3 views its teachers as Olympic athletes who must constantly train and improve their skills. To that end, we provide professional development for teachers so they can develop skills, acquire

knowledge in their content areas, and improve their pedagogical techniques. That way teachers are prepared to "win the race" that is educating children.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English language arts examination.

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in third grade in April 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

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

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

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. All students scheduled to take the ELA test, did take it.

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	69	0	0	0	69
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All	69	0	0	0	69

Results

The table below shows that of HSA3’s third grade students in at least their second year, 85.5% scored at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	85.5%	69
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	85.5%	69
4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
5	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
6	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
7	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
8	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
All	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		

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

In its first year administering the ELA test, HSA3 was able to exceed the goal of getting 75% of third graders to achieve a Time Adjusted Level 3 score or better. A similarly high percentage of HSA3’s special education scholars was able to score 3 or better as well. Much of this success can be attributed to the design of our literacy program detailed above and HSA3’s talented educators.

Additional Evidence

Since 2010-11 was the very first year HSA3 administered the ELA test, we cannot observe trends from previous years. However, HSA3 performed extremely well in its first year and we expect ELA results to only improve in coming years.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	85.5%	69
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	85.5%	69

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

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

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

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

Results

HSA3’s third graders outperformed third graders across District 5 by a very wide margin. In fact the share of HSA3 scholars who passed ELA exceeded that of District 5 by over 2 times. HSA3 posted dramatically better results based on the strength of its literacy program.

**2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	85.5%	69	40.9%	1145
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All	85.5%	69	40.9%	1145

Evaluation

In its first year administering the ELA test, HSA3 was able to exceed the goal of getting 75% of third graders to achieve a Time Adjusted Level 3 score or better. A similarly high percentage of HSA3’s special education scholars were able to score 3 or better as well. Much of this success can be attributed to the design of our literacy program detailed above and HSA3’s talented educators.

Additional Evidence

In its first year administering the ELA test, HSA3’s third graders outperformed ones across district 5 by a very wide margin.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	-	-	-	-	-	-	85.5%	40.9%
4								
5								
6								
7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
All							85.5%	40.9%

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

The chart below displays how HSA3’s students in each grade performed compared to students in public schools in New York State within the same grade and a similar population of free-lunch-eligible students. The results show an effect size that is higher than expected to a large degree.

2010-11 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Free Lunch Eligible Students	Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		69	72.4	45.1	27.3	1.71
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All	68	69	72.4	45.1	27.3	1.71

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

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

Evaluation

HSA3's third grade outperformed its expected overall comparative performance by a very wide margin. This provides further evidence that HSA3's literacy program is strong.

Additional Evidence

Since 2010-11 was the first year HSA3 administered the ELA test, we do not have data with which to compare Effect Size over previous years. For the one year we do have data, 2010-11, the Effect Size was higher than expected to a large 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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007-08	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008-09	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	3	68%	69	72.4	45.1	1.71

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

Goal 1: Value Added Measure

On the current year's state English language arts exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's state English language

arts exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

Each student, beginning in the second grade, will take the DRA, or a similar reading assessment, and at least 75% of students will increase in reading performance by a minimum of one grade level equivalent each year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

2010-11 was the first year HSA3 administered the ELA test to third graders or students in any other grade so HSA3 does not have data to report in the table below.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4				85.5%	YES
5					--
6					--
7	--	--	--	--	--
8	--	--	--	--	--
All				85.5%	YES

Additional Evidence

2010-11 was the first year HSA3 administered the ELA test to third graders or students in any other grade so HSA3 does not have comparative data to report in the table below.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	--		
2008-09	--		
2009-10	--		
2010-11	3	1	1

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Since 2010-2011 was the first year HSA3 administered the ELA test, we are not able to fully determine growth over time. However, we are confident that HSA3 will continue to post results that meet or exceed the goal of getting 75% of second year students to perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score for the ELA test.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	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.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	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	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	N/A
--	--	--

Action Plan

By refining the literacy curriculum and better targeting student deficits as identified through performance data, HSA3 will continue to maintain and/or improve student achievement in coming years. HSA3 will also continue to refine professional development, providing teachers with the skills that will make them most effective at raising student achievement.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

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

Background

HSA3 uses the Investigations math program. Some of its key elements are described below:

- **Problem Solving** – The Investigations math program offers students a chance to solve real world, contextualized mathematics problems using both conceptual understanding as well as procedural and computational fluency. Students learn problem-solving strategies by solving daily word problems in a program we call Cognitive Guided Instruction (CGI). CGI requires cooperative learning and critical thinking. Under the guidance of the teacher, students employ problem-solving strategies to math problems that are posed in various ways within the same topic. Students work together and individually to determine the math concept addressed in the problem, and then use their familiarity with procedures and number facts to solve the problem accurately and quickly.
- **Assessment** – The Investigations math program contains diagnostic assessment tools to determine the progress of students with respect to program topics as well as state and national standards. HSA3 has also interim assessments that are aligned to New York State and Common Core standards. These ensure that teachers have the tools necessary to get all students to successfully master the math skills tied to New York State and the Common Core.
- **Conceptual Understanding** – Investigations math places an emphasis on fact fluency and computational procedures, but also offers open-ended exploration and interactive learning components to each lesson to let students make sense of mathematics. This conceptual framework helps build on ideas and observations from previous experiences. Students are then able to apply their thinking to new situations and unfamiliar problems. The Investigations program uses daily word problems to give students meaning, understanding, and application to the math they learn.
- **Differentiation** – the Investigations program has a differentiated instructional program that allows teachers to routinely deliver formative assessments in each lesson and provide additional activities and homework that are in line with student understanding of the topic. For students who are struggling, re-teaching activities are provided to help students fully understand the material by delivering the information in a different way. For students who have internalized the lesson, there are additional activities designed so students can further analyze that lesson's topic. In addition, teachers are provided with extensive resources to encourage teaching to different modalities, including Smart Board integrated virtual manipulatives as well as hands-on manipulatives.
- **Computational Fluency** – HSA3 supplements Investigations with math facts practice because we recognize the importance of computational fluency. Students use the procedural and computational practice found in Investigations and reinforced with other math activities to teach students to answer math facts with accuracy and speed.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State mathematics examination.

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd grade in May 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

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

The table below summarizes participation information for this year’s test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have been enrolled for less than one year.

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁴			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	69	0	0	0	69
4					
5					

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

⁴ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam

6					
7					
8					
All	69	0	0	0	69

Results

The table below shows that of HSA3’s third grade students in at least their second year who took the state math test in May 2011, 100% scored at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	100%	69
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	69
4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
5	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
6	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
7	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
8	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
All	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		

Evaluation

In its first year administering the state math test, HSA3 was able to exceed the goal of getting 75% of third graders to achieve a Time Adjusted Level 3 score or better. A similarly high percentage of HSA3’s special education scholars were able to score 3 or better as well. Much of this success can be attributed to the design of our math program detailed above and HSA3’s talented educators.

Additional Evidence

Since 2010-11 was the very first year HSA3 administered the state math test, we cannot observe trends from previous years. However, HSA3 performed extremely well in 2010-11 and we expect math results to only improve in coming years.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	100%	69
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	100%	69

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State mathematics exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

Method

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

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

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

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

Results

HSA3’s third graders outperformed third graders across District 5 by a very wide margin.

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	100%	69	48.4%	1160
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All	100%	69	48.4%	1160

Evaluation

HSA3’s third graders’ performance far exceeded that of all third graders across District 5.

Additional Evidence

In its first year administering the state math test, HSA3’s third graders outperformed third graders across District 5 by a very wide margin. HSA3 does not have test results from previous years at this time.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	-	-	-	-	-	-	100%	48.4%
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All							100%	48.4%

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

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

2010-11 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Free Lunch Eligible Students	Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	68	69	92.7	50.0	42.7	2.30
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All	68	69	92.7	50.0	42.7	2.30

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

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

Evaluation

HSA3’s third grade outperformed its expected overall comparative performance by a very wide margin. This is further testament to HSA3’s effective math instruction.

Additional Evidence

Since 2010-11 was the first year HSA3 administered the math test, we do not have data with which to compare Effect Size over previous years.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007-08	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008-09	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	3	68%	69	92.7%	50%	2.3

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

Goal 1: Value Added Measure

On the current year’s state mathematics exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

2010-11 was the first year HSA3 administered the state math test to third graders or students in any other grade so HSA3 does not have data to report in the table below.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4				100%	YES
5					--

6					--
7					--
8					--
All				100%	YES

Evaluation

Since 2010-2011 was the first year HSA3 administered the math test, we are not able to fully realize growth over time. However, we are confident that HSA3 will continue to post results that meet or exceed the goal of getting 75% of second year students to perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

Additional Evidence

2010-11 was the first year HSA3 administered the math test to third graders or students in any other grade so HSA3 does not have comparative data to report in the table below.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	--		
2008-09	--		
2009-10	--		
2010-11	3	1	1

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Since 2010-2011 was the first year HSA3 administered the math test, we are not able to fully realize growth over time. However, we are confident that HSA3 will continue to post results that meet or exceed the goal of getting 75% of second year students to perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	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.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	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	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam	N/A

	and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	
	--	--

Action Plan

By refining the math curriculum and better targeting student deficits as identified through test data, HSA3 will continue to maintain and/or improve student achievement in coming years. HSA3 will also continue to refine professional development, providing teachers with the skills that will make them most effective at raising student achievement.

SCIENCE

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

Background

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

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

Method

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

Results

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students						
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year						
8	All Students						
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year						

Evaluation

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

Additional Evidence

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

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

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

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

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

**2010-11 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4				
8				

Evaluation

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

Additional Evidence

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

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

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

Summary

HSA3 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment because the highest grade level in 2010-11 was third grade.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	N/A
	--	N/A

Action Plan

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

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB
The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Goal 5: Absolute Measure
Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

Method

Since *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards which indicate each school’s status under the state’s NCLB accountability system. For a school’s status to be “Good Standing” it must not have failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years.

Results

HSA3 has met NCLB requirements and is in “good standing.” HSA3 has exceeded the goal of getting at least 75% of its second-year students to pass both the state ELA and math tests.

Evaluation

HSA3 has met NCLB requirements for the 2010-11 school year. We are confident that HSA3 will continue to meet or exceed NCLB requirements.

Additional Evidence

HSA3 is in good standing with respect to NCLB requirements based on results from the 2010-11 school year.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2010-11	Good Standing

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

Results

2010-11 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	95%
2	97%
3	96%
4	--
5	--
6	--
7	--
8	--
Overall	95%

Evaluation

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

Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2006-07	--
2007-08	--
2008-09	N/A
2009-10	95%
2010-11	95%

Note: Includes Kindergarten students.