

Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2007-08 School Year

Reader's Guide

SUNY Authorized Charter Schools

As set forth in the *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees*, the single most important factor that the Charter Schools Institute and the State University Board of Trustees consider in making renewal determinations is the school's record in generating successful student achievement outcomes. In order to determine whether a school has met that high standard, **each charter school that the State University Board of Trustees authorizes is required to enter into an accountability agreement, known as an Accountability Plan**, which ultimately becomes part of its charter.

The Charter Schools Institute closely monitors each school's progress toward achieving the goals outlined in its Accountability Plan.

In addition, as part of its annual reporting requirements, **each SUNY authorized charter school must submit an Accountability Plan Progress Report which, from its vantage point, addresses each of the goals and outcome measures contained in its Accountability Plan.** The information presented in these Progress Reports constitutes important evidence that a school is keeping its promises to its students, parents and community, and is critical to making its case for renewal at the end of its charter period. The most important parts of Progress Reports are student achievement results on state exams and other assessments. However, not all schools will have tested grade levels for a particular state exam. Each year, the state administers English language arts and mathematics tests to 3rd through 8th grade, science tests to the 4th and 8th grades, and social studies tests to the 5th and 8th grades.

Important Note: **The Accountability Plan Progress Report is authored by the charter school.** In reporting school progress toward meeting the outcome measures set forth in the Accountability Plan, schools are encouraged to build a case for the effectiveness of their program, and to lay the groundwork for writing a Renewal Application and ultimately for charter renewal. **The school's evaluation of its own progress does not necessarily reflect the conclusions of the Institute.** Further, the Institute does not affirm the completeness or accuracy of the report's data and may not endorse the school's characterization of the progress it has made toward achieving its Accountability Plan goals. Throughout the life of the school's charter, the Institute will visit each school, generating Institute School Visit Reports, and at the end of each charter period, a Renewal Report (select the <back> button in your browser to return to the school profile to see any/all available reports). These reports include detailed summaries of the Institute's observations of the school, as well as its evaluation of student performance and progress toward meeting the academic subject goals in its Accountability Plan.

**HENRY JOHNSON
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2007-08
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 1, 2008

By Lillian Turner, Principal

30 Watervliet Avenue, Albany, NY 12206

lturner@henryjohnsoncs.org

Ph: 518.432.4300 Fax: 518.432.4311

Lillian Turner, Principal, prepared this 2007-08 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Michelle Cleary	Chairperson
Debra Dickerson	Vice Chairperson
Alea DePauw	Secretary
Peter Murphy	Treasurer
Claire Hazzard	Trustee
Brennan Keating	Trustee

INTRODUCTION

Henry Johnson Charter School opened in September, 2007, as a Kindergarten-Grade Four school, beginning operations with Kindergarten and Grade 1. Proudly named for Albany’s World War I hero, the school strives to help students emulate Sergeant Johnson’s strength of character; indeed, he serves as a compelling touchstone for the school’s focus on the character development of its students. Our mission is to ensure that all students reach the highest levels of scholastic achievement in an environment that instills character, virtue, and “habits of mind” that ensure success both within and outside the classroom. Our school increases what students know and can do by changing how they learn, not just what they learn.

Modeled on the very successful Milwaukee College Preparatory School, we follow some of the tenets of Marva Collins (e.g., using daily recitals of alphabetic Wall Cards to assure knowledge of letters and sounds, thus promoting a phonics-based approach to reading, and enriching the ELA program with classic literature). We have adapted MCPS’s Proactivity Program to build character as a foundation for personal happiness and success as well as solid academic learning. Truly, the order of phrases in our slogan—“Building Character...Achieving Excellence”—reflects our belief in the fundamental role that strong traits of character play in preparing children to pursue and succeed in a setting of academic rigor.

Our daily schedule includes three hours of ELA and 1 ½ hours of math (to change to 3 ½ hours of ELA and 1 hour of math in the 2008-2009 school year). Science, social studies, art, music, physical education, and computer round out the program, to be supplemented with Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math in 2008-2009. In Kindergarten and Grade 1 we employ a co-teaching model, whereby two certified teachers along with an Educational Assistant are present during ELA and math blocks. Next year, Grade 2 will be staffed by one certified teacher and an Educational Assistant in the two second grade classrooms. There are at least two adults in every classroom all day, every day. Daily tutoring and homework time—homework is called Life’s Work—are provided during our longer school day (7:30-4:30) and school year (196 days).

In addition to holding high expectations for academic performance, Henry Johnson Charter School is defined by a culture of commitment and caring that teaches children they can be successful. It offers patience, support, and concern for each child, rewards accomplishments, and emphasizes strict and loving discipline that reinforces positive values and behaviors. We seek to involve parents as partners in their child’s education and succeed in assembling and retaining an excellent faculty.

Henry Johnson scholars come to us from the city of Albany as well as surrounding towns and cities such as South Colonie, Clifton Park, Guilderland, and Troy; next year, we will add Schenectady and Menands to the list. Our population is 90%+ free and reduced lunch and 95% minority children, the vast majority of whom are African American. Our total population in 2007-2008 resulted in three sections of Kindergarten and two of Grade 1; in 2008-2009, we will grow to three sections of both Kindergarten and Grade 1 and two sections of Grade 2.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2003-04														
2004-05														
2005-06														
2006-07														
2007-08	78	35												113

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Henry Johnson Charter School scholars will be proficient readers and writers of the English language.

Background

HJCS employed Macmillan-McGraw Hill's *Treasures* program as the basis for its ELA curriculum. This was supplemented by the strong literature basis of the Proactivity character education program, which was taught during daily 20-30 minute lessons. The ELA block over all lasted for three hours and included Wall Card recitals, the Proactivity lesson, and handwriting as well as reading and writing. In homeroom groups, students also memorized and recited to the entire school at least two Proactivity-themed poems a month plus the school's Declaration of Excellence, recited in homeroom daily and periodically by the entire school population during our weekly Friday assemblies. In each KG and Grade 1 homeroom, one teacher had the responsibility for ELA planning and delivery of instruction; she was supported by a second teacher and an Educational Assistant, both of whom headed up centers and reading groups during ELA time. ELA assessment was based on *Treasures'* program materials and supplemented by teacher-made materials.

We used the Terra Nova exams in the fall and spring to gauge baseline skills and knowledge and then to assess growth over the year. More important for our instructional purposes was the Northwest Evaluation Association's MAP test (Measure of Academic Performance), a dynamic online test that adjusts to the student's ability level and not only identifies student strengths and needs but also provides instructional resources and Checklist tests that can be used to check on acquisition of particular skills as often as desired. During this year we used the Summary tests in both Reading and Math to gather baseline information in October, to do an interim check in February, and to get a final measure of growth in June. Next year we will make more use of the checklist feature and instructional resources. Professional development related to the *Treasures* program was provided by the publisher prior to the school's opening, as was PD related to NWEA MAP.

Goal 1: 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 English language arts examination.

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State ELA assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

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 Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State ELA assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in grade 1-4 will perform at the proficient level on the Terra Nova exam.

Method

The Terra Nova exam was administered to all Kindergarten and Grade 1 students in both October 2007 and June 2008. The fall administration was intended to gather baseline data; the spring administration, to assess growth. The results reported below are the spring scores.

Results

**2007-08 English Language Arts Performance
On Terra Nova by Grade Level**

Grade (N=34)	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2008							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
1	52.9	18	29.4	10	11.8	4	5.9	2
2								
3								
4								
All	52.9	18	29.4	10	11.8	4	5.9	2

Clearly, 75% of our first graders did not perform at the Proficient or above level; instead, only 17.7% did.

Evaluation

Our school began operating in September 2007, so the students reported on above were educated at HJCS for only 9 ½ months prior to taking the exam. The "at the school for at least two years" modifier

that applies to the data of other goals is not required here, though it will be interesting to see how this cohort does after two years' attendance, as will be reported in the Progress Report for 2008-2009. In the meantime, we can present the comparison of scores from the fall 07 administration to the spring 08. That data are charted below.

Grade (N=34)	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Fall to Spring 07-08							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
1 (Fall)	67.6	23	23.5	8	8.8	3	0.0	0
1 (Spring)	52.9	18	29.4	10	11.8	4	5.9	2
Difference	-14.7	-5	+5.9	+2	+3.0	+1	+5.9	+2

While the 75% proficient and above was not reached, we did succeed in moving 14.7%, or 5 students, out of the lowest level, which in the fall represented more than two-thirds of the group and in the spring just a bit over one-half of them. In the fall, 31 students scored in Levels 1 and 2, while in the spring 28 of them did. This represents 82.3% scoring at those low levels, but that compares with 91% scoring there in the fall. Though a modest improvement, it does represent a gain in the number of children scoring in the upper two levels: six, or 17.7% in the spring compared with three, or 8.8% in the fall—an increase of 100%. Once again—very modest growth, but growth.

Additional Evidence

1) In addition to testing our first graders on the Terra Nova ELA exam, we tested Kindergartners as well. Fall percentiles were not available as the norms had not yet been established. By the spring, it was possible to present that information.

Grade (N=78)	Terra Nova ELA Exam							
	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 07-08							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	
KG (Spring)	46.2	36	25.6	20	17.9	14	10.3	8

The Kindergarten results are similar to Grade 1's, with the majority—71.8%—falling into Levels 1 and 2. But that is 10% fewer than the Level 1 and 2 First Graders. It is difficult at this time to ascribe reasons having to do with the HJCS school experience as having any part in creating this discrepancy. Perhaps the larger sample of students—more than twice as many Kindergartners as First Graders—plays a role here.

2) HJCS also administered the NWEA MAP Summary Tests to both Kindergarten and Grade 1, in the fall to gather baseline data and again in June to assess growth. The following provides this data:

NWEA MAP Reading				
Grade	Date	Number Tested	Mean Scores	Difference
KG	Oct 07	78	134.2 RIT*	
KG	Jun 08	78	151.8 RIT	+17.6 RIT fall to spring
KG MAP norm	Spring		147.6 RIT	+4.2 RIT
1	Oct 07	34	151 RIT	
1	Jun 08	34	167 RIT	+16 RIT fall to spring
Gr.1 MAP norm	Spring		160.2 RIT	+6.8 RIT

The average growth of Kindergarten and Grade 1 students over the year was comparable (17.6 RIT and 16 RIT). It is interesting to note that in June, the Kindergarten mean RIT was almost the same as the Grade 1 fall RIT (151.8 RIT cf. 151 RIT). Note also that the HJCS mean RIT growth in both grades exceeded the MAP norm growth, by 4.2 points at KG and by 6.8 points at Grade 1. From a national perspective, this is a positive note.

* "RIT" refers to the Rasch unit, or RIT scale, which measures performance on an equal-unit basis. For more information, see www.nwea.org/assessments/researchbased.asp.

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: Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State ELA assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

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 small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State ELA assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Goal 1: Growth Measure

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

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State ELA assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

On the one measure that was applicable to our KG-1 school in the 2007-2008 school year—the achievement of 75% proficiency on the Terra Nova ELA exam, we were not successful. Only 17.7% of our First Graders met that goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in grades 1-4 will perform at the proficient level on the Terra Nova exam	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

As teachers' become more familiar with our *Treasures* program, they will be able to make better and deeper use of the program's rich array of materials and resources in their instruction and assessment. We will also continue our weekly grade-level planning to assure consistency across the homerooms and to share best practices. And, although a long-term effort that may not yield fruit in this first year of the undertaking, our work on vertical curriculum mapping should tighten and strengthen curriculum across

the grades and from grade to grade. We also plan to increase our ELA block from three to three-and-a-half hours to allow for a 30-minute Writer's Workshop at Grades 1 and 2, and to allow a 30-minute Dramatic Play block at Kindergarten to strengthen students' social and emotional development and to allow them to practice the character traits promoted through our Proactivity program. Generally speaking, increasing self-control in these areas contributes to preparing the child for greater academic success, and we have found that our youngest students will benefit from time dedicated in this way.

Other actions that we will undertake that should also strengthen our efforts to target and address student needs are the following:

- Conduct an item analysis of the Terra Nova exam to assure that our curriculum and instruction address the areas students will be tested on
- Extend our use of the diagnostic features of the NWEA MAP assessment: i.e., follow the administration of the Summary test that will be used as a baseline for the year with a careful analysis of the needs the data reveal; then focus planning to include individualized and differentiated learning around those needs (using the Instructional Resources guidance provided as part of the MAP system); and then make more regular and consistent use of the Checklist tests that focus narrowly on the particular skills areas identified as needs. The result of these Checklists will allow teachers to group students appropriately and to move them individually on to other areas as they demonstrate mastery of the identified skills areas.
- Implement Accelerated Reader as a supplemental program in Grades 1 and 2 to reinforce reading skills (primarily fluency) and motivation for reading
- With our new library coming on line in September, conduct weekly library visits for all homerooms so that students can explore books of interest and check them out

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Henry Johnson Charter School scholars will demonstrate proficiency in the understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

Background

This year HJCS employed SRA's *Real Math* program as the basis for its math curriculum; the daily math block was ninety minutes long. At both KG and Grade 1, one teacher taught math to two homerooms and served as the ELA support in one of those rooms. In teaching math during the math block, he was supported by the homeroom's ELA teacher and an Educational Assistant. Math assessment was based on *Real Math's* program materials supplemented by teacher-made materials. We also used the Terra Nova exam in the fall and spring to gauge baseline skills and knowledge and then to assess growth over the year. More important for our instructional purposes was the Northwest Evaluation Association's MAP test (Measure of Academic Performance), a dynamic online test that adjusts to the student's ability level and that not only identifies student strengths and needs but also provides instructional resources and Checklist tests that can be used to check on acquisition of particular skills as often as desired. During this year we used the Summary tests in both Reading and Math to gather baseline information in October, to do an interim check in February, and to get a final measure of growth in June. Next year we will make more use of the checklist feature and instructional resources. Professional development related to the *Real Math* program was provided by the publisher prior to the school's opening, as was PD related to NWEA MAP.

Goal 2: 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 mathematics examination.

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State math assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

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 Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State math assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in grade 1-4 will perform at the proficient level on the Terra Nova exam

Method

The Terra Nova exam was administered to all Kindergarten and Grade 1 students in both October 2007 and June 2008. The fall administration was intended to gather baseline data; the spring administration, to assess growth. The results reported below are the spring scores.

Results

**2007-08 Math Performance
On Terra Nova by Grade Level**

Grade (N=34)	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2008							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
1	41.2	14	38.2	13	11.8	4	8.8	3
2								
3								
4								
All	41.2	14	38.2	13	11.8	4	8.8	3

Clearly, 75% of our first graders did not perform at the proficient or above level; instead, only 20.6% did.

Evaluation

Our school began operating in September 2007, so the students reported on above were educated at HJCS for only 9 ½ months prior to taking the exam. The “at the school for at least two years” modifier that applies to the data of other goals is not required here, though it will be interesting to see how this cohort does after two years’ attendance, as will be reported in the Progress Report for 2008-2009. In the meantime, we can present the comparison of scores from the fall 07 administration to the spring 08. That data are charted below.

Grade (N=34)	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Fall to Spring 07-08							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
1 (Fall)	52.9	18	29.4	10	8.8	3	8.8	3
1 (Spring)	41.2	14	38.2	13	11.8	4	8.8	3
Difference	-11.7	-4	+8.8	+3	+3.0	+1	+/-0.0	+/-0

While the 75% proficient and above was not reached, we did succeed in moving 11.7%, or four students, out of the lowest level, which in the fall represented slightly more than one-half of the group and in the spring just a bit over two-fifths of them. In the fall, 28 students scored in Levels 1 and 2, while in the spring 27 of them did. This represents 79.4% scoring at those low levels, compared with 82.3% scoring there in the fall. Though a very modest improvement, it does represent a gain in that one child more scored in the upper two levels: seven, or 20.5% in the spring compared with six, or 17.6% in the fall. Once again—very modest growth, but growth.

Additional Evidence

1) In addition to testing our first graders on the Terra Nova Math exam, we tested Kindergartners as well. Fall percentiles were not available as the norms had not yet been established. By the spring, it was possible to present that information.

Terra Nova ELA Exam								
Grade (N=78)	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 07-08							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
KG (Spring)	29.5	23	32.1	25	26.9	21	11.5	9

Kindergarten students showed a stronger performance than First Graders, with 61.6% falling into Levels 1 and 2, as compared to 79.4% at Grade 1, a difference of close to 20%. It is difficult at this time to ascribe reasons having to do with the HJCS school experience as having any part in creating this discrepancy. Perhaps the larger sample of students—more than twice as many Kindergartners as First Graders—plays a role here. Given the generally quite low performance of our students on the Terra Nova, seeing that 38.4% of Kindergartners scored at the upper levels is a welcome sight, though still clearly far from our target.

2) HJCS also administered the NWEA MAP Summary tests to both Kindergarten and Grade 1, in the fall to gather baseline data and again in June to assess growth. The following provides this data:

NWEA MAP Math				
Grade	Date	Number Tested	Mean Scores	Difference
KG	Oct 07	78	137.2 RIT	
KG	Jun 08	78	153.4 RIT	+16.2 RIT fall to spring
KG MAP norm	Spring		149.5 RIT	+3.9 RIT
1	Oct 07	34	151.1 RIT	
1	Jun 08	34	173 RIT	+21.9 RIT fall to spring
Gr.1 MAP norm	Spring		163.4 RIT	+9.6 RIT

It is interesting to note that in June, the Kindergarten mean RIT was almost the same as the Grade 1 fall RIT (153.4 RIT cf. 151.1 RIT). Note also that the HJCS mean RIT growth in both grades exceeded the MAP norm growth, by 3.9 points at KG and by 9.6 points at Grade 1.

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 Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State math assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

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 Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State math assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Goal 2: Growth Measure

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

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State math assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

On the one measure that was applicable to our KG-1 school in the 2007-2008 school year—the achievement of 75% proficiency on the Terra Nova math exam, we were not successful. Only 20.5% of our First Graders met that goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in grades 1-4 will perform at the proficient level on the Terra Nova math exam.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

We found as the year went on that the math program we had chosen, SRA's *Real Math*, was not after all well suited to our needs or our population. Among its shortcomings—at least for HJCS purposes—was the paucity of exercises and review materials related to the specific skills and understandings being taught at the moment. Additionally, we found the graphic design of the materials that were available to be confusing rather than enlightening to our students. Math teachers came to believe that the time spent on particular topics was not sufficient to allow our students to grasp them, and so an inordinate amount of time had to go into locating or creating supplemental materials to meet the teachers' and students' needs. As a result of this dissatisfaction, we began to research other programs. Fortunately, since pupil editions of math texts are intended to be consumables and we would have to replace them anyway, we will not be wasting our earlier investment by switching to another series. Beginning in September, 2008, we will use

the Scott Foresman-Addison Wesley *Mathematics* program, a scientifically-based program that links with New York State-specific Standards and includes relevant test preparation activities.

Next year we will continue our weekly vertical planning in math to assure curricular balance and to share best practices. And, although a long-term effort that may not yield fruit in this first year of the undertaking, our work on more formal vertical curriculum mapping should tighten and strengthen curriculum across the grades and from grade to grade. We will also reduce the math block from 90 to 60 minutes daily. Compressing this block will lead to a more effective and efficient use of time; we found that the 90-minute block was too long for students' attention span. Unlike ELA, where the variety of topics and activities can easily productively fill a three-to-three-and-a-half hour block, we have come to realize that math's focus on one concept each day with related activities can be better accommodated in the shorter time period. An additional benefit of this plan is that at the KG and 1st grade level, the same person will teach math to the entire grade level, thus supporting consistency and focus.

Other actions that we will undertake that should also strengthen our efforts to target and address student needs are the following:

- Conduct an item analysis of the Terra Nova exam to assure that our curriculum and instruction address the areas students will be tested on
- Extend our use of the diagnostic features of the NWEA MAP assessment: i.e., follow the administration of the Summary test that will be used as a baseline for the year with a careful analysis of the needs the data reveal; then focus planning to include individualized and differentiated learning around those needs (using the Instructional Resources guidance provided as part of the MAP system); and then make more regular and consistent use of the Checklist tests that focus narrowly on the particular skills areas identified as needs. The result of these Checklists will allow teachers to group students appropriately and to move them individually on to other areas as they demonstrate mastery of the identified skills areas.
- Implement Accelerated Math for Grades 1 and 2. This will be a resource for teachers in that the AM program will provide exercises and activities for the needs areas that MAP identifies for reinforcement

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Henry Johnson Charter School scholars will demonstrate proficiency in the understanding and application of scientific principles.

Background

HJCS uses the FOSS (Full Option Science System) program developed by Delta Education. This is a hands-on, experiential program that is, in the publisher's words, "dedicated to the proposition that elementary students learn science best by doing science. Teachers and students do science together when they open the FOSS kits, engaging in enduring experiences that lead to deeper understanding of the natural world." This curriculum is mapped to the K-8 New York Science Framework and is delivered in kits that focus on the study of science topics representing the physical, earth, and biological sciences. The content for each topic is sequenced across several units. At the Kindergarten level, our kits for the year were "Animals Two by Two" and "Wood and Paper." At Grade 1, the kits were "Air and Weather" and "Balance and Motion." A third kit, "Insects," is also available for Grade 1, though we did not use it this year. We will do so next year.

The science curriculum is taught by the ELA teacher in each homeroom, with the equivalent of one class per week at KG* and two per week at Grade 1. Science assessment is done through the FOSS materials. Staff received PD on the program from the developer's trainer prior to the beginning of the year.

*Instead of teaching one science class per week and one social studies class, for the sake of continuity Kindergarten teachers sometimes preferred to teach two science classes one week (and no social studies) and two social studies classes the next (and no science).

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State science assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

Although we did not administer a State science assessment, our First Graders did take the Terra Nova Science exam in both the fall and spring. Because there were no norms for the fall administration, our data cannot show growth, but it can show how the students did in the spring:

Terra Nova Science Exam								
Grade (N=34)	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 07-08							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
1 (Spring)	32.4	11	29.4	10	11.8	4	26.5	9

Once again, more than half of our students (61.8%) scored in the lower two levels, but fully a quarter of them scored at the top level! In fact, the students have made a significantly better showing on science than on either ELA (82.3% in Level 1 & 2) or math (79.4% in those levels), and, as will be seen later, on social studies (73.5%). Perhaps the hands-on nature of the FOSS program has motivated students and focused their efforts. Also, at this primary Kindergarten and First Grade level, weak skills in reading and math do not necessarily mean low performance in science, as prowess in reading and math is not as central to achievement in the scientific areas the students are learning about as they of course are in those foundational disciplines.

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 Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State science assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Summary

NA

Action Plan

NA

SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 4: Social Studies

Henry Johnson Charter School scholars will demonstrate proficiency in the understanding and application of principles related to social studies.

Background

HJCS uses the *Social Studies Alive!* program developed by Teachers' Curriculum Institute, a curriculum founded on the philosophy that all children can learn and put into practice through dynamic lesson design that puts children into the role of active learner. Lessons and activities are based on three well-established theories: multiple intelligences, cooperative interaction, and spiral curriculum. The content is standards-based and integrates hands-on active learning. It is taught by the ELA teacher in each homeroom, with the equivalent of one lesson per week in Kindergarten* and two lessons per week in Grade 1. The Kindergarten theme is "Me and My World," and the Grade 1 theme is "My School and Family." Assessment is done through materials included with the program; professional development was provided to staff by the publisher's trainer before the opening of school.

*Instead of teaching one science class per week and one social studies class, for the sake of continuity Kindergarten teachers sometimes preferred to teach two science classes one week (and no social studies) and two social studies classes the next (and no science).

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State social studies assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

Although we did not administer a State social studies assessment, our First Graders did take the Terra Nova Social Studies exam in both the fall and spring. Because there were no norms for the fall administration, our data cannot show growth, but it can show how the students did in the spring:

Terra Nova Social Studies Exam								
Grade (N=34)	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 07-08							
	Level One		Level Two		Level Three		Level Four	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
1 (Spring)	35.3	12	38.2	13	11.8	4	14.7	5

Once again, more than half of our students (73.5%) scored in the lower two levels. Nonetheless, the students again made a better showing on social studies than on either ELA (82.3% in Level 1 &2) or math (79.4% in those levels). The *Social Studies Alive!* program, like the FOSS science program, is highly experiential, but social studies requires language arts skills, and we are probably seeing our students' weaknesses in reading reflected in these low social studies scores as much as any lack of understanding of the principles of social studies.

Goal 4: Comparative Measure

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

Method Please note: Since our school was a K-1 school in 2007-2008, we did not administer the State social studies assessment.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA

Summary

NA

Action Plan

NA

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 Because our school opened in September 2007 as a K-1 school, this goal is not applicable to us this year.

Results

NA

Evaluation

NA

Additional Evidence

NA