

**HENRY JOHNSON  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2009-10**

**ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 3, 2010

By Lillian Turner, Principal

30 Watervliet Avenue, Albany, NY 12206

[lturner@henryjohnsoncs.org](mailto:lturner@henryjohnsoncs.org)

Ph: 518-432-4300 Fax: 518-432-4311

Lillian Turner, Principal, prepared this 2009-10 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Michelle Cleary	Chairperson
Debra Dickerson	Vice Chairperson (resigned April, 2010_
Alea DePauw	Secretary
Peter Murphy	Treasurer
Claire Hazzard	Trustee
Brennan Keating	Trustee
J. Christopher Callaghan	Trustee

## INTRODUCTION

Henry Johnson Charter School opened in September, 2007, as a Kindergarten-Grade 4 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 as the foundation for academic achievement and personal success. 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 letter 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 the basis 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 one hour of math daily. Science, social studies, art, music, physical education, computer, and library round out the program, supplemented with Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math. 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. Grade 2 and subsequent grades are staffed by one certified teacher and an Educational Assistant. There are at least two adults in every classroom all day, every day. Additionally, a Special Education Coordinator/Teacher, a Special Education teacher, an AIS Reading Teacher/Literacy Coach, an AIS Math Teacher/Math Coach, and a School Counselor provide special services to our students. 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 (193+ 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. Two of our oft-quoted proverbs—“Good choices, good consequences; poor choices, poor consequences” and “If you can’t make a mistake, you can’t make anything”—summarize these complementary goals. 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, North Colonie, Schenectady, Menands, and Troy as well as Melrose and Watervliet. 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, in three sections of Kindergarten and Grade 1 and two of Grade 2; in 2009-2010, three sections of Kindergarten, Grade 1 and 2, and two sections of Grade 3; and in 2010-2011, we will have three sections in Grades K-3 and two in Grade 4.

### School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2007-08	78	35												113
2008-09	75	78	51											204
2009-10	67	74	75	51										267

## 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 employs the Macmillan/McGraw-Hill *Treasures* program as the basis for its ELA curriculum. This is supplemented by the strong literature basis of our Proactivity character education program, which is taught during daily 20-30-minute lessons. The ELA block over all lasts for three hours and includes Wall Card recitals, the Proactivity lesson, and handwriting as well as reading and writing. In grades 1 through 3, there is an additional 30-minute block dedicated to writing daily. In homeroom groups, students also memorize and recite to the school at least two Proactivity-themed poems or songs 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. Additionally, Accelerated Reader is used successfully in Grades 1 through 3 to develop motivation for and fluency in reading. A daily, sequential phonemic awareness recitation/drill occurs in all homerooms, and lessons focusing on comprehension and fluency designed by Urban Education Exchange are used to supplement our work with *Treasures*. Finally, third graders read *A Midsummer Night's Dream* in the *Shakespeare for Kids* series, performed this version of the play for Grades 1 and 2, and then attended a New York City Ballet production of the play at Saratoga Performing Arts Center in July, 2010.

In each KG and Grade 1 homeroom, one teacher has the responsibility for ELA planning and delivery of instruction; she is supported by a second teacher and an Educational Assistant, both of whom support the lead teacher and head up centers and reading groups during ELA time. At Grades 2 and 3, the lead teacher teaches all subjects, backed up by an Educational Assistant who supports all instruction throughout the day. A new AIS Reading Teacher works with struggling students in individual and small groups. Teachers meet in grade-level planning groups for one hour every Friday, and they have all been involved in developing ELA curriculum maps using the Rubicon-Atlas online mapping software. They also attended a two-day training session on using Urban Education Exchange (UEE) materials. In addition, curriculum projects focused on Writer's Workshop and Writing Portfolio were introduced and implemented during the 2009-2010 school year. Many teachers also attended off-site professional development workshops on ELA topics.

We used the Terra Nova exams in the fall and spring (actually, in October and June for Grades 1 through 3 and in January and June for KG); this allowed us 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 and adaptive 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 assess acquisition of particular skills as often as desired. During this year, for Grade 1, 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. A Scantron testing program providing similar instructional resources, Performance Series, was used in Grades 2 and 3 for the same purpose and on the same schedule. For KG, we administered Terra Nova in January and then did the final test in June. Other assessments used in 2009-2010 included Renaissance Learning's STAR Reading, which offered a quick way to check on growth and adjust reading levels and Lexiles (Grades 1-3) and, in Kindergarten, the STAR Early Literacy test. We gave the NYS ELA Test to our Third Graders for the first time this year.

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

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English Language Arts assessment to students in grade 3 in April 2010. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>1</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	51				51
4					
All	51				51

**Results**

Whether the group is the total number of students enrolled in Grade 3 or the Two-Year Cohort, 73% achieved the 650 scaled score required in the goal. This is very close to the 75% goal and suggests that our program is moving students along in a way conducive to soon achieving that additional 2%.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students	73%	51
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	73%	40

<sup>1</sup> 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.

4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		
All	All Students	73%	51
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	73%	40

### Evaluation

This goal was almost met, our students' achievement falling short by only 2%. The variety of program enhancements introduced this year—more frequent benchmark testing, a more careful analysis of student needs, implementation of the UEE curriculum, daily phonemic awareness drills, writer's workshop, and a more sustained, intentional support system through our AIS teachers—prepared students well for the ELA test. We will use the diagnostic evidence from the test results to determine the areas of need as we shape program adjustments for 2010-2011.

### Additional Evidence

Since 2009-2010 is the first year in which our students took the NYS tests, we have no data to compare over time.

### English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3							73%	51
4								
5								
All							73%	51

### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

### Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state's learning standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year's English language arts AMO, which for 2009-10 is 155.<sup>2</sup> The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at

<sup>2</sup> With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

**Results**

According to the calculations below, the PI value for Henry Johnson Charter School students is 133.

**Calculation of 2009-10 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)**

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3	14%	39%	35%	12%	51

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 39\% + 35\% + 12\% = 86\% \\
 & & + 35\% + 12\% = 47\% \\
 \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{133}
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

This performance measure has not been met, as 133 is 22 points less than the goal of 155.

**Additional Evidence**

Since this is the first year our students have taken the NYS ELA test, we have no results from previous years with which to compare their achievement of 133.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07							122	
2007-08							133	
2008-09							144	
2009-10	3	51	14%	39%	35%	12%	133	155

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

**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**

The aggregate charter school performance compared to the district performance in the one grade tested:

**2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	50%	40	46%	595
4				
5				
All	<b>50%</b>	40	<b>46%</b>	595

**Evaluation**

The aggregate performance of Henry Johnson Charter School students in at least their 2<sup>nd</sup> year exceeded that of the Albany City School District by 4%.

**Additional Evidence**

Again, because this is our first year taking the NYS ELA test, we have no past years with which to compare the 2009-2010 performance.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3							50%	46%
4								
5								
All							50%	46%

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school’s actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2009-10 analysis is not yet available, and since we have no 2008-09 results, there is no data to include in this section.

**Results**

NA, given discussion above.

**2009-10 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						
4						
5						
All						

<b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b>

**Evaluation**

NA

**Additional Evidence**

NA

**English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07						
2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						

**Goal 1: Growth Measure**

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

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

**Results**

Once again, we have no data from previous years.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4					YES/NO
5					YES/NO
6					YES/NO
7					YES/NO
8					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

**Additional Evidence**

NA

**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			

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

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

**Method**

The Terra Nova exam was administered to all Kindergarten through Grade 3 students: KG students took the test in January 2010 and June 2010, and Grades 1 – 3 students took it in October 2009 and June 2010. The earlier administration was intended to gather baseline data; the spring administration, to assess growth. The results reported below are the spring scores.

**Results**

**2009-2010 English Language Arts Performance  
On Terra Nova by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2010							
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
K N=67	13%	9	36%	24	24%	16	27%	18
1 N=74	20%	15	29%	21	27%	20	24%	18
2 N=75	16%	12	35%	26	27%	20	22%	17
3 N=49	27%	13	37%	18	20%	10	16%	8

Clearly, none of our grades achieved 75% at the proficient level (Levels 3 & 4) on the Terra Nova test; instead, 51% of both KG and Grade 1 reached that level, 49% of Grade 2 did, and 36% of Grade 3 did.

**Evaluation**

It is disappointing that none of the grades achieved the goal score, but we can take heart in that scores for the same cohorts of students did improve from the 2008-2009 administration of the Terra Nova.

**2008-2009 and 2009-2010 English Language Arts Performance  
On Terra Nova by Grades 1-3 Cohort Groups**

	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2009 and 2010							
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
Gr K Spring 2009 N=69	30%	21	28%	19	22%	15	22%	14
Gr 1 Spring 2010 N=74	20%	15	29%	21	27%	20	24%	18

	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2009 and 2010							
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
Gr 1 Spring 2009 N=73	33%	24	23%	17	23%	17	21%	15
Gr 2 Spring 2010 N=75	16%	12	35%	26	27%	20	22%	17
Gr 2 Spring 2009 N=49	45%	22	35%	17	6%	3	14%	7
Gr 3 Spring 2010 N=49	27%	13	37%	18	20%	10	16%	8

In each case, the percentage of students achieving at the proficient level has increased in the spring-to-spring comparison of test scores. For our current first graders, those scoring in proficient moved from 44% in 2009 to 51% in 2010. Current second graders went from 44% in 2009 to 49% in 2010. This year’s third graders made the most gains, from 20% proficient in 2009 to 36% proficient this past spring. Though modest, the pattern of declining numbers in the below-proficiency range and increasing numbers in the above-proficiency range is headed in the right direction.

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

Of the four measures that are applicable to HJCS this year, the school clearly achieved one—that our students surpassed the performance of students in the Albany District Schools on the Grade 3 ELA test. We also came very close—though not close enough—in achieving 73%, though not 75%, scoring at or above the Scale Score of 650 on that test. We are 22 points short of attaining the 155 PI needed to meet the AMO, and the modest gains made on the Terra Nova tests fell considerably short of the 75% scoring in the Third and Fourth Quartile.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State examination.	Did Not Achieve
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.	Did Not Achieve
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	Achieved/

	State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, 75% of students in grades 1-4 will perform at the proficient level on the Terra Nova ELA exam.	Did Not Achieve

### Action Plan

- A major part of our plan for the coming year is to increase staffing to provide support services to those in need. In addition to our current AIS Reading Teacher/Literacy Coach (and AIS Math Teacher/Math Coach), we are adding another teacher to provide AIS services for both reading and math. She will be assigned to students depending on the numbers in each area. Her job will be to work daily with our struggling readers and math students in all grades. We are also increasing our Special Education staff through the addition of a Special Ed teacher who will be able to work with new students who bring IEPs with them as well as provide further services to those children already receiving this support. Finally, we have added a Director of Curriculum and Instruction staff position; this should greatly expand opportunities for teacher supervision, observation, professional development, and program oversight. The benefits of our adding this role will be manifest in all subject areas.
- Having just completed our third year of using *Treasures* as the basis of our ELA curriculum, teachers' familiarity with the program and its various materials and resources is paying off in KG through Grade 2. Since this was the first year of teaching Grade 3, we again had the situation of teachers using a program for the first time, and that may have limited the gains students made at that grade level. Next year, the third-grade program will be in its second year; teachers' familiarity with the texts and materials should help. However, Grade 4 will be in its first year, populated by the very students whose gains have been slow in coming. Adequate time for exploring the materials and planning in a way that aligns with ELA standards will need to be allocated to the new teachers who will use the new *Treasures* Grade 4 program for the first time. The school will provide professional development on curriculum mapping to these teachers as well as the opportunity to get a solid start on that during our orientation period prior to welcoming students back in September. A further enhancement to our reading and literature program is the Urban Education Exchange curriculum that we are using to supplement and strengthen comprehension and fluency. Teachers were provided with professional development on this program in late winter.
- We will extend our new Writing Portfolio element and our Writer's Workshop from Grades K-3 into Grade 4. We will continue to use the SRA Early Reader tutoring program in the lower grades and continue our daily, sequential phonemic awareness drills in all grades and homerooms. The Accelerated Reader program has become a more organized, coherent, and meaningful program supplement and will continue to be used weekly in Grades 1-4. Related to AR is the STAR Reading testing program provided by the same company (Renaissance Learning); the STAR Early Literacy testing program is used at KG to provide excellent diagnostics regarding performance levels and instructional needs. We will be adding DRA and Dibels resting to all grade levels this fall, allowing our reading department to identify students in need of support early on.
- We will continue the use of online resources to help in our assessment and diagnostic efforts.

Among these, we will employ tests formatted like SED ELA tests but assessing actual content taught in grades 3 and 4. This feature will be expanded to include the resources of the Scantron online Performance Series program that will link student performance with additional practices and resources focused on their needs areas through Nettekter. Our grade 3 and 4 teachers along with the literacy and math coaches and Director of Curriculum and Instruction will attend an on-site training on the use of the Scantron resource this summer. We will continue to use the NWEA MAP assessments as well three times a year to chart growth and pinpoint individual and class needs for grades 1 and 2.

- The Uncommon Schools Teaching Taxonomy provides a framework for professional development over all, with some of it focused on teaching reading (vocabulary, comprehension, fluency) across the school day. Staff who have been trained by Uncommon Schools will continue to provide staff development on new strategies during our orientation in August and round out the training on the other techniques over the course of the 2010-2011 year. (They will also bring new teachers and Educational Assistants up to date on techniques presented and practiced during the 2009-2010 school year.) All teaching staff will receive a copy of Doug Lemov's new book *Teach Like a Champion*, which will form the basis of the continuing PD on the teaching taxonomy.
- During the past three years, teachers have met weekly with the principal for a full teaching staff meeting and weekly in grade-level groups for co-planning. Beginning last year, the principal also met weekly with grade-level groups for data discussions following the administration of our external tests (following MAP and Terra Nova in the fall, MAP in January, and MAP and Terra Nova in the spring) and other grade-specific topics. In the upcoming year, these meetings will continue and will be supplemented by an additional 90-minute planning time for teachers at the grade level.
- Given the urgent needs of our rising fourth graders, clearly we need to dedicate major attention and energy to them, and we will employ all of the foregoing resources, program enhancements, and staff development to meet this need. At the same time, we want to keep our rising first through third graders on the positive upward trend that made a good start this year.

## MATHEMATICS

### **Goal 2: Mathematics**

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

### **Background**

For the second year HJCS employed Scott Foresman/Addison Wesley's *Mathematics* program as the basis for its math curriculum. We switched from this program after having used SRA's *Real Math* during our first year in 2007-2008. Our daily math block is one hour long. At both KG and Grade 1, one teacher teaches math to three homerooms (one teacher teaching all the KG homerooms and the other teaching all the Grade 1 homerooms) and serve as ELA support in the morning in one of those rooms. In teaching math during the math block, he/she is supported by the homeroom's ELA teacher and the Educational Assistant. In Grade 2, which are self-contained classrooms, teachers leveled the students so that one teacher taught all those approaching level, another those who were on level, and another those who are beyond level. In actuality, many of our students are needy in math and so these distinctions were not precisely observed but instead were approximated. In Grade 3, also self-contained classrooms, the homeroom teacher taught math to her students. A new AIS Math Teacher worked with struggling students in individual and small groups. Teachers meet in grade-level planning groups for one hour every Friday, and they have all been involved in developing math curriculum maps using the Rubicon-Atlas online mapping software.

Math assessment was based on *Mathematics*'s program materials supplemented by teacher-made materials. We also used the Terra Nova exam in the fall and spring for Grades 1 through 3 and in January and June for KG 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 and adaptive 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 assess acquisition of particular skills as often as desired. During this year, for Grades 1, we used the Summary tests in both Reading and Math to gather baseline information in October, to do an interim check in January, and to get a final measure of growth in June. A Scantron testing program providing similar instructional resources, Performance Series, was used in Grades 2 and 3 for the same purpose and on the same schedule. We also used Accelerated Math in grades 1 through 3 for additional practice in needs areas as well as for enrichment and made regular use of STAR Math in Grades 1-3. We gave the Grade 3 NYS Math test to our students for the first time this spring.

### **Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

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

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

## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in grade 3 in May 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. Through 2008-09 the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>3</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	50				50
4					
5					
All	50				50

## Results

All grade 3 students at HJCS, those with us for two years as well as those who joined more recently, achieved a Scale Score of 650 on the NYS Math test.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students	100%	50
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>100%</b>	39
4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		
5	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		
All	All Students	100%	50
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>100%</b>	39

<sup>3</sup> 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

Our students far exceeded the goal of 75% achieving a Scale Score of 650; that 100% did so is reason for celebration. This excellent performance can be attributed to careful oversight and professional development supplied by our new Math Coach as well as the enthusiasm of two new teachers who worked hard to prepare their students for the challenges of the test. Frequent reviews of the curriculum, the standards, and the benchmarks kept the curriculum and instruction on track for student success on the test.

## Additional Evidence

Because this is our first year taking the NYS Math test, we have no past years with which to compare the 2009-2010 performance.

### Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3							100%	50
4								
5								
All								

### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

## Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state's learning standards in Mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year's Mathematics AMO, which for 2009-10 is 135<sup>4</sup>. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

<sup>4</sup> With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

**Results**

HJCS scholars exceeded the PI goal of 135 by earning 17 points higher—152.

**Calculation of 2009-10 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)**

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3	0%	48%	36%	16%	50

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 48\% & + & 36\% & + & 16\% & = & 100\% \\
 & & & + & 36\% & + & 16\% & = & 52\% \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{152}
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

This measure was met since the PI of 152 was more than equal to the AMO of 135.

**Additional Evidence**

Since this is our first year of giving the State math test, we have no previous record to compare to.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07							86	
2007-08							102	
2008-09							119	
2009-10	3	50	0%	48%	36%	16%	152	135

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

As seen below, the aggregate charter school performance exceeds the Albany City School District’s performance by 11%.

**2009-10 State Mathematics Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	59%	39	48%	605
4				
5				
All	<u>59%</u>	39	<u>48%</u>	605

**Evaluation**

HJCS students met the measure, in that 59% of students at the school for two years or more scored in Levels 3 and 4 as compared to the ASCD achievement of 48%.

**Additional Evidence**

Once again, we have no earlier experience with the NYS tests, and so have no basis for comparison over 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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3							59%	48%
4								
5								
All							59%	48%

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school’s actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, and since we have no 2008-09 results, there is no data to include in this section.

**Results**

NA, given the discussion above.

**2008-2009 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						
4						
5						
All						

<b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b>

**Evaluation**

NA

**Additional Evidence**

NA

**Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06						
2006-07						
2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						

**Goal 2: Growth Measure**

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

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

**Results**

NA

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4					YES/NO
5					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

**Evaluation**

NA

**Additional Evidence**

NA

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2006-07			
2007-08			
2008-09			
2009-10			

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

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

**Method**

The Math Terra Nova exam was administered to all Kindergarten through Grade 3 students: KG students took the test in January 2010 and June 2010, and Grades 1 – 3 students took it in October 2009 and June 2010. The earlier administration was intended to gather baseline data; the spring administration, to assess growth. The results reported below are the spring scores.

**Results**

**2009-2010 Math Performance  
On Terra Nova by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2010							
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
K N=67	16%	11	29%	19	40%	27	15%	10
1 N=74	8%	6	33%	24	28%	21	31%	23
2 N=75	16%	12	27%	20	29%	22	28%	21
3 N=49	12%	6	49%	24	23%	11	16%	8

Clearly, none of our grades achieved 75% at the proficient level (Levels 3 & 4) on the Terra Nova test; instead, 55% of KG, 59% of Grade 1, 57% of Grade 2, and 39% of Grade 3 did.

**Evaluation**

It is disappointing that none of the grades achieved the goal score, but we can take heart in that scores for the same cohorts of students did improve from the 2008-2009 administration of the Terra Nova.

**2008-2009 and 2009-2010 English Language Arts Performance  
On Terra Nova by Grades 1-3 Cohort Groups**

	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2009 and 2010							
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
Gr K Spring 2009 N=69	15%	10	38%	26	25%	17	23%	16
Gr 1 Spring 2010 N=74	8%	6	33%	24	28%	21	31%	23

	Percent of Students at Levels 3 (Proficient) and 4—Spring 2009 and 2010							
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
Gr 1 Spring 2009 N=73	44%	32	27%	20	18%	13	11%	8
Gr 2 Spring 2010 N=75	16%	12	27%	20	29%	22	28%	21
Gr 2 Spring 2009 N=49	47%	23	27%	13	12%	6	14%	7
Gr 3 Spring 2010 N=49	12%	6	49%	24	23%	11	16%	8

In each case, the percentage of students achieving at the proficient level has increased in the spring-to-spring comparison of test scores. For our current first graders, those scoring in proficient moved from 48% in 2009 to 59% in 2010. This year's third graders went from 26% proficient in 2009 to 39% proficient this past spring. Current second graders made the most gain, moving from 29% in 2009 to 57% in 2010. Though modest, the pattern of declining numbers in the below-proficiency range and increasing numbers in the above-proficiency range is headed in the right direction.

### **Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

Of the four measures that are applicable to HJCS this year, the school achieved three—two absolute measures: That 75 percent of all tested achieved a Scale Score of 650 (actually, 100% did), and that our students surpassed the performance of students in the Albany District Schools on the Grade 3 ELA test. We also attained the 135 PI needed to meet the AMO, actually scoring 152. The modest gains made on the Terra Nova tests fell considerably short of the 75% scoring in the Third and Fourth Quartile.

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent	Achieved/

	at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	Did Not Achieve
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

- A major enhancement for our math program this year has been the hiring of a Math Coach/Math AIS teacher. His experience has allowed him to provide the support and guidance teachers need to do their strongest work as well as the interventions needed for identified students. The Math Coach's job is two-fold: 1) working daily with our struggling math students in all grades, but focusing primarily on grades 2 and 3, and 2) overseeing the math program, including coaching teachers in best practices, providing staff development, coordinating the in-class tutoring that is provided by the HR teaching team, and taking the lead in math vertical alignment. Continuing to map the math curriculum using Rubicon-Atlas software, including vertical mapping, and curriculum projects completed last summer tightened up and aligned our math curriculum with State Standards. Further work on mapping math curriculum is going on this summer. For the 2010-2011 year we are adding a third teacher to the AIS Department, joining the current AIS Math and AIS reading teachers. The new teacher will pick up struggling students in math and reading to assure that all who need the attention will get it. A second Special Education teacher, also newly added, will offer more help to students with IEPs. Finally, we have added a Director of Curriculum and Instruction staff position; this should greatly expand opportunities for teacher supervision, observation, professional development, and program oversight. The benefits of our adding this role will be manifest in all subject areas.
- Strong and steady math instruction across the grades is resulting in the clear progress of our students towards meeting their achievement goals. A practice instituted mid-year—the leveling of Grade 2 students and teaching to those basically homogeneous groups resulted in significant growth for the grade level (from 29% passing in spring 2009 to 57% passing in 2010). Teachers and the math coach, however, were ultimately unhappy with the way this practice played out, and so they will return to taking responsibility for the math instruction of their own HR students.
- We have just completed our second year of using *Mathematics* as the basis of our math curriculum; thus teachers' familiarity with the program and its various materials and resources has been growing. Next year, Grade 4 will be in its first year, populated by students whose gains have been slow in coming. Adequate time for exploring the materials and planning in a way that aligns with math standards will need to be allocated to the new teachers who will use the *Mathematics* Grade 4 program for the first time. The school will provide professional development on curriculum mapping to these teachers as well as the opportunity to get a solid start on that during our orientation period prior to welcoming students back in September. In addition, more math resources and manipulatives will be available for use at all grades, and continuing opportunities for PD in math will be provided. For example, this summer the publisher's rep for our core program will work with all grade-level teachers.
- We will broaden and continue the use of online resources to help in our assessment,

diagnostic, and intervention efforts. We will continue to use the NWEA MAP assessments three times a year to chart growth and pinpoint individual and class needs for Grades 1 and 2, and we will use the Scantron Performance series for the same purposes at Grades 3 and 4. We successfully used Accelerated Math this year to provide additional practice for needs areas as well as to offer enrichment activities for students who are ready for that, and we will continue to do so. We will also use STAR Math testing for more regular and frequent assessment of students to chart their progress in achieving concepts and skills.

- We continue to build our library collection of math-related books. Teachers use them in the classroom to supplement instruction and encourage students to enjoy them on their own. This exploration of math-related reading deepens understandings and increases motivation for getting happily involved with math.
- During the past three years, teachers have met weekly with the principal for a full teaching staff meeting and weekly in grade-level groups for co-planning. Beginning last year, the principal also met weekly with grade-level groups for data discussions following the administration of our external tests (following MAP and Terra Nova in the fall, MAP in January, and MAP and Terra Nova in the spring) and other grade-specific topics. In the upcoming year, these meetings will continue and will be supplemented by an additional 90-minute planning time for teachers at the grade level.
- Given the needs of our rising third and fourth graders, clearly a major focus of our attention and energy needs to be dedicated to them, and we will employ all of the foregoing resources, program enhancements, and staff development to meet this need. At the same time, we want to keep our rising first graders and second graders on the positive upward trend that we have witnessed.

## 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," "Balance and Motion," and "Insects." The second grade kits were "New Plants," "Pebbles, Sand, and Silt," and "Solids and Liquids." Finally, the Grade 3 kits are "Structures of Life," "Earth materials," and "Measurement."

At grades K-2, 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 Grades 1 through 3. At Grade 3, one of the two third grade teachers teaches science to both sections while the other teacher teaches social studies. Science assessment is done through the FOSS materials.

\*Instead of teaching one science class per week and one social studies class, for the sake of continuity KG teachers sometimes prefer to teach two science classes one week (and no social studies) and two social studies the next week (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-3 school in 2009-2010, we did not administer the State science assessment.

#### **Results**

NA

#### **Evaluation**

NA

#### **Additional Evidence**

NA

### **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-3 school in 2009-2010, we did not administer the State science assessment.

**Results**

NA

**Evaluation**

NA

**Additional Evidence**

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**

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**

Henry Johnson Charter School is In Good Standing for the 2009-2010 year.

**Evaluation**

The NCLB measure was met.

**Additional Evidence**

During this first year of accountability status applying to HJCS, we are in good standing.

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2007-08	NA
2008-09	Good Standing
2009-10	Good Standing