



**ICAHN  
CHARTER SCHOOL 2**

**2013-14 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2014

By Brenda Carrasquilo-Silen

[bcarrasquillo@CCICS.ORG](mailto:bcarrasquillo@CCICS.ORG)

1640 Bronxdale Avenue  
Bronx, NY 10462

718-716-8105

718-828-7308

Brenda Carrasquilo-Silen and Dr. Arthur H. Pritchard prepared the 2013-14 Accountability Plan Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees.

Trustee's Name	Voting Board Position
Gail Golden	President
Julie Goodyear	Secretary
Seymour Fliegel	Member
Robert Sancho	Member
Edward J. Shanahan	Member
Karen Mandelbaum	Member
Tamara Delgado De-Jesus	Parent Representative

Brenda Carrasquilo-Silen has served as the Principal since 2007.

## INTRODUCTION

The mission of Icahn Charter School 2 is to use the Core Knowledge curriculum developed by E.D. Hirsch, to provide students with a rigorous academic program offered in an extended day/year setting. Students will graduate armed with the skills and knowledge to participate successfully in the most rigorous academic environments, and will have a sense of personal and community responsibility. Our instructional program is data driven and combines Core Knowledge with ongoing assessments. Children, who have demonstrated a deficiency in ELA or Mathematics, as evidenced by the results of an assessment test, are placed in our Targeted Assistance Program. We have an extended school day of 7.5 hours and an extended school year ranging from 188 to 192 days of instruction.

Icahn Charter School 2 opened in September 2007 and initially serviced K through Grade 2. A grade has been added each year and this September, 2013 we will be opening as a grade K-8 school.

For academic year 2009-2010 we were housed in School District 8. In September 2010, Icahn Charter School 2 moved to School District 11.

### **Student Population:**

The school is composed of 35.23 percent African American, 58.41 percent Hispanic, 3.17 percent Asian or .95 percent Native American/Alaskan ,3.17 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, and 1.26 percent White children. We have a free and reduced lunch rate of 78.7 percent. Our instructional program is data driven and combines Core Knowledge with ongoing assessments.

### **School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year**

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2010-11	40	39	37	30	34	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	215
2011-12	37	43	37	34	30	35	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	248
2012-13	42	39	40	32	35	34	32	29	-	-	-	-	-	283
2013-14	36	39	41	40	28	35	35	32	29	-	-	-	-	315

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will become proficient readers of the English language.

#### Background

Our ELA curriculum follows the Core Knowledge sequence and is comprised of McGraw-Hill readers, workbooks, a strong emphasis on writing, extensive classroom libraries and by-monthly assessments. Our ELA specialist provides small group instruction (Targeted Assistance/TA) for 45 minutes a day 5 days a week to those children who have demonstrated a deficiency in any area of reading. The results of all practice tests go through an intensive error analysis by the Director of Assessment and are discussed in great detail with the Staff Developer. The Staff Developer meets with the teacher and ELA specialist to provide remediation lessons for the targeted children. Our process of ongoing assessments ensures that the program will closely monitor the child's progress and promote the child out of TA where appropriate, as well as accept new students as required by their practice test results. The ELA program is personally supervised by the Principal and Staff Developer. We are consistently monitoring the alignment of the ELA materials with the NYS ELA Curriculum as well as Core Knowledge. There were no important changes to the English language arts program or staff prior to or during the 2013-14 school year.

#### Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

#### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades in April 2014. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

**2013-14 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	40	0	0	0	40
4	28	0	0	0	28
5	35	0	0	0	35

<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.

6	35	0	0	0	35
7	32	0	0	0	32
8	29	0	0	0	29
All	199	0	0	0	199

## Results

2013-14 is the second year NYS testing has been based on the core curriculum standards.

Students completing the NYS 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA assessments had either been enrolled at the school for at least two years, or were newer to the school. The table below illustrates the difference between those who have been enrolled for at least two years, and others as follows: Grade 3 = 40-40 (same); Grade 4 – 28-27(one less); Grade 5 = 35-35 (same); Grades 6 and 7 = 35-33 and 32-30 (two less in each grade); Grade 8 =29-29 (same).

### Performance on 2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	48	40	48	40
4	61	28	63	27
5	57	35	55	35
6	60	35	64	33
7	50	32	49	30
8	59	29	59	29
All	55.8	199	56.33	194

## Evaluation

The measure was not met.

## Additional Evidence

Comparison of 2011-12 scores shows students in each of four Cohorts demonstrating or continuing to demonstrate high performance ranging from 97% to 100%. As the result of the impact of the NYSED testing system, based on the common core learning standards, the five 2012-13 cohorts (grades 3 through 7) dropped to below the 75% target to 57.2% with a range of 39.2% (grade 6) to 71.4% (grade 7). The school average remained essentially the same at 57.33% in 2013-14, though there are now six cohorts with percentages ranging from 48% (grade3) to 64% (grade 6).

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency
-------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	97	34	43.3	30	48	40
4	100	28	64.5	31	63	27
5	100	33	67.7	31	57	35
6	97	30	39.2	28	64	33
7	-	-	71.4	28	49	29
8	-	-	-	-	59	29
All	98.4	125	57.2	148	56.33	194

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 English language arts AMO of 89. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>2</sup>

**Results**

ICAHN 2 students in grades 3 through 8 achieved an English Language Arts Performance Index value of 149, which was 60 points above the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 89.

**English Language Arts 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
199	6	39	42	13

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 39 & + & 42 & + & 13 & = & 94 \\
 & & & & 42 & + & 13 & = & 55 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 149
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

<sup>2</sup> In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

### Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

### Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>3</sup>

### Results

ICAHN 2's 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade students in at least their second year at the school out scored their CSD 11 peers by an average 35.73%. 3<sup>rd</sup> graders out scored their CSD 11 peers by 25%, and 4<sup>th</sup> graders, outscored their CSD 11 peers by 40%. 5<sup>th</sup> graders outscored their District 11 peers by 36%, 6<sup>th</sup> graders outscored their District 11 peers by 46%, 7<sup>th</sup> graders outscored their District 11 peers by 37%, and 8<sup>th</sup> graders outscored their District 11 peers by 40%.

**2013-14 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District 11 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	48	40	23	3240
4	63	27	23	3137
5	55	35	19	3089
6	64	33	18	2968
7	49	31	16	3173
8	59	29	19	3130
All	<b>56.33</b>	199	<b>19.6</b>	18737

### Evaluation

The measure was met.

### Additional Evidence

While ICAHN 2's grade 3 through 8 students did not achieve the target proficiency measure, given the impact of testing based on the common core learning standards, they did maintain a significant difference in their performance as compared with their District 11 peers.

<sup>3</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

In 2011-12 the difference when comparing 3<sup>rd</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grade students was 77.9%, in 2012-13 with the Common Core Learning Standards, the difference when comparing 3<sup>rd</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup> grade students was lower at 36.75% and in 2013-14 the difference when comparing 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> was slightly higher than the previous year at 36.73%.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	District 11
3	97	21.0	43.3	21.0	48	23
4	100	20.0	64.5	20.0	63	23
5	100	20.6	67.7	20.6	55	19
6	97	20.2	39.2	20.2	64	18
7	-	-	71.4	16.3	49	16
8	-	-	-	-	59	19
All	98.4	20.45	57.2	20.45	<b>56.33</b>	<b>19.6</b>

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>4</sup>

**Method**

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

<sup>4</sup> The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics.

## Results

In 2012-13, ICAHN 2's 3<sup>rd</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup> grade students achieved an Effect Size of 2.68, which led to the Overall Comparative Performance rated at "Higher than expected to a large degree."

### **2012-13 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	81.3	32	43.8	21.3	22.5	1.67
4	75.0	35	68.5	22.5	46.0	3.56
5	80.0	35	71.4	21.0	50.4	3.75
6	71.0	32	40.7	21.0	19.7	1.60
7	51.7	29	69.0	30.5	38.5	2.61
8						
All	72.4	163	58.9	23.1	35.8	2.68

<b>School's Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<b>Higher than expected to a large degree</b>

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

## Additional Evidence

ICAHN 2 students demonstrated "Higher than expected to a large degree"

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

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11	3,4,5	75	98	84.7	49.4	2.29
2011-12	3,4,5,6	62.3	131	96.2	48.2	3.19
2012-13	3,4,5,6,7	72.4	163	58.9	23.1	2.68

### **Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>5</sup>**

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

## Method

<sup>5</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

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

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>6</sup>

### Results

ICAHN 2 achieved a score of 52.5, 2.5% higher 50%. Students in grades 4 and 7 surpassed the statewide median, while students in grades 5 and 6 scored below it.

#### **2012-13 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
3	-	50.0
4	55.6	50.0
5	48.4	50.0
6	49.2	50.0
7	56.5	50.0
8	0	50.0
All	52.5	50.0

### Evaluation

The measure was met.

### Additional Evidence

Comparison with past performance cannot begin until next year. ICAHN 2 surpassed the statewide average in 2012-13.

#### **English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11 <sup>7</sup>	2011-12 <sup>7</sup>	2012-13	Statewide Average

<sup>6</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

<sup>7</sup> Grade level results not available.

3			-	50.0
4			55.6	50.0
5			48.4	50.0
6			49.2	50.0
7			56.5	50.0
8			0	50.0
All			52.5	50.0

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: CSD 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/MS 194

**Method**

ICAHN 2 tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which ICAHN 2 had tested students and the result of grades 3 through 8 in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

ICAHN 2 students in grades 3 through 8 outscored their peers in District 11 and in surrounding schools. Compared with K-5 schools PS 103 and 106, ICAHN 2 in grades 3 through 5 outscored their peers by 36.7% and 34.7% respectively. Compared with K-8 schools PS 83 and PS/MS 194, ICAHN 2 students outscored their peers by 28.5% and 30.67% respectively.

2013-14 NYS ELA – Comparison of All Student Performance on the Math assessment – Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 – ICAHN 2 with District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 103, PS/IS 194						
Grade	District	School				
	11	PS 103	PS 83	PS 106	PS/IS 194	ICAHN 2 CS
3	23	21	27	23	24	48
4	23	18	34	22	32	63
5	19	16	29	16	28	55
6	18	-	24	-	26	64
7	16	-	24	-	23	49
8	19	-	29	-	21	59
Total (3-5)	21.66	18.3	30	20.3	28	56
Total (3-6)	19.66	-	27.83	-	25.66	56.33

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

**Absolute** - Overall, 57.33% of ICAHN 2's 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade students enrolled for at least two years scored proficiency on NYS ELA assessments. They did not reach the first absolute measure of 75%.

**Absolute** - The Performance Index value achieved by ICAHN 2 students was 149. The value is 60 points higher than the state-wide AMO of 89.

**Comparative** - While ICAHN 2's grade 3 through 8 students maintained a significant difference in their performance as compared with their District 11 peers. In 2011-12 the difference when comparing 3<sup>rd</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grade students was 55.9%; in 2012-13 the difference when comparing 3<sup>rd</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup> grade students was lower at 36.75%; and in 2013-14 the difference when comparing 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade was slightly lower than the previous year at 35.73%

**Comparative** - ICAHN 2 students achieved an Effect Size value of 2.68 the 2012-13 comparative performance analysis. ICAHN 2 students demonstrated "Higher than expected to a large degree"

**Growth** - Under the state's Growth Model ICAHN 2's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile, 52.5 as compared with 50.

**Optional** - ICAHN 2 students in grades 3 through 8 outscored their peers in District 11 and in surrounding schools. Compared with K-5 schools PS 103 and 106, ICAHN 2's students in grades 3 through 5 outscored their peers by 37.7% and 35.7% respectively. Compared with K-8 schools PS 83 and PS/MS 194, ICAHN 2 students outscored their peers by 29.5% and 31.67% respectively.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved
Optional	Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: CSD 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS106, and PS/MS 194	Achieved

## Action Plan

ICAHN 2 had a testing year with impressive results with slight gains as compared with 2012-13. ICAHN 2 students continued to significantly outscore their peers in CSD 11.

In the coming year we shall continue to analyze the impact of our instruction on our students to identify possible changes we can introduce to support their increased academic achievement.

## **MATHEMATICS**

### **Goal 2: Mathematics**

Students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts

### **Background**

Our Mathematics curriculum follows the Core Knowledge sequence and is comprised of Pearson's enVision Mathematics Program, workbooks, and a strong emphasis on hands on learning and monthly assessments. Our Mathematics specialist provides small group instruction for 45 minutes a day 5 days a week to those children who have demonstrated a deficiency in any area of Mathematics. The results of practice tests are reviewed with the Principal, teachers, mathematics specialist, and Mathematics consultant in order to provide remediation lessons for the targeted students. Our process of ongoing assessments ensures that the program will closely monitor the child's progress and promote the students out of targeted assistance where appropriate, as well as accept new students as required by practice tests and teacher recommendation. The Mathematics program is supervised by the Principal and with additional support from a Mathematics Consultant from the NYC Mathematics Project at Lehman College. The Mathematics Consultant is responsible for demonstration lessons and participates in developing teaching strategies. The mathematics consultant also provides professional development during common planning periods.

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

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

### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade in April 2014. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

### **2013-14 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>8</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	40	0	0	0	40
4	28	0	0	0	28
5	35	0	0	0	35
6	35	0	0	0	35
7	32	0	0	0	32
8	29	0	0	0	29
All	199	0	0	0	199

## Results

2013-14 is the second year NYS testing has been based on the core curriculum standards.

Students completing the NYS 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade ELA assessments had either been enrolled at the school for at least two years, or were newer to the school. The table below illustrates the difference between those who have been enrolled for at least two years, and others as follows: grade 3 = 40-40 (same); grade 4 – 28-27(one less); grade 5 = 35-35 (same); grades 6 and 7 = 35-33 and 32-30 (two less in each grade); grade 8 =29-29 (same).

### Performance on 2013-14 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	78	40	78	40
4	64	28	66	27
5	86	35	86	35
6	83	35	87.8	33
7	59	32	63.3	30
8	48	29	48	29
All	69.6	199	71.4	194

## Evaluation

The measure was not met.

## Additional Evidence

Comparison of 2011-12 scores shows students in each of four Cohorts demonstrating or continuing to demonstrate high performance ranging from 97.02% to 100%. As the result of the impact of the NYSED testing system, based on the common core learning standards, the five 2012-13 cohorts (grades 3

<sup>8</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.

through 7) dropped to below the 75% target to 71.6% with a range of 64.5% (grade 3) to 77.4% (grade 5). The school average remained essentially the same at 71.6% in 2013-14, though there are now six cohorts with percentages ranging from 48% (grade 8) to 87.8% (grade 6). The students in three grades demonstrated proficiency or exceeded it: Grades 3, 5, and 6.

### Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	91.1%	34	64.5	30	78	40
4	100	30	77.1	31	66	27
5	97	35	77.4	31	86	35
6	100	32	71.4	28	87.8	33
7	-	-	67.8	28	63.3	30
8	-	-	-	-	48	29
All	97.02	131	71.6	148	71.4	194

#### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

#### Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2013-14 mathematics AMO of 86. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.<sup>9</sup>

#### Results

ICAHN 2's 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade students achieved a Performance Index value of 167, which was 81 points higher than the state set AMO of 86.

### Mathematics 2013-14 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
199	4	26	42	29

<sup>9</sup> In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 26 & + & 42 & + & 29 & = & 96 \\
 & & & & 42 & + & 29 & = & \underline{71} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 167
 \end{array}$$

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

### Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

## Method

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.<sup>10</sup>

## Results

While ICAHN 2 students in grades 3 through 8, as a collective, outscored their District 11 peers by 47.9%, they did not achieve the absolute proficiency measure as they missed it by 3.9%. Students in each grade outscored their District 11 peers as follows: grade 3 – 49%; grade 4 – 34%; grade 5 – 60%; grade 6 – 60.8%; grade 7 – 46.3%; and grade 8 – 38%.

**2013-14 State Mathematics Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District 11 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	78	40	29	3293
4	66	27	32	3182
5	86	35	26	3140
6	87.8	33	27	3018
7	63.3	30	17	3216
8	48	29	10	2659
All	<b>71.4</b>	194	<b>23.5</b>	18508

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

<sup>10</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

## Additional Evidence

While ICAHN 2's grade 3 through 8 students did not achieve the target proficiency measure, they did maintain a significant difference in their performance as compared with their District 11 peers.

In 2011-12, the difference when comparing 3<sup>rd</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> grade students was 43.53%. In 2012-13 the difference between 3<sup>rd</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts increased to 51.9% then dropped to 47.9% for cohorts in grades 3 through 8 in 2013-14.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	91.1	45.5	62.5	21.0	78	29
4	100	59.3	80.0	20.0	66	32
5	97	58.2	77.1	20.6	86	26
6	100	50.9	71.9	20.2	87.8	27
7	-	-	65.5	15.6	63.3	17
8	-	-	-	-	48	10
All	97	53.47	71.4	19.5	<b>71.4</b>	<b>23.5</b>

#### Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.<sup>11</sup>

#### Method

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

<sup>11</sup> The Institute will continue using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2013-14. Schools should report previous year's results using reported free-lunch statistics.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

**Results**

In 2012-13, ICAHN 2’s 3<sup>rd</sup> through 7<sup>th</sup> grade students achieved an Effect Size of 2.75, which led to the Overall Comparative Performance rated at “Higher than expected to a large degree.”

**2012-13 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	<b>81.3</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>62.5</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>2.15</b>
4	<b>75.0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>80.0</b>	<b>28.2</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>3.02</b>
5	<b>80.0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>77.1</b>	<b>21.2</b>	<b>55.9</b>	<b>3.50</b>
6	<b>71.0</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>71.9</b>	<b>22.7</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>2.73</b>
7	<b>51.7</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>65.5</b>	<b>25.8</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>2.22</b>
8						
All	<b>72.4</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>71.8</b>	<b>24.5</b>	<b>47.3</b>	<b>2.75</b>

<b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<b>Higher than expected to a large degree</b>

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Additional Evidence**

ICAHN 2 students continue to demonstrate “Higher than expected to a large degree”

**Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2010-11	3,4,5	75	98	96.9	59.0	2.19
2011-12	3,4,5,6	62.5	131	96.2	48.2	3.19
2012-13	3.4.5.6,7	61.3	163	71.8	24.5	2.75

**Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>12</sup>**

Each year, under the state’s Growth Model, the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.

**Method**

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of Growth Model data, the 2013-14 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2012-13 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>13</sup>

**Results**

ICAHN 2 students achieved a score of 69.5%, 19.5% higher 50%. Students in all grades surpassed the 50% benchmark.

**2012-13 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Average
3	-	50.0
4	67.1	50.0
5	67.8	50.0
6	73.4	50.0
7	70.0	50.0
8	0	50.0
All	69.5	50.0

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Additional Evidence**

<sup>12</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>13</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED’s business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

ICAHN 2's unadjusted mean growth percentile exceeded the state's unadjusted median growth percentile by 19.5% with a score of 69.5%

**Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2010-11 <sup>14</sup>	2011-12 <sup>14</sup>	2012-13	Statewide Average
3			-	50.0
4			67.1	50.0
5			67.8	50.0
6			73.4	50.0
7			70.0	50.0
8			0	50.0
All			69.5	50.0

**Goal 2: Optional Measure**

Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: CSD 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/MS 194

**Method**

ICAHN 2 tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which ICAHN 2 had tested students and the result of grades 3 through 8 in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

ICAHN 2 students in grades 3 through 8 outscored their peers in District 11 and in surrounding schools. Compared with K-5 schools PS 103 and 106, ICAHN 2 in grades 3 through 5 students outscored their peers by 40.5% and 61% respectively. Compared with K-8 schools PS 83 and PS/MS 194, ICAHN 2 students outscored their peers by 35.6% and 24.1% respectively.

2013-14 NYS Math – Comparison of All Student Performance on the Math assessment – Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 – ICAHN 2 with District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 103, PS/IS 194						
Grade	District	School				
	11	PS 103	PS 83	PS 106	PS/IS 194	ICAHN 2 CS
3	29	16	40	29	34	78
4	32	16	41	40	33	64
5	26	13	38	37	44	86
6	27	-	42	-	59	83
7	17	-	25	-	43	59
8	10	-	18	-	23	48
Total (3-5)	29	15	39.6	35.5	37	76

<sup>14</sup> Grade level results not available.

Total (3-6)	23.5	-	34	-	45.5	69.6
-------------	------	---	----	---	------	------

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

**Absolute** - ICAHN 2’s 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade students enrolled for at least two years demonstrated 71.6% proficiency, 3.4% below their target of 75%. Three grades, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> exceeded 75% as follows: 3<sup>rd</sup> = 78%; 5<sup>th</sup> = 86% and 6<sup>th</sup> = 87.8%

**Absolute** - ICAHN 2’s 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade students achieved a Performance Index value of 167, which was 81 points higher than the state set AMO of 86.

**Comparative** - While ICAHN 2 grade 3 through 8 students maintained a significant difference in their performance as compared with their District 11 peers. In 2013-14 ICAHN 2’s average proficiency level of 71.6 was 47.9 points higher than District 11. ICAHN 2’s grade 3 outscored District 11 peers by 49%; grade 4 by 34.7%; grade 5 by 40%; grade 6 by 40.1%; grade 7 by 46.3% and grade 8 by 38%.

**Comparative** - ICAHN 2 students achieved an Effect Size value of **2.75** on the 2012-13 comparative performance analysis. ICAHN 2 students demonstrated “Higher than expected to a large degree”

**Growth** - Under the state’s Growth Model ICAHN 2’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 were slightly below the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile, 49.05 as compared with 50.

**Optional** - ICAHN 2 students in grades 3 through 8 outscored their peers in District 11 and in surrounding schools. Compared with K-5 schools PS 103 and 106, ICAHN 2 in grades 3 through 5 students outscored their peers by 40.5% and 61% respectively. Compared with K-8 schools PS 83 and PS/MS 194, ICAHN 2 students outscored their peers by 35.6% and 24.1% respectively.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public	Achieved

	schools in New York State. (Using 2012-13 school district results.)	
Growth	Each year, under the state’s Growth Model the school’s mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state’s unadjusted median growth percentile.	Achieved
Optional	Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 on the State math exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: CSD 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS106, and PS/MS 194	Achieved

**Action Plan**

ICAHN 2 met all of its measures. The school will continue utilizing the NYC Math Project as well as ongoing assessment and remediation as needed. In addition, we will continue to align our curriculum and provide current texts as the NYS Education Department modifies its mathematic strands. Additionally we will use Pearson’s SuccessMaker to meet every child’s individual needs in mathematics.

**SCIENCE**

**Goal 3: Science**  
Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning

**Background**

The ICAHN 2 science curriculum is aligned with the NYS Common Core standards and utilizes McGraw-Hill/National Geographic text.

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

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in spring 2014. The school converted each student’s raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at proficiency.

**Results**

100% of all ICAHN 2’s 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students in at least their second year at the school demonstrated proficiency.

**Charter School Performance on 2013-14 State Science Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency
-------	------------------------------------

	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100	27		
8	100	29		

### Evaluation

The measure was met.

### Additional Evidence

ICAHN 2's 4<sup>th</sup> grade students in at least their second year at the school have consistently achieved either Level 3 or Level 4 on the NYSED Science examination.

### Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100	28	100	35	100	27
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	29
All	100	28	100	35	100	56

### Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

### Method

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

### Results

Results of District 11's 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade science exam were not available at the time this report was written

### 2013-14 State Science Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency
-------	------------------------------------

	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District 11 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100	27	Data Unavailable	
8	100	29	Data Unavailable	

### Evaluation

Without District 11's data the performance on the measure cannot be determined.

### Additional Evidence

In previous years ICAHN 2's students have outscored their District 11 peers. While the comparison cannot be made until District 11 data are available, **District 11 students must score 100% to tie ICAHN 2 students, in which case the measure will most probably be met.** Based on previous performance the likelihood of District 11 students achieving 100% is low.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	100	28	100	82	100	-
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	-
All	100	28	100	82	100	-

### Summary of the Science Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Cannot be Determined

### Action Plan

Efforts at ICAHN 2 will continue to ensure that our students are provided with available resources such as the TA program, afterschool and the Saturday Academy Program and their instruction is aligned with the NYS standards

### NCLB

**Goal 4: NCLB**

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

**Goal 4: Absolute Measure**

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as a local-assistance-plan school.

**Method**

Since *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school’s status under the state’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

**Results**

ICAHN 2 met the 2013-14 NCLB requirement.

**Evaluation**

NYS testing began in the 2010-11 school year and ICAHN 2 has consistently been recognized as “a school in good standing” since that time. To achieve this status of a “school in good standing”, we had to meet the Annual Yearly Progress (AYP), thereby demonstrating that the children’s achievement was in accordance with NCLB requirements. In fact, our achievement was significantly higher than the NCLB requirements and greatly exceeded the neighborhood schools.

**Additional Evidence**

As illustrated below, ICAHN 2 has met the NCLB requirement for the last 3 years

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2011-12	Good Standing
2012-13	Good Standing
2013-14	Good Standing

**APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES – Not Applicable****APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS**

The following section contains a Parent Satisfaction optional goal, as well as examples of possible

optional measures.

**Goal S: Parent Satisfaction**

Parents will demonstrate strong support and commitment to the school

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**

Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school’s program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

**Method**

A parent survey is provided to all parents/guardians of students who attend Icahn Charter School 1. The survey contains fifteen (15) questions on the school’s performance with options to select from A to D, with A equaling poor and D equaling excellent. After the collection of the surveys, all questions are tallied with notification of how many surveys were not returned to the school. Below is a copy of the survey provided to the parents/guardians. The survey, provided in both English and Spanish is presented below:

**Results**

Responses pertaining to 15 questions contained in the 2013-2014 Parent Satisfaction Survey were received. The table below depicts the number of responses received which were 255 out of 283 families. The response rate was 90.10% which is a 1.2% % decrease in the number of responses for this year.

**2013-14 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate**

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
222	247	89.87%

**2013-14 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results**

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
1. I feel welcome when I visit the school.	98.1
2. This school provides a safe environment for learning.	98.00
3. My child has up-to date instructional tools.	99.00
4. School holds high academic expectations.	96.52
5. Schools hold high discipline expectations.	95.75
6 Parent regularly reads progress report and notices sent from school	88.2
7. Homework assignments area valuable contribution to my child’s learning	94.01
8. Sufficient material provided by school to aid in learning and homework.	95.53
9. Child receiving a quality education.	96.00
10.The school keeps me informed about what goes on at the school.	94.01
11. School’s goal to parent(s) are clear.	95.01

12. School property and building are clean and well maintained.	98.00
13. Parent would send other siblings to our school	97.35
14. Parent will recommend the school to other parents.	95.00
15. My child's attendance is monitored by the school calling about absences.	99.00

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**  
 Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

**Method**

Tracking of ICAHN 2 students is maintained by the Principal, using attendance records, and interactions with parents.

**Results**

97.2% of ICAHN 2 students who completed the 2012-13 school year continued in 2013-14

**2013-14 Student Retention Rate**

2012-13 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2012-13	Number of Students Who Returned in 2013-14	Retention Rate 2013-14 Re-enrollment ÷ (2012-13 Enrollment – Graduates)
315	29	286	97.2%

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Additional Evidence**

Year	Retention Rate
2011-12	97.2%
2012-13	97.1%
2013-14	97.2%

**Goal S: Absolute Measure**  
 Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 95 percent.

**Method**

For each month, the principal determines the number of instructional days. Each teacher records the presence or absence of each student on each instructional day of the month. The principal maintains a spread sheet with monthly attendance data from each class. The data includes: Total Number of School Days, Average Daily Attendance, Aggregate Attendance Percent for the Month, Total Number of Attendees, and Maximum Number of Attendees

**Results**

ICAHN 2 students demonstrated an average daily attendance rate of 94.1%, lower than the measure by .9%

**2013-14 Attendance**

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	93.9%
2	94.6%
3	94.3%
4	93.4%
5	94.5%
6	93.9%
7	91.7%
8	93.6%
Overall	94.1%

**Evaluation**

The measure was not met.

**Additional Evidence**

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2011-12	95.5%
2012-13	95.%
2013-14	94.1%