

# Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2007-08 School Year

## Reader's Guide

### *SUNY Authorized Charter Schools*

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

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

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

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

**CARL C. ICAHN  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2007-08**

**ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

July 31, 2008

By Jeffrey Litt

1525 Brook Avenue  
Bronx, NY 1057  
718 716 8105

Jeffrey Litt prepared this 2007-08 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Carl C. Icahn	Chair
Gail Golden	Vice-Chair
Julie Goodyear	Secretary
Robert Sancho	Officer
Seymour Fliegel	Officer
Edward J. Shanahan	Officer
Karen Mandelbaum	Officer
Robin Williams	Officer, Parent

**INTRODUCTION**

The mission of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School 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. Carl C. Icahn Charter School opened in September 2001 and initially served grade Kg-2. A grade was added each year culminating in grade eight. Our school is composed of 58% African American and 42% Latino children, with a free and reduced lunch rate of 80%. 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. Our TA program consists of in school remediation, afterschool tutoring and Saturday Academy. We have an extended school day of 7.5 hours and an extended school year ranging from 190 to 192 days of instruction. A full compliment of afterschool programs including chess team, journalism, girl scouts, boy scouts, basketball, football, track and field, step team and cheer leading. A drum line will be added in September 2008. We are particularly proud that dozens of our children are provided with a summer camp experience with the Fresh Air Fund and a private camp.

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

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2003-04	35	36	34	33	34									
2004-05	35	36	36	37	36	34								
2005-06	35	38	36	35	34	32	36							
2006-07	36	38	37	36	31	32	30	36						
2007-08	34	35	38	34	40	35	33	29	34					

## 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 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 Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Instruction. As the New York State Education Department made significant changes in the ELA curriculum, we replaced all existing readers to align with the new curriculum.

### **Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

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

#### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in January 2008. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. The criterion for success on this measure requires 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.

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.

**2007-08 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	33	0	0	0	33
4	38	0	0	0	38
5	32	0	0	0	32
6	34	0	0	0	34
7	29	0	0	0	29
8	36	0	0	0	36
All	202	0	0	0	202

**Results**

Students in grades three to seven demonstrated strong results with scores significantly higher than the required measure of 75%, whereas students in grade eight fell short in the required measure. It is important to note that although the eighth grade students fell short of the measure, they exceeded the NYS average for the grade and more than doubled the results of all district students for the grade. We also wish to note that all students in at least their second year at CCICS achieved 83.52% in levels 3-4.

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State English Language Arts Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
3	All Students	0	15.15	78.79	6.06	84.85	33
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	17.24	75.86	6.9	<b>82.76</b>	29
4	All Students	0	10.53	84.21	5.26	89.47	38
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	12.12	81.82	6.06	<b>87.88</b>	33
5	All Students	0	0	90.63	9.38	100	32
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	0	89.29	10.71	<b>100</b>	28
6	All Students	0	11.76	85.29	2.94	88.24	34
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	10.71	85.71	3.57	<b>89.29</b>	28
7	All Students	0	6.9	93.1	0	93.1	29
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	8	92	0	<b>92</b>	25
8	All Students	0	41.67	55.56	2.78	58.33	36
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	45.45	52.52	3.03	<b>54.55</b>	33
All	All Students	0	14.85	80.69	4.46	85.15	202
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	16.48	78.41	5.11	<b>83.52</b>	176

<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.

**Evaluation**

CCICS demonstrated strong results in grades three to seven by significantly exceeding the required measure. Our strongest showing was grade 5 in which 100% of students achieved results of level 3-4. Grades three, four, six and seven also demonstrated significant results that exceeded the measure whereas eighth grade fell short. These results are curious as these eighth grade results students were the same children who passed highly competitive high school admission exams to specialized high schools, special programs, parochial schools, and private schools. In fact, many of our eighth graders received financial scholarships for their achievement including an annual scholarship of \$33,000 to Phillips Exeter. This student, along with three others missed level four by one question. While we will most certainly increase our efforts in this grade, we question the norming of the ELA test for eighth grade.

**Additional Evidence**

A comparative analysis as illustrated below demonstrates significant gains as follows: Our fourth graders achieved 88 % in levels 3-4 as compared to their previous year’s performance of 81%; Our fifth graders achieved 100% in level 3-4 as compared to their previous performance of 90%; Our sixth graders achieved 89% in level 3-4 as compared to their previous performance of 80% and our seventh graders achieved 92% in level 3-4 as compared to their previous performance of 87%. Our eighth grade fell short by 20%, while still exceeding the NYS average for their grade.

**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									
	2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3					85	33	81	27	83	29
4	55	11	89	17	87	30	90	31	88	33
5					85	26	80	25	100	28
6					73	33	87	23	89	28
7							74	31	92	25
8									55	33
All	55	11	89	17	82	122	83	137	84	176

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State ELA 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 2007-08 is 133. 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.

**Results**

CCICS students in grade three through eight exceeded the Performance Index of 133 for 2007-2008.

**Calculation of 2007-08 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)**

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3-8	0	15	81	4	202

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 15 & + & 81 & + & 4 & = & 100 \\
 & & & & + & 81 & + & 4 & = & 85 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \text{185}
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

CCICS students significantly exceeded the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 133 with their Performance Index of 185.

**Additional Evidence**

CCICS has shown an increase in the Performance Index from 180 for the 2006-07 school year to 185 for the 2007-08 school year. The percent of children in level 2 decreased by 3 percent from 2006-07 to 2007-08, demonstrating continued achievement.

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

Year	Grades <sup>2</sup>	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2005-06	3-6	137	0	18	75	7	182	122
2006-07	3-7	168	1	18	73	8	180	122
2007-08	3-8	203	0	15	81	4	185	133

<sup>2</sup> Beginning in 2005-06 the state administered tests in grades 3-8 and a single AMO was set for the aggregate PI of all tested students in those grades.

**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**

As anticipated, CCICS significantly exceeded the results in every grade as compared to the local school district.

**2007-08 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	83	29	41	1206
4	88	33	42	1200
5	100	28	48	1359
6	89	28	32	0942
7	92	25	44	1317
8	55	33	23	633
All	<b>84</b>	176	39	6657

**Evaluation**

As illustrated the results of students who have attended CCICS for at least two years have more than doubled the results of all district students.

**Additional Evidence**

CCICS has significantly exceeded the local district for all grades beginning with our first testing year 2003-04.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3					85	45	81	39	83	41
4	55	30	89	48	87	44	90	40	88	42
5					85	37	80	33	100	48
6					73	34	87	37	89	32
7							74	31	92	44
8									55	23
All	55	30	89	48	82	40	83	37	84	39

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state ELA 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 2007-08 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2006-07 results, the most recent ones available.

**Results**

CCICS strongly exceeded the predicted measure of performance for the ELA exam.

**2006-07 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		35	77.1	48.5	28.6	1.92	
4		33	90.9	48.8	42.1	2.83	
5		33	78.8	48.7	30.1	1.94	
6		30	83.3	40.3	43	2.62	
7		36	75	34.4	40.6	2.66	
8							
All		82.0	167	80.8	44.1	36.7	2.39

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

**Evaluation**

CCICS exceeded its predicted level of performance on the state ELA exam higher than expected to a higher degree. All testing grades exceeded the performance higher than expected to a large degree.

**Additional Evidence**

For as long as this measure has been required, CCICS has performed 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
2005-06	3-6	76	137	82.5	46.8	1.90
2006-07	3-7	82.0	167	80.8	44.1	2.39
2007-08					N/A	N/A

**Goal 1: Growth Measure**

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2007-08 and also have a state exam score in 2006-07. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2006-07 and 75 percent proficient in 2007-08. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2006-07, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. 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**

CCICS significantly met the measure on 4 of the 5 grades tested.

**Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2006-07 to 2007-08**

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2006-07	Target	2007-08	
3 to 4	37	77	75	89	YES
4 to 5	28	93	75	100	YES
5 to 6	32	81	75	88	YES
6 to 7	28	86	75	93	YES
7 to 8	36	75	75	58	NO
All	161	82	75	86	NO

**Evaluation**

Whereas grade level cohort growth for students in grades 3-7 met the measure, students in eighth grade did not. In addition, there were significant improvements in grades 3-7, ranging from 7% to 12%. For example, third grade cohort students scored 77% in 2006-07 whereas the same students scored 89% in the following school year.

**Goal 1: (Optional) Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar school: CS: 4, 42, 55 MS: 313, 339

**Method**

CCICS tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which CCICS had tested students and the result of the respective grades in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

CCICS significantly exceeded all surrounding similar schools.

<b>2007-2008 NYS ELA Percent Level 3 or higher (All Students)</b>						
School	CS 4	CS 42	CS 55	MS 313	MS 339	<b>CCICS</b>
Grade 3	45	39	28			<b>85</b>
Grade 4	40	40	28			<b>89</b>
Grade 5	45	67	44			<b>100</b>
Grade 6	36			27	21	<b>88</b>
Grade 7	40			24	40	<b>92</b>
Grade 8	27			13	9	<b>55</b>
Total	39	48	33	21	26	<b>85</b>

**Evaluation**

This result is above the measure’s requirement that the percent of CCICS students perform at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of the local school in all grades.

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

CCICS met 5 of the 6 English Language arts goals. The growth measure goal was not achieved by one grade.

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	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
Growth	Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools: CS: 4,42,55 MS: 313, 339	Achieved

**Action Plan**

CCICS students had a particularly challenging year due to limited physical space. The delay in construction, although it was not due to our organization, resulted in our older students not receiving a full middle school program until early June 2008. Until we moved, the students remained in one classroom throughout the day. We are pleased however that although they did not meet the growth measure, they did, as stated earlier, perform quite well on complete high school admission tests. We are also pleased that many of our graduating eighth graders passed the ninth grade Integrated Algebra Regents as well as the Regents Foreign Language Competency test.

We anticipate that our new middle school, with its full program offerings of a library, science lab, and gymnasium, will result in significantly higher achievement level in the eighth grade.

## 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 Glencoe Math for grades 6-8, workbooks, and a strong emphasis on hands on learning and by-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 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 Mathematics 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 Mathematics program is personally supervised by the Principal and Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Instruction. As the New York State Education Department made significant changes in the Mathematics curriculum, we replaced all existing readers to align with the new curriculum. We retain the services of an additional Mathematics specialist from the New York City Math Project at Lehman College, who is responsible for demonstration lessons and participates in developing teaching strategies. Children in grades K-5 will be utilizing revised McMillan Math program beginning with the 2008-09 school year.

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

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

### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in January 2008. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires 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.

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.

**2007-08 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>3</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	33	0	0	0	33
4	41	0	0	0	41
5	33	0	0	0	33
6	34	0	0	0	34
7	29	0	0	0	29
8	36	0	0	0	36
All	206	0	0	0	206

**Results**

All students in at least their second year met the measure.

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Mathematics Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
3	All Students	0	0	69.7	30.3	100	33
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	0	72.41	27.59	<b>100</b>	29
4	All Students	0	2.44	73.17	24.39	97.56	41
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	3.03	72.73	24.24	<b>96.97</b>	33
5	All Students	0	0	36.36	63.64	100	33
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	0	32.14	67.86	<b>100</b>	28
6	All Students	0	0	61.76	38.24	100	34
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	0	60.71	39.29	<b>100</b>	28
7	All Students	0	0	93.10	6.90	100	29
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	0	92.00	8.00	<b>100</b>	25
8	All Students	0	11.11	69.44	19.44	88.89	36
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	12.12	66.67	21.21	<b>87.88</b>	33
All	All Students	0	2.43	66.99	30.85	97.57	206
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	2.88	65.91	31.25	<b>97.16</b>	176

**Evaluation**

All cohort students in every grade significantly exceeded the measure with 97.16 % in levels 3-4.

<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

**Additional Evidence**

As illustrated, this measure has been met beginning with the 2003-04 school year to the present.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3					100	33	100	27	100	29
4	75	20	100	22	100	29	94	29	97	33
5					88	26	100	24	100	28
6					97	33	100	23	100	28
7							97	30	100	25
8									88	33
All	75	20	100	22	96	121	98	136	97	176

**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 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 2007-08 is 102. 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.

**Results**

CCICS students significantly exceeded the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 102 with their Performance Index of 185.

**Calculation of 2007-08 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)**

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3-8	0	2	67	31	206

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 2 & + & 67 & + & 31 & = & 100 \\
 & & & & + & 67 & + & 31 & = & 98 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \text{198}
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

CCICS students significantly exceeded the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 133 with their Performance Index of 185.

**Additional Evidence**

CCICS has shown a high consistency in the Performance Index from year to year. The percent of children in level 2 continues to be a very low percentage throughout all testing years.

**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		
2005-06	3-6	137	0	3	56	41	197	86
2006-07	3-7	167	0	2	66	32	198	86
2007-08	3-8	207	0	2	67	31	198	102

**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 anticipated, CCICS significantly exceeded the results in every grade as compared to the local school district.

**2007-08 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	100	29	81	2420
4	97	33	68	1974
5	100	28	65	1846
6	100	28	55	1652
7	100	25	56	1704
8	88	33	45	1359
All	<b>97</b>	176	<b>61</b>	10,955

**Evaluation**

As illustrated, the results of students who have attended CCICS for at least two years have significantly exceeded the results of all district students.

**Additional Evidence**

CCICS has significantly exceeded the local district for all grades beginning with our first testing year 2003-04.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3					100	61	100	71	100	81
4	90	48	100	48	100	52	94	60	97	68
5					88	38	100	48	100	65
6					97	30	100	45	100	55
7							97	37	100	56
8									88	45
All	90	48	100	48	97	45	98	53	97	61

**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 2007-08 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2006-07 results, the most recent ones available.

**Results**

CCICS strongly exceeded the predicted measure of performance for the Mathematics exam.

**2006-07 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		36	100	75	25.0	1.54
4		33	93.9	66.4	27.5	1.69
5		32	96.9	61.5	35.4	1.82
6		30	100	53.6	46.4	2.20
7		36	97.2	43.7	53.5	2.49
8						
All	82.0	167	97.6	60.1	37.5	1.95

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

**Evaluation**

CCICS exceeded its predicted level of performance on the state Mathematics exam higher than expected to a higher degree. All testing grades exceeded the performance higher than expected to a large degree.

**Additional Evidence**

For as long as this measure has been required, CCICS has performed 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
2004-05	3-5	71.6	29	100	76.4	1.75
2005-06	3-6	76	137	97.1	55.0	2.03
2006-07	3-7	82.0	167	97.6	60.1	1.95
2007-08						N/A

**Goal 2: Growth Measure**

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2007-08 and also have a state exam score in 2006-07. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this

measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2006-07 and 75 percent proficient in 2007-08. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2006-07, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. 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**

CCICS significantly met the measure on all 5 grades with a 97% school pass rate for 2007-08.

**Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2006-07 to 2007-08**

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2006-07	Target	2007-08	
3 to 4	37	97	75	97	YES
4 to 5	28	100	75	100	YES
5 to 6	32	97	75	100	YES
6 to 7	28	100	75	100	YES
7 to 8	36	97	75	89	YES
All	161	98	75	97	YES

**Evaluation**

Cohort students who tested in 2006-07 have shown consistency in the reaching a level 3-4 on the NYS Mathematics exam in the following school year. In 2006-07 the school percent at level 3 and 4 was 98% compared to 97% in 2007-08. This illustrates a high level of consistency in the mathematics program.

**Goal 1: (Optional) Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Mathematics exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar school: CS: 4, 42, 55 MS: 313, 339

**Method**

CCICS tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which CCICS had tested students and the result of the respective grades in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

CCICS significantly exceeded all surrounding similar schools.

<b>2007-2008 NYS Math Percent Level 3 or higher (All Students)</b>						
School	CS 4	CS 42	CS 55	MS 313	MS 339	<b>CCICS</b>
Grade 3	77	77	87			<b>100</b>
Grade 4	58	78	66			<b>97</b>
Grade 5	54	83	86			<b>100</b>
Grade 6	55			44	44	<b>100</b>
Grade 7	65			34	55	<b>100</b>
Grade 8	49			24	39	<b>89</b>
Total	59	79	80	34	46	<b>98</b>

**Evaluation**

This result is above the measure's requirement that the percent of CCICS students perform at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of the local school in all grades.

**Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

As evidence by the following chart, all measures were met.

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	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
Growth	Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	Achieved
Compare	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Mathematics exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools: CS: 4,42,55 MS: 313, 339	Achieved

**Action Plan**

CCICS 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 stands.

**SCIENCE**

**Goal 3: Science**

Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning

**Background**

Our science curriculum is aligned with the NYS standards and utilizes McGraw-Hill/National Geographic text. An important change in our science program is the addition of our science lab in the new middle school. All students have their own microscope and a complete supply of slides for individual and independent study, curriculum aligned DVDs and software, as well as completely stocked library for independent reading in the area of science. All classes in our new middle school have smart boards and the lower school will have them added in the near future. We are therefore planning to provide distance learning to our students in this area. It is our intention to provide advance instruction in science to enable our students to take the high school Biology Regents, as we did in the area of foreign language and mathematics.

**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**

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 2008. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires 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.

**Results**

All students in at least their second year met the measure.

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Science Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	0	2.44	70.73	26.83	97.56	41
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	3.03	75.76	21.21	<b>96.97</b>	33
8	All Students	0	23.53	61.76	14.71	76.47	34
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	22.58	61.29	16.13	<b>77.42</b>	31

**Evaluation**

As stated above, our school continues to perform strongly in the area of science. We attribute our success in this area as well as the students’ love of science to the resources provided to them, most importantly a NYS science certified teacher. We anticipate a stronger eighth grade result in the future with the addition of a science lab.

**Additional Evidence**

An analysis of year-to-year trends for the eighth grade is not able to be made at this time since this was our first eighth grade class. Our analysis of our 4<sup>th</sup> grade results illustrated a 22% gain from our initial testing in 2003-04, and a six percent gain from 2006-07. While the 2005-06 school year demonstrated a 100% pass rate, the number tested was 25, as compared to a 97% pass rate for the 2007-08 school year with 33 students being tested.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	75	15	95	18	100	25	91	29	97	33
8									77	31

**Goal 3: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

District NYS science results are not yet available.

**2007-08 State Science Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	97	33	N/A	N/A
8	77	31	N/A	N/A

**Evaluation**

District NYS science exam results are not yet available.

**Goal 3: (Optional) Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the Science exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar school: CS: 4, 42, 55 MS: 313, 339

**Method**

CCICS tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of the 4<sup>th</sup> grade and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in which CCICS had tested students and the result of the respective grades in similar schools.

**Results**

District NYS science results are not yet available.

2007-2008 NYS Science Percent Level 3 or higher (All Students)						
School	CS 4	CS 42	CS 55	MS 313	MS 339	CCICS
Grade 4						<b>98</b>
Grade 8						<b>76</b>

**Evaluation**

District NYS science results are not yet available.

**Summary**

CCICS students met the absolute measure as illustrated below. The comparative measure with the local school district and similar schools is not available at this time.

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	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.	District results not available
Comparative	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Science exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools: CS: 4,42,55 MS: 313, 339	District results not available

**Action Plan**

As stated previously, we will continue our efforts to ensure that our students are provided with all available resource and their instruction is aligned with the NYS standards.

**SOCIAL STUDIES**

**Goal 4: Social Studies**

Students will demonstrate a thorough understanding of Social Studies and the impact of history of modern day.

**Background**

CCICS students continue to perform exceptionally well in Social Studies due to our NYS aligned Core Knowledge program which is considered to have this subject as its strongest area. In addition we provide three social studies teachers to ensure that the children receive a thorough instructional program in this area. The use of the Pearson Social Studies Text, numerous videos, smart boards and library books all contribute to their success.

**Goal 4: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in 5<sup>th</sup> grade in November 2007 and 8th grade in June 2008. Each student’s raw score has been

converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires 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.

**Results**

All students in at least their second year met the measure.

**Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Social Studies Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
5	All Students	0	3.13	25.00	71.88	96.88	32
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	3.57	21.43	75.00	<b>96.43</b>	28
8	All Students	0	8.82	76.47	14.71	91.18	34
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	9.68	74.19	16.13	<b>90.32</b>	31

**Evaluation**

A careful analysis of the above table illustrates that the provision of three teachers in this area bring non-cohort students to a level which greatly surpasses their previous performance in neighborhood schools. There has been particular concern regarding the low performance of NYC students on the NYS Social Studies exam, including a front page story in the New York Times in the recent past. Students at CCICS however, have greatly outperformed their peers since our initial testing in this area. Although the 2007-08 results for district school are not yet available, our history has certainly proven a record of performance that greatly exceeds the neighborhood schools. There have been noticeable gains in the percent of students scoring Level 4.

**Additional Evidence**

An examination of year-to-year trends for the fifth grade clearly illustrates our exceptional performance in this area. An analysis of eighth trends is once again not available since this is our first year in having an eighth grade.

**Social Studies Performance  
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2003-04		2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5			97	33	100	18	100	24	96	28
8									90	31

**Goal 4: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

District NYS Social Studies results are not yet available.

**2007-08 State Social Studies 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		N/A	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	96	28	N/A	N/A
8	90	31	N/A	N/A

**Evaluation**

District NYS Social Studies results are not yet available.

**Goal 4: (Optional) Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the Social Studies in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar school: CS: 4, 42, 55 MS: 313, 339

**Method**

CCICS tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of the 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in which CCICS had tested students and the result of the respective grades in similar schools.

**Results**

District NYS Social Studies results are not yet available.

2007-2008 NYS Social Studies Percent Level 3 or higher (All Students)						
School	CS 4	CS 42	CS 55	MS 313	MS 339	<b>CCICS</b>
Grade 5						<b>97</b>
Grade 8						<b>91</b>

**Evaluation**

District NYS Social Studies results are not yet available.

**Summary**

CCICS students met the absolute measure as illustrated below. The comparative measure with the local school district and similar schools is not available at this time.

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	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.	District results not available
Comparative	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Social Studies exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools: CS: 4,42,55 MS: 313, 339	District results not available

**Action Plan**

As stated previously, we will continue our efforts to ensure that our students are provided with all available resource and their instruction is aligned with the NYS standards.

**NCLB**

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

**Goal 5: Absolute Measure**

**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**

CCICS has met the NCLB requirement for the 2007-08 school year.

**Evaluation**

We began NYS testing in the 2003-04 school year and have 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.

We have received recognition from the NYSED Commissioner for High Performing/Gap Closing School for the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years. Additionally, our school has been recognized as one seven charter schools in the nation for High Performing/Gap Closing, May 2007, by the U.S. Department of Education.

**Additional Evidence**

As illustrated below, CCICS has met the NCLB requirement for the last 5 years.

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2003-04	Good Standing
2004-05	Good Standing
2005-06	Good Standing
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing

## OPTIONAL GOALS

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

### Goal 6: Parent Satisfaction

Parents will demonstrate a strong support and commitment to the school.

### Goal 6: Absolute Measure

Each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the school's Parent Survey in which at least two-thirds of all parents provide a positive response to each of the survey items.

### Method

A parent survey is provided to all parents/guardians of students who attend CCICS. 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.

## PARENT SURVEY JUNE 2008

**Please mark each item next to the response that you feel is appropriate.**

*Por favor poner una sena al lado de cada respuesta que sea apropiada para usted.*

1. I feel welcome when I visit this school.

*Me siento bien recibida(o) cuando visito la escuela.*

- |  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| a. Poor – <i>nunca</i>                 | c. Good - <i>bien</i>           |
| b. Satisfactory – <i>satisfactorio</i> | d. Excellent - <i>excelente</i> |

2. This school provides a safe environment for learning.

*La escuela mantiene un ambiente seguro para que los estudiantes puedan aprender.*

- |  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| a. Poor – <i>nunca</i>                 | c. Good - <i>bien</i>           |
| b. Satisfactory – <i>satisfactorio</i> | d. Excellent - <i>excelente</i> |

3. My child has up-to-date instructional tools (books, computers, videos, etc.) that are used effectively.

*Mi nina(o) tiene materiales instructivos de lo mas reciente (libros, computadoras, videos, etc.) que son utilizados efectivamente.*

- |  |                                 |
|--|---------------------------------|
| a. Poor – <i>nunca</i>                 | c. Good - <i>bien</i>           |
| b. Satisfactory – <i>satisfactorio</i> | d. Excellent - <i>excelente</i> |

4. The school holds high academic expectations for my child.

*La escuela tiene esperanzas académicas de el nivel mas alto para mi niña(o).*

- |                        |                       |
|------------------------|-----------------------|
| a. Poor – <i>nunca</i> | c. Good - <i>bien</i> |
|------------------------|-----------------------|

- b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
5. The school holds high expectations of discipline for my child.  
*La escuela tiene esperanzas de comportamiento de el nivel mas alto para mi nina(o).*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
6. I regularly read progress reports and notices sent home from school.  
*Yo regularmente leo los noticieros y cartas que la escuela me manda.*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
7. Homework assignments are a valuable contribution to my child’s learning.  
*Las tareas asignados son una contribución valerosa para la educación de mi niña(o).*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
8. My child has enough supplies, materials, and text books to help with his/her studies.  
*Mi niña(o) tiene suficiente materiales para ayudarle con su estudios.*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
9. My child is receiving a quality education.  
*Mi niña(o) esta recibiendo una educación de alta calidad.*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
10. The school keeps me informed about what goes on at the school.  
*La escuela me mantiene informada(o) de todo lo que sucede en la escuela.*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
11. The school clearly tells me what the school’s goals are.  
*La escuela me explica claramente lo que aspira lograr.*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
12. School property and building are clean and well maintained.  
*La escuela y las aceras están limpias y bien mantenidas.*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
13. I would like my younger children to attend this school.  
*Me gustaría que mis hijas/hijos menores asistieran esta escuela.*
- a. Poor – *nunca*                                  c. Good - *bien*  
b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*      d. Excellent - *excelente*
14. I would recommend my child’s school to other parents.  
*Yo recomendaría esta escuela a otros padres.*

- a. Poor – *nunca*
- b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*
- c. Good - *bien*
- d. Excellent - *excelente*

15. My child’s attendance is monitored by the school calling about absences.  
*La escuela me llama cuando mi niña(o) a faltado clase.*

- a. Poor – *nunca*
- b. Satisfactory – *satisfactorio*
- c. Good - *bien*
- d. Excellent - *excelente*

Current grade of my child \_\_\_\_\_  
*Grado presente de mi nina(o) \_\_\_\_\_*

My child will be returning to this school.            Yes\_\_\_\_            No\_\_\_\_  
*Mi nina(o) regresara a esta escuela.            Si \_\_\_\_\_            No \_\_\_\_\_*

If no, please explain \_\_\_\_\_  
*Si su nina(o) no regresara, favor de explicar \_\_\_\_\_*

Other Comments:  
*Otros Comentarios:*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Results**

As demonstrated by the responses, the percentage of respondents rating the school’s academic program as good or excellent was 97%. All respondents indicated that they would recommend their child’s school to other parents and that their child will return to school, except for those who are moving out of state or have family issues that require movement to distant neighborhoods.

QUESTIONS	POOR	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	EXCELLENT	N/A
1	2	38	106	169	0
2	1	14	91	209	0
3	0	12	92	211	0
4	1	10	71	232	0
5	5	22	109	179	0
6	0	8	87	219	0
7	1	12	72	229	0
8	0	10	93	212	0
9	0	5	67	242	1
10	1	21	97	195	1
11	2	23	95	195	0
12	0	12	80	224	0
13	2	8	39	152	114
14	1	6	65	243	0
15	2	8	64	238	1
<b>TOTAL:</b>	18	209	1,228	3,149	117

**Evaluation**

We were pleased with the increase in the number of parents who returned the survey. This year 100% returned the survey.

Ninety three percent (93%) of our children are brought to school and picked up by their parents/guardians each day. The remaining six percent (7%) arrive to school by bus. Therefore the great majority of parents/guardians have daily communication with the teachers and administration, affording them the opportunity to express their concerns.

Additionally, it is widely known that at Carl C. Icahn Charter School, “you cannot make an appointment to see the principal”. Rather, the parents are urged to, “come in, have coffee in the lounge and as soon as the principal is available, he’ll meet with you”. This procedure reassures the parents and provides them with the security of knowing that their concerns will be addressed.

**Goal 6: Fiscal Soundness**

Carl C. Iahn Charter School will maintain strong fiscal practices and effective, responsible decision making.

**Goal 6: Absolute Measure**

Each year, the school will operate on a balanced budget meaning actual revenues will equal or exceed expenses.

**Method:**

Annually, the Board of Trustees approves a budget for CCICS.

**Results:**

Board Approved Budget	\$	3,565,923
Final Revised Budget	\$	
Date Revised: <u>          N/A          </u>		
<i>Actual Revenues</i>	\$	3,934,975
Actual Expenses	\$	3,892,446
Difference	\$	42,529

**Evaluation:**

For the 2007-2008 fiscal year, the school recorded a net gain of \$42,529. The school was able to provide all the necessary tools and resources to teachers and administrators to accomplish the measures in the accountability plan and to sustain a high level of student achievement that we all strive for.