

ICAHN CHARTER SCHOOL 1

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY
PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 31, 2011

By Daniel Garcia

1525 Brook Avenue
Bronx, NY 10457
718-716-8105

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

Trustee's Name	Voting Board Position
Carl C. Icahn	President
Gail Golden	Chairperson
Julie Goodyear	Secretary
Seymour Fliegel	Member
Robert Sancho	Member
Edward J. Shanahan	Member
Karen Mandelbaum	Member
Robin Williams	Parent Guardian Assn. President

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Icahn Charter School 1 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.

Icahn Charter School 1 opened in September 2001 and initially served Kindergarten through Grade two. A grade was added each year culminating in grade eight. Presently Icahn Charter School 1 has its full complement of students in grades K–8. Our school is composed of 58% African American and 42% Latino children, with a free and reduced lunch rate of 65%. 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, after-school 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 complement of afterschool programs is offered, including chess team, journalism, girl scouts, boy scouts, basketball, football, track and field, step team and cheer leading. 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. A chapter of the National Junior Honor Society was initiated this school year and will continue in 2011. In the 2009 – 2010 school year a chapter of the National Elementary Honor Society was developed.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2006-07	35	38	36	35	34	32	36							246
2007-08	36	38	37	36	31	32	30	36						276
2008-09	34	35	38	34	40	35	33	29	34					312
2009-10	38	39	39	35	39	37	40	36	28					331
2010-11	38	38	40	35	35	36	38	37	38					332

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All Icahn Charter School 1 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.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in April 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	657
4	654

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

5	654
6	654
7	652
8	652

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	35	2	0	0	35
4	35	5	0	0	35
5	36	1	1	0	36
6	36	1	2	2	38
7	37	1	0	0	37
8	34	1	0	1	35
All	216	10	3	0	216

Results

All students in grades three to eight demonstrated strong performances with scores higher than the required measure. Those students who were enrolled at least in their second year achieved a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	85.7	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>85.7</u>	35
4	All Students	100%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	35
5	All Students	100%	36
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	36
6	All Students	84.2%	38
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>83.3%</u>	36

² Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

7	All Students	97.3%	37
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>97.3%</u>	37
8	All Students	91.4%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>94.1%</u>	34
All	All Students	92.2%	216
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>93.4%</u>	213

Evaluation

Icahn Charter School 1 met its measure as students demonstrated strong performances in grades three to eight as they exceeded the required Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score. Students in Grades 4 and 5 were the highest scoring students as all exceeded the target.

Additional Evidence

Since the measure has changed from the percentage at Levels 3 and 4 to Scale Score a direct comparison with previous years was not made. Based on Scale Score, the table illustrates a high level of achievement consistency throughout the grades and from year to year.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	83	29	93	27	96.8	32	85.7	35
4	88	33	88	34	96.8	31	100	35
5	100	28	100	33	100.0	34	100	36
6	89	28	100	27	97.2	36	83.3	36
7	92	25	100	27	100.0	28	97.3	37
8	55	33	82	28	82.1	27	94.1	34
All	84	176	94	176	96.1	187	93.4%	213

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

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

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

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

Results

Icahn Charter School 1 significantly exceeded the results in every grade as compared to CSD #9.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	85.7	35	31.2	2878
4	100	35	32.5	2775
5	100	36	29.3	2662
6	83.3	36	23.5	2795
7	97.3	37	17.7	2808
8	94.1	34	18.6	2925
All	93.4	213	25.4	16,843

Evaluation

The results of Icahn Charter School 1 student performance on the 2010-11 NYS ELA assessment for at least two years show they out-scored District #9 student by 68%.

Additional Evidence

Icahn Charter School 1 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 at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	83	29	93	27	96.8	32	85.7	31.2
4	88	33	88	34	96.8	31	100	32.5
5	100	28	100	33	100.0	34	100	29.3
6	89	28	100	27	97.2	36	83.3	23.5
7	92	25	100	27	100.0	28	97.3	17.7
8	55	33	82	28	82.1	27	94.1	18.6
All	84	176	94	176	96.1	187	93.4	25.4

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

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

Results

Data from NYSED were not available, thus comparison could not be made.

2009-10 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						

7	
8	
All	

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
N/A

Evaluation

Data from NYSED were not available, thus comparison could not be made.

Additional Evidence

Data from NYSED were not available, thus comparison could not be made.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3-7	82.0	167	80.8	44.1	2.39
2007-08	3-8	66.77	202	85.17	55.97	2.00
2008-09	3-8	63.6	200	94.0	69.4	1.80
2009-10	3-8				N/A	N/A

Goal 1: Growth Measure

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

Method

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

Results

The students of grades 5 and 8 achieved the measure and increased the percentage of Level 3 from 55.5% to 80.5% and 64.7% to 88.2% respectively. The students of grade 6 do not achieve the target, but did increase the percentage of Level 3 from 50% to 69.4%. The students of grades 4 and 7 did not achieve the target and decreased the percentage of Level 3 from 74.3 to 71.2% and 67.6% to 51.5% respectively.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	35	74.3	75	71.2	NO
5	36	55.5	75	80.5	YES
6	36	50.0	75	69.4	NO
7	37	67.6	75	51.4	NO
8	34	64.7	75	88.2	YES
All	178	62.4	75	72.2	NO

Evaluation

While the grade 3 through 8 students as a group increased from 62.4 to 72.2, Icahn Charter School 1 did not meet this measure.

Additional Evidence

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	3-8	4	5
2008-09	3-8	5	5
2009-10	3-8	5	5
2010-11	3-8	2	5

Goal 1: Optional 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 schools: CS: 4, 42, 55, MS 313, 339

Method

This measure compares the performance of Icahn Charter School 1 students with those of District 8, and four comparable schools, which are PS 4, PS 42, PS 55, MS 313, and MS 339. Data were collected from recently released 2010-11 NYSED ELA and Math scores.

Results

On the 2010-11 NYS ELA examination, Icahn 1 students in Grades 3-8 out-scores their peers in each of the comparable schools, whether those schools were K-8 (CS-4), elementary (CS-42, or CS-55) or middle

school (MS 313 or MS 339). Icahn 1 students outscored CS – 4 students by 47%, CS-42 and CS 55 by approximately 50%, and MS 313 and 339 by approximately 57%.

2010-2011 NYS ELA Percent Level 3 or Higher By All Students*						
School	CS 4	CS 42	CS 55	MS 313	MS 339	ICAHN CHARTER SCHOOL 1
Grade 3	26.8	30.2	10.7	-	-	74.3
Grade 4	43.2	21.3	17.8	-	-	71.4
Grade 5	26.8	27.2	43.1	-	-	80.5
Elem Avg	32.3	26.2	23.9			75.4
Grade 6	23.3	-	-	16.3	13.6	68.4
Grade 7	10.2	-	-	7.0	7.8	51.3
Grade 8	18.9	-	-	12.9	10.1	85.7
MS Avg	17.5			12.0	10.5	68.5
Total	24.9	-	-	-	-	71.9

Evaluation

The measure was met. This result is above the measure’s requirement that the percent of Icahn Charter School 1 students performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of the local school in all grades.

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Icahn Charter School 1 achieved its first absolute measure, as the students of each Grade exceeded the Time Adjusted Level cut score. In Grades 4 and 5, 100% of students scored above the target.

The second absolute measure could not be assessed as information from NYSED was unavailable.

Icahn Charter School 1 achieved its first comparative measure as the students of each Grade out scored their peers in the local school district.

The second comparative measure could not be assessed as information from NYSED was unavailable.

Two (Grades 5 and 8) among five Icahn Charter School 1 student cohorts met their targets, while students in remaining grades (4, 6, and 7) did not. The school as a whole did not meet the measure.

Icahn Charter School 1 students outscored their peers in comparison schools

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be	Achieved

	greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	N/A
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve
Optional	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	Achieved

Action Plan

Icahn Charter School 1 had a successful testing year. While the change in scoring had a significant impact on outcome of percentages in each Level, Icahn Charter School students demonstrated growth and significantly outscored their peers in District #9 and the schools identified by Icahn Charter School 1 for comparison. A comparison of performance outcomes between the school and District #9 over two years shows District #9 students demonstrated a greater drop in their performances.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All Icahn Charter School 1 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 McGraw-Hill Mathematics for grades K–5 and Glencoe Math for grades 6-8, workbooks, technology and a strong emphasis on hands-on learning and by-monthly assessments. Our Mathematics 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 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, Staff Developer, and the Director of Assessment. We review all existing readers and math materials to create alignment with the ever changing NYS curriculum. We retain the services of additional Mathematics specialists from the New York City Math Project at Lehman College, who are responsible for demonstration lessons and participate in developing teaching strategies for K-8. The children in grades K-8 began utilizing the SuccessMaker software in Math in 2009-10 school year as a means of improving student math ability. SuccessMaker offers individualized math prescriptions.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in May 2011. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

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

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

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁴			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	35	2	0	0	35
4	35	5	0	0	35
5	36	1	1	0	36
6	36	1	2	0	38
7	37	1	0	0	37
8	34	0	0	0	35
All	213	10	3	0	216

Results

The results for all students and for students enrolled in at least their second year were almost identical. Both groups in each grade met the measure.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	100%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	35
4	All Students	100%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	35
5	All Students	100%	36
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	36

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

6	All Students	100%	38
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	36
7	All Students	100%	37
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	37
8	All Students	100%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	34
All	All Students	100%	216
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	213

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

The data presented in the table below show a high performance at the school through its history, in which the measure was continuously met.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	100	29	100	29	100	32	100	35
4	97	33	94	34	100	32	100	35
5	100	28	100	33	100	34	100	36
6	100	28	100	27	100	37	100	36
7	100	25	100	27	100	32	100	37
8	88	33	100	28	100	27	100	34
All	97	176	99	178	100	194	100	213

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

As SED has not yet determined this year's AMO, schools need not calculate their

Performance Index and may omit reporting on this measure.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Method

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

Results

Icahn Charter School 1 students out-scored their peers in a range which extended from 54.7 percent by 5th graders to 63.9 percent by 8th graders. All tested students at Icahn Charter School out-performed all District 9 students by 60.2%

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	80.0	35	38.6	2967
4	91.4	35	42.7	2862
5	91.4	36	45.3	2740
6	88.9	36	38.2	2914
7	91.6	37	38.1	2891
8	100.0	34	36.1	3039
All	90.5	213	39.8	17,413

Evaluation

The comparison measure was met.

Additional Evidence

The data presented in the table below show a high performance at the school through its history, in which the Icahn students have consistently out-scored their District #9 peers.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students
-------	---

	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	100	81	100	86.5	81.2	36.8	80.0	38.6
4	97	68	94	77.1	90.6	38.8	91.4	42.7
5	100	65	100	72.4	76.4	41.6	91.4	45.3
6	100	55	100	65.3	83.7	36.9	88.9	38.2
7	100	56	100	68.6	96.8	34.8	91.6	38.1
8	88	45	100	62.5	100.0	30.5	100.0	36.1
All	97	61	99	72.0	88.1	42.7	90.5	39.8

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 schools’ actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure.

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

Results

NYSED data were not available to permit the comparison of the school’s performance with demographically similar public schools state-wide.

2009-10 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All						

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
<i>N/A</i>

Evaluation

NYSED data were not available to permit the comparison of the school's performance with demographically similar public schools state-wide.

Additional Evidence

NYSED data were not available to permit the comparison of the school's performance with demographically similar public schools state-wide.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3-7	82.0	167	97.6	60.1	1.95
2007-08	3-8	66.8	206	97.6	71.56	1.64
2008-09	3-8	63.6	199	99.0	81.0	1.35
2009-10						
2010-11						

Goal 1: Growth Measure

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

Method

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

Results

All cohorts substantially exceeded the target and increased the percentage of Level 3 achievement as follows: Grade 4 - 82.8% to 91.4%; Grade 5 - 88.9% to 91.4%; Grade 6 - 75% to 88.9%; Grade 7 - 88.9% to 91.6%; and Grade 8 97% to 100%. As a school, Icahn 1 increased the percentage of students achieving Level 3 by 6.2% from 86.5% to 92.7%

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	35	82.8	75	91.4	YES
5	36	88.9	75	91.6	YES
6	36	75.0	75	88.9	YES
7	37	88.9	75	91.6	YES
8	34	97.0	75	100	YES
All	178	86.5	75	92.7	YES

Evaluation

All cohorts and the school as a whole met the measure. Cohort students who tested in 2009-10 and 2010-11 have shown consistency in reaching a level 3-4 on the NYS Mathematics exam in the following school year. In 2009-10 and 2010-11 all students scored either Level 3 or 4. This illustrates a high level of consistency in the mathematics program.

Additional Evidence

Each of the six cohorts met and exceeded its target.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	3-8	5	5
2008-09	3-8	5	5
2009-10	3-8	5	5
2010-11	3-8	5	5

Goal 2: Optional 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

Icahn Charter School 1 tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which Icahn Charter School 1 had tested students and the result of the respective grades in the surrounding schools.

Results

On the 2010-11 NYS Math examination, Icahn 1 students in Grades 3-8 out-scores their peers in each of the comparable schools, whether those schools were K-8 (CS-4), elementary (CS-42, or CS-55) or middle school (MS 313 or MS 339). Icahn 1 students outscored CS – 4 students by 44%, CS-42 and CS 55 by approximately 50%, and MS 313 and 339 by approximately 64%.

2010-2011 NYS Math Percent Level 3 or higher by all Students						
School	CS 4	CS 42	CS 55	MS 313	MS 339	ICAHN CHARTER SCHOOL 1
Grade 3	53.7	55.3	23.4	-	-	80.0
Grade 4	65.8	42.0	32.0	-	-	91.4
Grade 5	51.2	57.6	51.8	-	-	91.4
Elem Avg.	56.9	51.6	35.7			87.6
Grade 6	46.7	-	-	29.2	14.2	88.9
Grade 7	28.6	-	-	31.7	18.7	91.6
Grade 8	32.1	-	-	42.0	20.1	100.0
MS Avg.	35.1			34.3	17.6	93.5
Total	46.4	-	-	-	-	90.5

Evaluation

The measure was met. This result is above the measure’s requirement that the percent of Icahn Charter School 1 students performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of the local school in all grades.

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Icahn Charter School 1 achieved its first absolute measure, as the students of each Grade exceeded the Time Adjusted Level cut score targets. In all Grades, students scored 100%.

The second absolute measure could not be assessed as information from NYSED was unavailable.

Icahn Charter School 1 achieved its first comparative measure as the students of each Grade out scored their peers in the local school district.

The second comparative measure could not be assessed as information from NYSED was unavailable.

Icahn Charter School 1 students in five cohorts, all Grades met or maintained their targets.

Icahn Charter School 1 students outscored their peers in comparison schools.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school	Achieved

	district.	
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	N/A
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Achieved
Optional	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	Achieved

Action Plan

Icahn Charter School 1 met all of its measures. Icahn Charter School 1 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

All Icahn Charter School 1 students will demonstrate competency in understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

Background

The Icahn Charter School 1 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 advanced 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 4th and 8th grade in spring 2010. 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

100% of all grade 4 students scored either at Level 3 or Level 4 on the 2010-11 NYS 4th grade Science examination. 94.3% of all grade 8 students scored at Level 3 or Level 4 on the 2010-11 NYS 8th grade, while 94.1% of students in at least their second year scored at either Level 3 or Level 4.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	0	0	23	12	35	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	23	12	35	35
8	All Students	0	2	22	11	33	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	2	21	11	32	34

Evaluation

Students in grades 4 and 8 exceeded the measure. The school met the measure.

Additional Evidence

4th and 8th grade Science scores for district 9 were not available for this report.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	97		100		97	39	100	35
8	77		89		100	28	94.1	34
All	87		94.5		98.5	67	97.05	69

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

4th and 8th grade Science scores were not available for this report.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100	35		
8	94.1	34		

Evaluation

4th and 8th grade Science scores were not available for this report.

Additional Evidence

4th and 8th grade Science scores were not available for this report.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	97	60	100	N/A	97	N/A	100.0	N/A
8	-	31	77	N/A	100	N/A	94.1	N/A
All	97	45.5	88.5	N/A	98.5	N/A	97.1	N/A

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

Icahn Charter School 1 tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of the 4th grade and 8th grade in which Icahn Charter School 1 had tested students and the result of the respective grades in similar schools.

Results

District NYS science results are not yet available.

2010-2011 NYS Science Percent Level 3 or higher (All Students)						
School	CS 4	CS 42	CS 55	MS 313	MS 339	ICAHN CHARTER SCHOOL 1
Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100.0
Grade 8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	94.1

Summary

4th and 8th grade Science scores were not available for this report.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled	N/A

	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.	
Optional	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	N/A

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 in Science.

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

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

Method

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

Results

Icahn Charter School 1 has met the NCLB requirement for the 2010-11 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 of 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, Icahn Charter School 1 has met the NCLB requirement for the last 5 years.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2005-06	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	Good Standing
2009-10	Good Standing
2010-11	Good Standing

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

Goal 6: Parent Satisfaction

Parents will demonstrate a strong support and commitment to the school

Goal 6: 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.

Results

228 responses pertaining to 15 questions contained in the 2010-11 Parent Satisfaction Survey were received. The data are illustrated in three tables. The first shows a response rate of 68.6% among 332 families. The second shows survey results and indicates the number of parents who selected each choice offered for each question asked. It includes 16 responses were "Poor", which results in 63.8% of all parents demonstrated satisfaction. The third table illustrates the percentage of parents taking the survey, who were satisfied.

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction Survey Responses

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
228	332	68.6%

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction Survey Results

Questions	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	N/A
1	1	18	69	140	0
2	0	10	58	160	0
3	0	10	58	159	0
4	1	4	39	184	0
5	1	17	63	146	0
6	0	11	45	172	0
7	0	8	56	165	0
8	0	10	58	160	0
9	0	5	39	184	0
10	2	19	58	148	0

11	1	12	75	140	0
12	8	10	63	147	0
13	1	12	18	97	105
14	1	6	30	191	0
15	0	7	37	183	1
Total	16	159	766	2376	105

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
1. I feel welcome when I visit this school.	99.6
2. This school provides a safe environment for learning	100.0
3. My child has up-to-date instructional tools (Books, computers, videos, etc.) that are used effectively	100.0
4. The school holds high academic expectations for my child	99.6
5. The holds high expectations of discipline for my child	99.6
6. I regularly read progress reports and notices sent home from school	100.0
7. Homework assignments are a valuable contribution to my child's learning.	100.0
8. My child has enough supplies, materials, and text books to help with his/her studies.	100.0
9. My child is receiving a quality education	100.0
10. The school keeps me informed about what goes on at the school	99.1
11. The school clearly tells me what the school's goals are	99.6
12. School property and building are clean and well maintained	96.5
13. I would like my younger children to attend the school.	99.6
14. I would recommend my child's school to other parents.	99.6
15. My child's attendance is monitored by the school calling about absences.	100

Evaluation

Because the number of respondents was low at 68.6%, the percentage of parents indicating satisfaction was 63.8% thus the measure was not met.

Goal 6: Absolute Measure

Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

Method

Tracking of Icahn Charter School 1 students is maintained by the Principal, using attendance records, and interactions with parents.

Results

97.35% of Icahn Charter School 1 students enrolled in 2009-10 returned to the school in 2010-11.

2010-11 Student Retention Rate

2009-10 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2009-10	Number of Students Who Returned in 2010-11	Retention Rate 2010-11 Re-enrollment ÷ (2009-10 Enrollment – Graduates)
303	28	295	97.35%

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

Year	Retention Rate
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	100.0%
2009-10	97.35%
2010-11	N/A

Goal 7: 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 Charter School 1 met its attendance measure. Two grades, 5, and 7 met the measure, while the remaining attendance levels were slightly below 95%. No attendance level was below 94%.

2010-11 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	94.6%
2	94.8%
3	94.1%
4	94.8%
5	95.1%
6	94.7%
7	96.2%
8	94.3%
Overall	95%

Evaluation

The Icahn Charter School 1 school-wide attendance rate met or slightly exceeded 95%

Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2006-07	95%
2007-08	95%
2008-09	95%
2009-10	95.3%
2010-11	95.0%

APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, each Kindergarten, Grade 1 through Grade 7 cohorts will halve the difference between their previous year's NCE and 50 NCE in English Language Arts on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Cohorts that have already achieved an average NCE of 50 will show an increase in their average NCE.

Method

In 2009-10 and 2010-11 Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) English Language Arts assessments were administered to students in Kindergarten and grades 1-7. These assessments allowed for the determination of positive or negative growth from one year to the next within each cohort. For purposes of determining success with the measure, comparisons of year-end assessments were made for each cohort group.

Results

In June 2009-10 and June 2010-11 the ITBS Reading and Language assessments were administered to students in kindergarten and grades 1-8.

A comparison of results led to the conclusion that in Reading, three cohorts, 3, 4, and 7 demonstrated an increase in NCE values, while four cohorts, 1, 2, 5 and 6 did not. In all cases but Cohort 2 (NCE=49) all NCE values exceeded 50.

A comparison of results led to the conclusion that in Language, three cohorts, 1, 3, and 5 demonstrated an increase in NCE values, while four cohorts 2, 4, and 6 did not. In all cases but Cohort 2 (NCE=49) all NCE values exceeded 50.

ITBS English Language Arts Pre and Post Assessment Scores for 2009-10 and 2010-10 – Test given in June of 2010 and 2011				
NCE Scores				
2009-10				
Grade	Cohort	# Students	Reading	Language
Kindergarten	1	39	74 (Vocabulary)	64
First	2	38	74	80
Second	3	37	52	53
Third	4	35	57	66
Fourth	5	39	58	58
Fifth	6	37	53	54
Sixth	7	40	54	55
Seventh	8	37	63	60
2010-11				
Kindergarten	New	38	65 (Vocabulary)	58
First	1	37	72	68
Second	2	40	49	49
Third	3	35	60	65
Fourth	4	35	59	62
Fifth	5	36	55	59

Sixth	6	38	51	52
Seventh	7	37	55	54

June to June Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE <u>Reading</u> scores – For NCE values below 50, cohort must score 50% or more of the difference between the 2009-10 score and 50. For NCS values higher than 50, the cohort must show and increase							
Year	Cohorts						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2009-10	74	74	52	57	58	53	54
2010-11	72	49	60	59	55	51	55
Measure Made	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES

June to June Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE <u>Language</u> scores – For NCE values below 50, cohort must score 50% or more of the difference between the 2009-10 score and 50. For NCS values higher than 50, the cohort must show and increase							
Year	Cohorts						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2009-10	64	80	53	66	58	54	55
2010-11	68	49	65	62	59	52	54
Measure Made	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO

Evaluation

Cohort 3 met the measure for both Reading and Language. Cohorts 4 and 7 met the measure for Reading, but not for Language. Cohorts 1 and 5 met the measure for Language, but not for Reading.

Goal 2 Each year, each Kindergarten, Grade 1 through Grade 7 cohorts will halve the difference between their previous year’s NCE and 50 NCE in Mathematics on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Cohorts that have already achieved an average NCE of 50 will show an increase in their average NCE.

Method

In 2009-10 and 2010-11 Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) Mathematics assessment was administered to students in Kindergarten and grades 1-7. These assessments allowed for determination of positive or negative growth from one year to the next within each cohort. For purposes of determining success with the measure, comparisons of year-end assessments were made for each cohort group

Results

In June 2009-10 and June 2010-11 the ITBS Mathematics assessment was administered to students in kindergarten and grades 1-8.

A comparison of results led to the conclusion that in Mathematics, three cohorts, 3, 4, and 7 demonstrated an increase in NCE values, while four cohorts, 1, 2, 5 and 6 did not. In all cases but Cohort 2 (NCE=39) all NCE values exceeded 50.

TBS Math Pre and Post Assessment Scores for 2009-10 and 2010-10 – Test given in June of 2010 and 2011			
NCE Scores			
2009-10			
Grade	Cohort	# Students	Math
Kindergarten	1	38	69
First	2	38	84
Second	3	37	45
Third	4	35	59
Fourth	5	39	66
Fifth	6	37	55
Sixth	7	40	59
Seventh	8	37	65
2010-10			
Kindergarten	New	36	62
First	1	38	67
Second	2	40	39
Third	3	35	64
Fourth	4	35	62
Fifth	5	36	63
Sixth	6	38	54
Seventh	7	37	62

June to June Comparison of ITBS Math NCE scores – For NCE values below 50, cohort must score 50% or more of the difference between the 2009-10 score and 50. For NCS values higher than 50, the cohort must show and increase							
Year	Cohorts						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2009-10	69	84	45	59	66	55	59
2010-11	67	39	64	62	63	54	62
Outcome	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES

Evaluation

Cohorts 1, 2, 5, and 6 did not meet the measure by demonstrating a decrease in NCS, while Cohorts 3, 4 and 7 met the measure by demonstrating an increase in NCE. All cohorts scored above 50 except Cohort 2 (NCE = 39).