

**ICAHN
CHARTER SCHOOL 2**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY
PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

July 31, 2011

By Brenda Carrasquilo-Silen

1640 Bronxdale Avenue
Bronx, NY 10462

718-716-8105

718-828-7308

Brenda Carrasquillo-Silen, Steven Sorokin, and Dr. Arthur H. Pritchard prepared this 2010-11 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	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
Tamara Delgado	Parent Guardian Representative

INTRODUCTION

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

Icahn Charter School 2 opened in September 2007 and initially serviced K through Grade 2. A grade has been added each year and this September, 2011 we will be opening as a grade K-6 school. A grade will be added each year culminating in grade eight.

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

Demographic Characteristics:

Bussing:

Our diverse ethnic student population is bussed to our school. Presently, we are approximately 71% bussed, which is an increase of 1% from last year. Approximately 3% of the students lost their bussing when we moved from District 8 to District 11 and were issued metro cards. Parents no longer had bus stops that were easily accessible to them and they had to decide whether or not the students would continue to be enrolled in our school because of the lack of transportation. Everyone worked with the Office of Pupil Transportation and bus stops that were further away for the parents, but within the OPT guidelines, were created and parents opted to walk further distances.

Student population:

The school is composed of 40.5% African American, 52.9% Hispanic, 2.3% Asian or native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander, 1.7% Asian, and 2.7% White children. We have a free and reduced lunch rate of 71.8%. Our instructional program is data driven and combines Core Knowledge with ongoing assessments.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2006-07														
2007-08	36	36	36											108
2008-09	39	40	35	24										138
2009-10	39	37	37	33	25									171
2010-11	40	39	37	30	34	35								215

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All Icahn Charter School 2 Students will become proficient readers of the English language.

Background

The English Language Arts Core Knowledge Curriculum is supported through the McMillan-McGraw Hill Reading Program supplemented by Classroom Leveled Libraries and the Waterford Early learning Program, which integrates the use of technology and fundamental reading instruction. Our Grade 3rd through 5th students were administered the New York State English Language Arts Examination for the first time in January 2011.

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 3 through 5 grades 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
5	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).

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	29	1	3	0	33
4	34	2	0	0	35
5	35	1	0	0	37
All	98	0	0	0	105

Results

All students in grades 4, and 5 in at least their second year achieved a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score. In grade 3 all but one student 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	96.55%	29
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	96.55%	29
4	All Students	100%	34
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	28
5	All Students	100%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	22
All	All Students	98.85%	98
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	98.85%	82

Evaluation

Icahn Charter School 2 met its measure as students demonstrated strong performances in grades 3 exceeded the required measure of 657, and grades 4 and 5 exceeded the required measure of 654 in each grade. 96.55% of grade 3 students achieved Scale Scores higher than 657. 100% of grade 4 and 5 students achieved Scale Scores higher than 654.

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.

Additional Evidence

Comparison of 2009-10 with 2010-11 scores shows grade 3 students continuing to show high academic performance. In 2009-10 all grade 3 students equaled or exceeded the Time Adjusted Level 3, while in 2010-11 all but one student did the same. Grade 4 student performance rose from 96% to 100%.

Cohort comparisons for students currently in grades 4 and 5 shows a maintenance of 100% among grade 4 students, and a slight increase among grade 5 students from 96% in 2009-10 to 100% in 2010-11.

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	N/A	N/A	96%	26	100%	33	96.55%	29
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	96%	25	100%	28
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	22
All	N/A	N/A	96%	26	98%	58	98.85%	79

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 2 significantly exceeded the results in every grade as compared to CSD #8. The results of Icahn Charter School 2 student performance on the 2010-11 NYS ELA assessment for at least two years show they out-scored District #8 students at each grade level as follows: Grade 3 by 60.25%; Grade 4 by 59.3%; and Grade 5 by 59.8%.

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	96.55%	29	36.3	2290
4	100%	28	40.7	2333
5	100%	22	40.2	2420
All	98.85%	79	39.0	7043

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

Icahn Charter School 2 has significantly exceeded the local district in each of its three testing years.

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	N/A	N/A	100%	68.3%	100%	38.6%	96.55%	36.3
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	60.8%	36.2%	100%	40.7
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	40.2
All	N/A	N/A	100%	68.3%	80.4%	37.4%	98.85%	39.0

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

The data were not available to assess this comparative measure.

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

The data were not available to assess this comparative measure.

Additional Evidence

The data were not available to assess this comparative measure.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School	Grades	Percent	Number	Actual	Predicted	Effect
--------	--------	---------	--------	--------	-----------	--------

Year		Eligible for Free Lunch	Tested			Size
2006-07						
2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						

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

Both cohorts, current Grade 4 and 5 students achieved their targets.

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	28	100%	100%	100%	YES
5	22	96%	100%	100%	YES
All	50	98%	100%	100%	YES

Evaluation

The measure was met

Additional Evidence

In 2010-11, both Icahn Charter School 2 cohorts, students in Grades 4 and 5 met targets.

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008-09	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	4	1	1
2010-11	4, 5	2	2

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Icahn Charter School 2 achieved its first absolute measure, as the students of each Grade exceeded the 75% target as follows: Grade 3 – 96.55%; Grade 4 – 100%; and Grade 5 – 100%.

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

Icahn Charter School 2 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 2 students in two cohorts, current Grade 4 and 5 met or maintained their targets. For two years in a row, the current Grade 5 cohort achieved 100%.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform 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 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.	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

Action Plan

Icahn Charter School 2 had a testing year with impressive results. While the change in scoring had a significant impact on outcome of percentages in each Level, Icahn Charter School 2 students significantly outscored their peers in the local district.

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

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All Icahn Charter School 2 students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts.

Background

Mathematics skills and concepts are integrated into all areas of instruction within our Core Knowledge Curriculum. Professional development for our staff has been provided by a Mathematics Consultant that supports the integration of literature with mathematics. The McMillan-McGraw Hill Mathematics Program is used within classroom instruction and provides the basis for differentiated instructional practices during target assistance sessions.

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 5th 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.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	656
4	655
5	653

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

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).

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	29	1	3	4	33
4	34	2	0	1	35
5	35	1	0	2	37
All	98	4	3	7	105

Results

In 2010-11 all students, including those enrolled for at least two years in each of the three tested grades exceeded the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score.

**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%	29
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	29
4	All Students	100%	34
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	28
5	All Students	100%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	22
All	All Students	100%	98
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100%</u>	79

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
-------	---

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

	and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	N/A	100%	25	100%	29	100%	29
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	96%	23	100%	28
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	22
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	79

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 2 students at each grade level out scored their peers in the local school district as follows: Grade 3 by 54.3%; Grade 4 by 45%; and Grade 5 by 43%.

**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	100%	29	45.7	2337
4	100%	28	55.0	2364
5	100%	22	57.0	2467
All	100%	79	52.6	7162

Evaluation

The Measure was met.

Additional Evidence

Icahn Charter School 2 has significantly exceeded the local district in each of its three testing years.

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	N/A	N/A	100%	25%	100%	29	100%	45.7
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	96%	23	100%	55.0
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	57.0
All	N/A	N/A	100%	25%	100%	26%	100%	52.6

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

The data were not available to assess this comparative measure.

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:
N/A

Evaluation

The data were not available to assess this comparative measure.

Additional Evidence

The data were not available to assess this comparative measure.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

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

Both cohorts, current Grade 4 and 5 students achieved their targets.

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	28	100	100	100	YES
5	22	96	98	100	YES
All	50	98	99	100	YES

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

In 2010-11, both Icahn Charter School 2 cohorts, students in Grades 4 and 5 met targets.

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008-09	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	4	1	1
2010-11	4, 5	2	2

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Icahn Charter School 2 achieved its first absolute measure, as the students of each Grade exceeded the 75% target as follows: Grade 3 – 96.55%; Grade 4 – 100%; and Grade 5 – 100%.

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

Icahn Charter School 2 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 2 students in two cohorts, current Grade 4 and 5 met or maintained their targets. For two years in a row, the current Grade 5 cohort achieved 100%.

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 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.	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

Action Plan

Icahn Charter School 2 met all of its measures. Icahn Charter School 2 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 2 students will demonstrate competency in understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

Background

The Icahn Charter School 2 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 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 ICAHN 2 4th grade students achieved either Level 3 or Level 4 on the NYS 4th grade Science assessment, as did all students who were enrolled in at least their second year.

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	14	20	34	34
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0	0	14	17	31	31

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

**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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	97	39	100	31
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	97	39	100	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

2011-12 Science performance scores from the local school district were not available when the report was written.

**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	31	-	-

Evaluation

2011-12 Science performance scores are unable from the local district

Additional Evidence

2011-12 Science performance scores are unable from the local district

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	92%	-	100%	-
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	-	N/A	-

Summary

Icahn Charter School 2 4th grade students, including those enrolled in at least their second year scored Level 3 or 4 on the 2011-12 NYS 4th Grade Science assessment.

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 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.	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 2 has met the NCLB requirement for the 2010-11 school year.

Evaluation

We began NYS testing in the 2008-09 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.

Additional Evidence

As illustrated below, Icahn Charter School 2 has met the NCLB requirement for the last 3 years.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2005-06	N/A
2007-08	N/A
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 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. The survey, provided in both English and Spanish is presented below:

2010-11 Results

Responses pertaining to 15 questions contained in the 2010-2011 Parent Satisfaction Survey were received. The table below depicts the number of responses received which were 191 out of 202 families. The response rate was 94.5% which is a 1.77% decrease in the number of responses for this year.

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction Survey Responses

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
191	202	94.5%

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
1. I feel welcome when I visit the school.	98.7
2. This school provides a safe environment for learning.	100
3. My child has up-to date instructional tools.	100
4. School holds high academic expectations.	99.0
5. Schools hold high discipline expectations.	100
6 Parent regularly reads progress report and notices sent from school	100
7. Homework assignments are a valuable contribution to my child's learning	100
8. Sufficient material provided by school to aid in learning and homework.	100
9. Child receiving a quality education.	100

10. The school keeps me informed about what goes on at the school.	98.7
11. School's goal to parent(s) are clear.	98.0
12. School property and building are clean and will maintained.	100
13. Parent would send other siblings to our school	98.0
14. Parent will recommend the school to other parents.	98.0
15. My child's attendance is monitored by the school calling about absences.	96.7

Evaluation

Icahn Charter School 2 experienced a decrease of 1.77% decrease in the number of parent surveys returned. Next year, outreach efforts will continue to be conducted to encourage parents to complete and return survey forms, particularly during parent/guardian meetings.

Compared with 2009-10, the level of parental satisfaction regarding homework assignments (#7) rose 3%. The gain is attributed to grade-level parent workshops, specifically in the area of mathematics. Parents learned to solve problem strategies, and therefore had a greater ability to understand the homework assigned their children. In turn they were more able to help to support their children at home.

Compared with 2009-10, the level of parental satisfaction regarding clarity of school goals (#11) dropped 2%. For academic year 2011-2012, ICAHN 2 will incorporate school goals at each parent meeting/workshop to reduce uncertainties they might have regarding goals and their purposes.

Compared with 2009-10, the level of parental satisfaction regarding the school's monitoring of student attendance (#15) rose 2.7%. The gain is attributed to the hiring of a guidance counselor in 2010-11 and her outreach efforts.

Compared with 2009-10, the level of parental satisfaction regarding feeling welcome (#1) dropped 1%.

During the school year, ICAHN 2 was moved into a new building, housing an additional two schools. Parents had to re-orientate themselves to the new security protocols in place. During future parent meetings, we will address the need for security procedures so parents understand the value of such procedures.

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

Results

95.4% of Icahn Charter School 2 students who completed the 2009-10 school year continued 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)
175	N/A	167	95.4%

Evaluation

Icahn Charter School 2 exceeded the measure.

Additional Evidence

Year	Retention Rate
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	91.66%
2009-10	92.19%
2010-11	95.4%

Goal 6: 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

While attendance percentages varied, three grades, 3rd, 4th, and 5th exceeded the measure, while grades 1 and 2 were below. The change in school location, and transportation issues had slightly negative impact on attendance during the transition period.

2010-11 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	89.7 %
2	92.2%
3	95.6%
4	95.2%
5	95.8%
Overall	95.2%

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	94.9%
2008-09	94.0%
2009-10	94.3%
2010-11	95.2%