

ICAHN CHARTER SCHOOL 3

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY
PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 31, 2011

By Migda L. Agosto

108-110 West 174th Street,
Bronx, NY 10453

Telephone: (718) 294-4827

Fax: (718) 294-4952

Icahn Charter School 3 – 2010-2011 Accountability Plan Progress Report

Migda Agosto and Dr. Arthur 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
Robert Sancho	Member
Seymour Fliegel	Member
Edward J. Shanahan	Member
Karen Mandelbaum	Member - Parent

INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Icahn Charter School 3 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 3 opened in September 2008 and served grades kindergarten-2. In September 2009 grade 3 was added, and in September 2010 grade 4 was added. Our school is composed of 61% African American, 33% Latino, 2% Asian/Pacific and .8% multiracial, with a free and reduced lunch rate of 79%. Our instructional program is data driven and combines Core Knowledge with ongoing assessments. Children who have demonstrated a deficiency in ELA or Mathematics as evident by the results of an assessment test are placed in our Targeted Assistance Program. Our Targeted Assistance Program consists of in school remediation, and after school tutoring. We have an extended school day of 7.5 hours and an extended school year ranging from 190 to 192 days of instruction.

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	NA	NA	NA											
2007-08	NA	NA	NA											
2008-09	36	36	35	-										107
2009-10	38	38	38	32										146
2010-11	34	37	37	34	37									179

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All Icahn Charter School 3 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 monthly assessments. Our ELA specialist provides small group instruction for 45 minutes a day 5-days a week to those children who have demonstrated a deficiency in any area of reading. Teachers and ELA specials meet to provide remediation lessons for the targeted students. The process of ongoing assessments ensure that the program will closely monitor the student's progress and promote the student out of the Targeted Assistance where appropriate, as well as accept new students as required by their practice tests and teacher recommendation. Teachers are provided with professional development at the beginning of the school year followed by monthly on-going professional development 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 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 4th 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).

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	6	5	0	35
4	37	2	2	0	37
All	72	8	7	0	72

Results

All grade 3 students (74.3%) and those enrolled in at least their second year (74.5%) scored just below the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score benchmark of 75%. All grade students (86.4%) and those enrolled in at least their second year (93.5%) scored well above the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score benchmark of 75%. All tested Icahn Charter School 3 students (80.35%) and those in at least their second year (84%) scored well above the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score benchmark of 75%.

**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	74.3%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>74.5%</u>	34
4	All Students	86.4%	37
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>93.5%</u>	31
All	All Students	80.35%	72
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>84%</u>	65

Evaluation

The measure was met as all students and those in at least their second year exceeded the Time Adjusted Level 3 benchmark.

Additional Evidence

Grade 4 students scored higher in 2010 than they had in 2009 by 11.2%

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

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.

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	N/A	N/A	82.3%	32	74.5%	34
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	93.5%	31
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	82.3%	32	84.0%	65

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

Both Icahn Charter School 3 3rd and 4th grade students out-performed their peers in District 9. 3rd grade students scored 23.1% higher, while 4th grade students scored 27% higher

**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	54.3%	35	31.2	2878
4	59.5%	37	32.5	2775
All	56.9%	72	31.85	5653

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

During 2009-10 Icahn Charter School 3 grade 4 students were compared with District 8 students. In 2010-11 Icahn Charter School 3 grade 4 students were compared with District 9 students. In both years Icahn Charter School 3 4th grade students out-performed their peers in the two districts.

**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	N/A	N/A	82.3%	32%	54.3%	36.3%
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	59.5%	40.7%
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	82.3%	32%	57.0%	38.5%

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

Icahn Charter School 3 began its operations in 2008-09. NYS 3rd grade ELA assessments were given for the first time in 2009-10. In 2009-10, with one grade tested, comparisons cannot be made.

2009-10 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Not Applicable

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

2009-10 was the first year Icahn Charter School 3 students participated in NYS ELA testing, grade-level comparisons cannot be made. Comparisons cannot be made until the release of 2010-11 data.

Additional Evidence

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2008-09	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	3					

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

ELA performance scores of the Icahn Charter School 3 cohort currently in Grade 4 remained essentially the same at almost 60%, which was 15% below the target measure.

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	29	59.3%	75%	59.5%	NO
All	29	59.3%	75%	59.5%	NO

Evaluation

While Icahn Charter School 3 4th grade students demonstrated a significant increase from 2009-10 to 2010-11, based on Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Scores, the measure, based on students achieving Level 3 or 4 on the NYS Report Card was not met.

Additional Evidence

In 2010-11, the Icahn Charter School 3 cohort, consisting of students in Grade 4 did not meet their target.

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	4	0	1

Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State English Language Arts exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following District and similar school: District 9, PS 64, PS 126, and PS 230

Method

Icahn Charter School 3 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 3 had tested students with the result of the same grades in the surrounding schools.

Results

Icahn Charter School 3 students exceeded their peers in all surrounding similar schools.

2010-2011 NYS ELA Percent Level 3 or higher by all Students in District 9 and Comparable Schools					
School	District 9	PS 64	PS 126	PS 230	ICAHN 3
Grade 3	31.3	21.4	32.7	24.2	54.3%
Grade 4	32.6	18	23.5	27.9	59.5%
Total	31.95	19.7	28.1	25.95	57.0%

Evaluation

Icahn Charter School 3 met the measure by exceeding or equaling student performance all surrounding similar schools.

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Icahn Charter School 3 achieved its first absolute measure, as the students of each Grade exceeded the 75% target as follows: Grade 3 – 74.5%; Grade 4 – 93.5%; Total achievement – 84%

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

Icahn Charter School 3 achieved its first comparative measure as the students of each Grade out scored their peers in local District 9.

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

Icahn Charter School 3 students in one cohort, the current Grade 4, did not meet their target.

Icahn Charter School 3 students out scores their peers in District 9, and the comparison schools: PS 64, PS 126, and PS 230.

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	Achieved

Icahn Charter School 3 – 2010-2011 Accountability Plan Progress Report

	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 English Language Arts exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following District and similar school: District 9, PS 64, PS 126, and PS 230	Achieved

Action Plan

Icahn Charter School 3 had its second testing year. Icahn Charter School 3 students outscored their peers in District #9 and the schools identified by Icahn Charter School 3 for comparison in both years. In the coming year we plan to analyze the impact of our instruction on at risk students, and those scoring in the high Level 2 to low Level 3 range to identify possible changes we can introduce to support their increased academic achievement.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All Icahn Charter School 3 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 Connect, workbooks, and a strong emphasis on hands on learning and monthly assessments. Our Mathematics specialist provides small group instruction for 45 minutes a day 5 days a week to those children who have demonstrated a deficiency in any area of Mathematics. The results of practice tests are reviewed with the principal, teachers, mathematics specialist, and Mathematics consultant in order to provide remediation lessons for the targeted students. Our process of ongoing assessments ensures that the program will closely monitor the child's progress and promote the students out of targeted assistance where appropriate, as well as accept new students as required by practice tests and teacher recommendation. The Mathematics program is supervised by the Principal and with additional support from a Mathematics Consultant from the NYC Mathematics Project at Lehman College. The mathematics consultant is responsible for demonstration lessons and participates in developing teaching strategies. The mathematics consultant also provides professional development during common planning periods.

Goal 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 and 4th 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
-------	--------------------------

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).

	Level 3
3	656
4	655

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	6	5	0	35
4	37	2	2	0	37
All	72	8	7	0	72

Results

97 % of Icahn Charter School 3 Grade 3 students and 100% of Grade 4 students who were enrolled in at least their second year scored at or above 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	97.1%	35
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	97.0%	34
4	All Students	95.4%	37
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	100%	31
All	All Students	97.05%	72
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	98.5%	65

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

Icahn Charter School 3 grade 4 students scored 100% in both 2009-10 and 2010-11. Their grade 3 peers were close behind with 97%.

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

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	32	97%	34
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	31
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	32	98.5%	65

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

Both Icahn Charter School 3 3rd and 4th grade students out-performed their peers in District 9. 3rd grade students scored 17% higher, while 4th grade students scored 28.8% higher

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	64.7%	34	38.6	2967
4	90.3%	31	42.7	2862
All	77.5%	65	40.65	5829

Evaluation

The measure was met for each grade and for the school. Icahn Charter School 3 students out scored their District 9 peers by 36.85%.

Additional Evidence

During 2009-10 Icahn Charter School 3 grade 4 students were compared with District 8 students. In 2010-11 Icahn Charter School 3 grade 4 students were compared with District 9 students. In both years Icahn Charter School 3 4th grade students out-performed their peers in the two districts.

**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	N/A	N/A	90.6%	46.1%	64.7%	38.6
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90.3%	42.7
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	90.6%	46.1%	77.5%	40.65

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

Data from NYSED were not available, thus the measure could not be assessed.

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

Data from NYSED were not available, thus the measure could not be assessed.

Additional Evidence

Data from NYSED were not available, thus the measure could not be assessed.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
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

Icahn Charter School grade 4 students exceeded the 75% target both years. Their performance remained at approximately the same percent and in doing so did not meet the measure.

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	31	90.6%	75%	90.3%	NO
All	31	90.6%	75%	90.3%	NO

Evaluation

The measure was not met. While students exceeded the target by 15.3%, they were .3% lower in 2010-11 than in 2009-10.

Additional Evidence

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	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	4	0	1

Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State English Language Arts exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following District and similar school: District 9, PS 64, PS 126, and PS 230

Method

Icahn Charter School 3 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 3 had tested students with the result of the same grades in the surrounding schools.

Results

Icahn Charter School 3 significantly exceeded all surrounding similar schools.

2010-2011 NYS ELA Percent Level 3 or higher by all Students in District 9 and Comparable Schools					
School	District 9	PS 64	PS 126	PS 230	ICAHN 3
Grade 3	38.6	24.1	25.0	38.2	64.7%
Grade 4	42.7	17.7	30.7	34.7	90.3%
Total	40.65	20.9	27.85	36.45	77.5%

Evaluation

Icahn Charter School 3 met the measure by exceeded student performance all surrounding similar schools

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Icahn Charter School 3 achieved its first absolute measure, as the students of each Grade exceeded the 75% target as follows: Grade 3 – 64.7%; Grade 4 – 90.3%; Total achievement – 77.5%

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

Icahn Charter School 3 achieved its first comparative measure as the students of each Grade out scored their peers in local District 9.

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

Icahn Charter School 3 students in one cohort, the current Grade 4, did not meet their growth target, but scored 90.3%, .3% lower than in 2009-10

Icahn Charter School 3 students out scores their peers in District 9, and the comparison schools: PS 64, PS 126, and PS 230.

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	N/A

Icahn Charter School 3 – 2010-2011 Accountability Plan Progress Report

	State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	
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 District and similar school: District 9, PS 64, PS 126, and PS 230	Achieved

Action Plan

Icahn Charter School 3 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 3 students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

Background

The Icahn Charter School 3 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

34 of all 37 (92%) ICAHN 3 students scored at either Level 3 or Level 4. 31 of 32 (97%) students enrolled in at least their second year scored at either Level 3 or Level 4 on the 2011 NYS Science assessment.

**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	1	2	24	10	34	37
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	1	0	21	10	31	32

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

ICAHN # 4th grade students enrolled in at least their second year exceeded the target by 22%.

**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	N/A	N/A	97%	32
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	97%	32

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Results

District scores were not available for the production of 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	97%	32	N/A	N/A

Evaluation

The measure could not be assessed.

Additional Evidence

The measure could not be assessed.

**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	N/A	N/A	97%	-
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	97%	-

Summary

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.	Data Not Available

Action Plan

As stated in the background statement, 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 3 has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009-10 and in 2010-11 thus it is a school in good standing.

Evaluation

The measure was met.

Additional Evidence

Given the requirement for AYP in two consecutive years, 2010-11 is the first year Good Standing status could be determined.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2005-06	N/A
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	N/A
2009-10	N/A
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 Icahn Charter School 3'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 3. The survey contains fifteen (15) questions on the school's performance with options to select from A to D with A equaling poor and D equaling excellent. After the collection of the surveys, all questions are tallied with notification of how many surveys were not returned to the school. Below is a copy of the survey provided to the parents/guardians.

PARENT SURVEY JUNE 2010

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

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

1. I feel welcome when I visit this school.

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

- Poor – nunca*
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
- Good – bien*
- Excellent – excelente*

2. This school provides a safe environment for learning.

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

- Poor – nunca*
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
- Good – bien*
- Excellent – excelente*

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

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

- Poor – nunca*
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
- Good – bien*
- Excellent – excelente*

4. The school holds high academic expectations for my child.
La escuela tiene esperanzas académicas de el nivel mas alto para mi niña(o).
- *Poor – nunca*
 - *Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
 - *Good – bien*
 - *Excellent – excelente*
5. The school holds high expectations of discipline for my child.
La escuela tiene esperanzas de comportamiento de el nivel mas alto para mi niña(o).
- *Poor – nunca*
 - *Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
 - *Good – bien*
 - *Excellent – excelente*
6. I regularly read progress reports and notices sent home from school.
Yo regularmente leo los noticieros y cartas que la escuela me manda.
- *Poor – nunca*
 - *Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
 - *Good – bien*
 - *Excellent – excelente*
7. Homework assignments are a valuable contribution to my child’s learning.
Las tareas asignados son una contribución valerosa para la educación de mi niña(o).
- *Poor – nunca*
 - *Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
 - *Good – bien*
 - *Excellent – excelente*
8. My child has enough supplies, materials, and text books to help with his/her studies.
Mi niña(o) tiene suficiente materiales para ayudarle con su estudios.
- *Poor – nunca*
 - *Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
 - *Good – bien*
 - *Excellent – excelente*
9. My child is receiving a quality education.
Mi niña(o) esta recibiendo una educación de alta calidad.
- *Poor – nunca*
 - *Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
 - *Good – bien*
 - *Excellent – excelente*
10. The school keeps me informed about what goes on at the school.
La escuela me mantiene informada(o) de todo lo que sucede en la escuela.
- *Poor – nunca*
 - *Satisfactory – satisfactorio*
 - *Good – bien*
 - *Excellent – excelente*

11. The school clearly tells me what the school's goals are.

La escuela me explica claramente lo que aspira lograr.

- Poor – nunca
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio
- Good – bien
- Excellent – excelente

12. School property and building are clean and well maintained.

La escuela y las aceras están limpias y bien mantenidas.

- Poor – nunca
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio
- Good – bien
- Excellent – excelente

13. I would like my younger children to attend this school.

Me gustaría que mis hijas/hijos menores asistieran esta escuela.

- Poor – nunca
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio
- Good – bien
- Excellent – excelente
- N/A

14. I would recommend my child's school to other parents.

Yo recomendaría esta escuela a otros padres.

- Poor – nunca
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio
- Good – bien
- Excellent – excelente

15. My child's attendance is monitored by the school calling about absences.

La escuela me llama cuando mi niña(o) a faltado clase.

- Poor – nunca
- Satisfactory – satisfactorio
- Good – bien
- Excellent – excelente

Current grade of my child _____

Grado presente de mi niña(o) _____

My child will be returning to this school.

Yes _____

No _____

Mi niña(o) regresara a esta escuela.

Si _____

No _____

If no, please explain: _____

Si su niña(o) no regresara, favor de explicar: _____

Other Comments:

Otros Comentarios:

Results

126 responses were received from members of 149 families, resulting in an 84.56 % response rate.

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction Survey Responses

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
126	149	84.56%

Question	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	N/A	Total
1	60	41	21	4	-	126
2	58	49	17	2	-	126
3	63	49	12	2	-	126
4	80	40	6	0	-	126
5	67	40	18	1	-	126
6	83	38	5	0	-	126
7	81	38	6	1	-	126
8	77	40	9	0	-	126
9	76	42	6	2	-	126
10	64	43	15	4	-	126
11	67	43	12	4	-	126
12	47	48	25	6	-	126
13	47	24	4	5	46	126
14	70	39	8	8	1	126
15	62	45	9	5	5	126

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
4 - The school holds high academic expectations for my child.	100%
6 - I regularly read progress reports and notices sent home from school	100%
7 - Homework assignments are a valuable contribution to my child's learning	99%
8 - My child has enough supplies, materials, and text books to help with his/her studies.	100%
9 - My child is receiving a quality education.	98%

Evaluation

The measure was 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 3 students is maintained by the Principal, using attendance records, and interactions with parents. Student attrition data are also maintained.

Results

90% of Icahn Charter School 3 students who were enrolled at the school in 2009-10 returned 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)
146	-	131	90%

Evaluation

The measure was met

Additional Evidence

Year	Retention Rate
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	N/A
2009-10	N/A
2010-11	90%

Goal 7: Absolute Measure

Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 90 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

The overall average attendance for 2010-2011 was 94.23%, with grades 1 through 4 scoring as follows: Grade 1 – 92.11%, Grade 2 – 93.52%, and Grade 3 – 95.23%, and grade 4 - 96.09%

2010-11 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	92.11%
2	93.52%
3	95.23%
4	96.09%
Overall	94.23%

Evaluation

Icahn Charter School 3 continued to demonstrate attendance gains over previous years, and met its measure.

Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	92.6%
2009-10	92.5%
2010-11	94.23%

APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, each Kindergarten, Grade 1 and Grade 2 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

2008-2009 is the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 3. Pre- and post- English Language Arts assessments were administered each year since. Pre-assessment at the beginning of the school year served to identify students in need of targeted assistance and provide students with continuous on-going academic support. Post assessments allowed for comparison of growth at the end of the school year. For purposes of determining success with the measure, comparisons of year-end assessments were made for each cohort group.

Results

2008-2009 was the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 3, which served Kindergarten through grade 2. In 2009-10 grade 3 was added, and in 2010-11 grade 4 was added. Pre and post test results were acquired through test administration, with results presented in the table below. To assess success with the optional measure, June to June comparisons of cohorts 1 through 4 were made. Three of the cohorts, 1, 2 and 3 achieved a lower NCE value in 2010-11 than they had in 2009-10. Cohort 4 students demonstrated a gain.

The ITBS Reading assessment was administered to Kindergarten students in Fall 2010 and again in Spring 2011. They achieved a significant gain by increasing from 43.63 in the Fall to 72.90 in the Spring.

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
Kindergarten	1	38	65.55
First	2	33	62.39
Second	3	34	55.75
Third	4	32	46.43
Fourth	5	32	55.10
2010-11			
Kindergarten	New Cohort	30	72.90
First Grade	1	33	57.94
Second Grade	2	34	35.35
Third Grade	3	32	44.43
Fourth Grade	4	32	56.03

June to June Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE Reading 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 an increase				
Years	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
2009-10	65.55	62.39	55.75	46.43
2010-11	57.94	35.35	44.43	56.03
Outcome	Measure Not Made	Measure Not Made	Measure Not Made	Measure Made

Fall to Spring Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE Reading scores among Kindergarten students – 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 an increase		
Administration	# Students	NCE Score
Fall 10-11	30	43.63
Spring 10-11	30	72.90
Outcome	-	Measure was made

Evaluation

Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 did not meet the measure. Cohort 4 made the measure. Kindergarten students also demonstrated growth in Reading during 2010-11 as they achieved 43.63 in the Fall and 72.90 in the Spring.

Goal 2 Each year, each Kindergarten, Grade 1 and Grade 2 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

2008-2009 is the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 3. Pre- and post- Mathematics assessments were administered each year since. Pre-assessment at the beginning of the school year served to identify students in need of targeted assistance and provide students with continuous ongoing academic support. Post assessments allowed for comparison of growth at the end of the school year. For purposes of determining success with the measure, comparisons of year-end assessments were made for each cohort group.

Results

2008-2009 was the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 3, which served Kindergarten through grade 2. In 2009-10 grade 3 was added, and in 2010-11 grade 4 was added. Pre and post test results were acquired through test administration, with results presented in the table below. To assess success with the optional measure, June to June comparisons of cohorts 1 through 4 were made. Three of the cohorts, 1, 2 and 4 achieved a higher NCE value in 2010-11 than they had in 2009-10. Cohort 3 students demonstrated a loss.

Kindergarten student growth was determined through a comparison of Fall and Spring administrations of ITBS in Reading. Kindergarten students increased their NCE Math scores by 6.87 NCEs.

ITBS 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	52.61
First	2	33	49.84
Second	3	34	48.91
Third	4	32	56.00
2010-11			
Kindergarten	New	30	55.13
First Grade	1	33	57.93
Second Grade	2	34	56.06
Third Grade	3	32	30.73
Fourth Grade	4	32	60.50

June to June Comparison of ITBS Math NCE scores				
Years	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3	Cohort 4
2008-09	52.61	49.84	48.91	56.00
2009-10	57.93	56.06	30.73	60.50
Outcome	Measure Made	Measure Made	Measure Not Made	Measure Made

Fall to Spring Comparison of ITBS Math NCE Reading scores among Kindergarten students – 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 an increase		
Administration	# Students	NCE Score
Fall 10-11	30	48.26
Spring 10-11	30	55.13
Outcome	-	Measure was made

Evaluation

Students of cohorts 1, 2, and 4 made the measure. Cohort 3 students did not meet the measure. Kindergarten students demonstrated success in Math with a 6.87 gain between Fall and Spring administrations of the ITBS Math assessment.