

**ICAHN  
CHARTER SCHOOL 4  
2011-12 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 15, 2012

By Michelle Allen

1500 Pelham Parkway  
South Bronx, New York 10461  
Phone: (718) 828-0034  
Fax: (718) 828-0664

Michelle Allen, Principal, and Dr. Arthur H. Pritchard, consultant prepared this 2011-12 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Gail Golden	Chairperson
Carl C. Icahn	Member
Julie Goodyear	Secretary
Robert Sancho	Officer
Seymour Fliegel	Officer
Edward J. Shanahan	Officer
Karen Mandelbaum	Officer

**Michelle Allen has served as the Principal since 2010.**

## INTRODUCTION

The mission of Icahn Charter School 4 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 4 opened in September 2010 and served grades kindergarten through second grade. Our school is composed of 63.3% African American and 36.7% Latin with a free and reduced lunch rate of 88.9%. 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
2007-08	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2009-10	36	35	38	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	109
2010-11	37	40	38	31	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	146
2011-12	39	37	39	33	32	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	180

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will become proficient readers of the English Language

#### Background

Our ELA curriculum follows the Core Knowledge sequence and is comprised of McGraw-Hill readers, workbooks, a strong emphasis on writing, extensive classroom libraries and 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

In 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12, 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.<sup>1</sup>

#### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3 through 4 grade in April 2012. 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, 2010-11, and 2010-12, 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 scores<sup>1</sup>, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	657
4	654

<sup>1</sup> 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.

**2011-12 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>2</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	33	2	0	0	33
4	32	8	2	0	32
All	65	10	2	11	76

**Results**

All ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scored above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores.

**Charter School Performance on 2011-12 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	100	33
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	29
4	All Students	100	32
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	26
All	All Students	100	65
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	55

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Additional Evidence**

As 2011-2012 was the second year ICAHN 4 served 3<sup>rd</sup> grade student comparisons with other years. In 2011-12 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students scored 100% as compared with 87% one year ago.

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

## 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 in 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12							
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	-	-	-	-	87	31	100	29
4	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	26
All	--	-	-	-	87	31	100	55

### 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, which for 2011-12 is 148. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

### Results

ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students achieved a Performance Index value of 197, 49 points higher than the 2011-12 AMO.

### Calculation of 2011-12 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3,4	0	2	38	25	65

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 3 & + & 58.5 & + & 38.5 & = & 100 \\
 & & & & + & 38 & + & 25 & = & 97 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{197}
 \end{array}$$

### Evaluation

The measure was made.

**Additional Evidence**

ICAHN 4 students achieved Performance Index values which exceeded the AMO in both 2010-11 and 2011-12.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2008-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	162
2009-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	169
2010-11	3	31	3	16	77	3	176	122
2011-12	3,4	65	0	3	58.5	38.5	197	148

**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**

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

**Results**

ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students out scored their CSD 11 peers by an average 57 percent. 3<sup>rd</sup> graders out scores their CSD 11 peers by 60.2%, while 4<sup>th</sup> graders outscored their CSD 11 peers by 53.8%. Both grades scored 100% proficiency on the NYS 2011-12 ELA Exam.

**2011-12 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	100	29	39.8	3260
4	100	26	46.2	3084
All	<b>100</b>	55	<b>43.0</b>	6344

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

## Additional Evidence

Current 4<sup>th</sup> graders outscored their CSD 11 peers both years by 50.3 (2010-11) and 53.8 (2011-12) respectively. Current 3<sup>rd</sup> graders outscored their CSD 11 peers by 60.2%.

### 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							
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	-	-	-	-	80.6	30.3	100	39.8
4	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	46.2
All	-	-	-	-	80.6	30.3	100	43.0

#### 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. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of family income data, the 2011-12 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2010-11 results, the most recent one available.

#### Results

IN 2010-11 ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students achieved an Effect Size of 1.89, well above the required 0.3.

**2010-11 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		<b>31</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>1.89</b>
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All	<b>54</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>80.6</b>	<b>51.8</b>	<b>28.8</b>	<b>1.89</b>

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

**Evaluation**

The measure was met.

**Additional Evidence**

ICAHN 4 students demonstrated "Higher than expected to a large degree"

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

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2007-08	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008-09	-	-	-	-	-	-
2009-10	-	-	-	-	-	-
2010-11	4	85.7	31	80.6	51.8	1.89

**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 2011-12 and also have a state exam score in 2010-11. 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 school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students taking a state exam in both years.

## Results

The first ICAHN 4 student cohort, completing 3<sup>rd</sup> grade in 2010-11, gained 29.7 the percent of students demonstrating proficiency.

### Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2010-11 to 2011-12

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2010-11	Target	2011-12	
4	26	80.3	75	100	YES
All	26	80.3	75	100	YES

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

## Additional Evidence

### Cohort Performance on State English Language Arts Exam

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2008-09	-	-	-
2009-10	-	-	-
2010-11	-	-	-
2011-12	4	1	1

### Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students performing at or above Level 3 on the English Language Arts exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools with local School district 11: PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS./IS. 194

## Method

ICAHN 4 tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which ICAHN 4 had tested students and the result of grade 4 in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

ICAHN 4 significantly exceeded all surrounding similar schools.

2011-12 NYS Math – Comparison of All Student Performance on the ELA assessment – Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 – Icahn 4 with District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 103, PS/IS 194						
Grade	District	School				
	11	PS 103	PS 83	PS 106	PS/IS 194	Icahn CS 4
3	39.8	43.2	66.9	48.7	39.9	100
4	46.2	36.5	58.5	57.8	56.2	100
Total	43.0	39.8	62.7	53.2	48.2	100

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students performed in a manner, which resulted in all measures being met.

They surpassed the first absolute measure of 75% by 25% as they scored 100%.

The Performance Index value achieved by ICAHN 4 students was 197 and surpassed the AMO by 49 points.

ICAHN 4 students outscored their peers in District 11, and in the following schools: PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/IS 194.

ICAHN 4 students achieved an Effect Size value of 1.89 the 2010-11 comparative performance analysis. Their achievement was well above the required value of 0.3.

ICAHN 4 4<sup>th</sup> grade students achieved 100% in 2011-12 as compared with 80.3 in 2010-11 thereby demonstrating growth in math performance.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students 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 enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved

Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved
Growth	On the 2011-12 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2010-11 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Achieved
Optional	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/IS 194	Achieved

**Action Plan**

ICAHN 4 had its first testing year. ICAHN 4 students outscored their peers in District #11 and the schools identified by ICAHN 4 for comparison. 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 1: Mathematics**  
 Students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts

**Background**

Our Mathematics curriculum follows the Core Knowledge sequence and is comprised of 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**

In 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12, 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 examination.<sup>3</sup>

## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 4 through 4 grade in April 2012. 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, 2010-11, and 2010-12, 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 scores<sup>1</sup>, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	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.

### 2011-12 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>4</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	33	2	0	0	33
4	32	8	2	0	32
All	65	10	2	0	65

## Results

All ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scored above Time Adjusted Cut Scores established for 2011-12.

### Charter School Performance on 2011-12 State Mathematics Exam

<sup>3</sup> 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).

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

**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	33
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	29
4	All Students	100	32
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	26
All	All Students	100	65
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	55

**Evaluation**

The Measure was met.

**Additional Evidence**

ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students continued to score 100% in Math, based on the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score. 4<sup>th</sup> graders scored 100% two years in a row.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 in 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12							
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	-	-	-	-	100	31	100	33
4	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	32
All	-	-	-	-	100	31	100	65

**Goal 1: 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, which for 2011-12 is 158. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

## Results

The aggregate Performance Index scored by 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade ICAHN 4 students was 198, 40 points above the 2011-12 mathematics AMO.

### Calculation of 2011-12 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3,4	0	2	43	55	65

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 2 & + & 43 & + & 55 & = & 100 \\
 & & & & + & & 55 & = & 98 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{198}
 \end{array}$$

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

## Additional Evidence

The Performance Index values for 2010-11 and 2011-12 were essentially, averaging 197.5 and well above the annual AMOs for 2010-11 (60 points above) and 2011-12 (40 points above).

### Mathematics Performance Index (PI) and Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) by School Year

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2008-09	-	-	-	-	-	-	168	
2009-10	-	-	-	-	-	-	174	
2010-11	3	31	0	3	55	42	197	
2011-12	3,4	65	0	2	43	55	198	

### 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 mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

## Method

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

## Results

100% of ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students demonstrated proficiency on the math assessment in 2011-12 as compared with 45.5% of District 11 students who demonstrated proficiency on the ELA assessment, and 59.3% who demonstrated proficiency on the math assessment.

### 2011-12 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	100	29	45.5	3333
4	100	26	59.3	3139
All	<b>100</b>	55	<b>52.4</b>	6472

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

## Additional Evidence

Both ICAHN 4 and District 11 students showed gains in math achievement on the two year period from 2010-11 to 2011-12. District 11 students gained more than 24 points to 59.3%, which was 40.7 % lower than ICAHN 4. ICAHN 4 students moved from 96.7% to 100%.

### 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							
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	-	-	-	-	96.7	36.1	100	45.5
4	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	59.3
All	-	-	-	-	96.7	36.1	100	52.4

#### Goal 1: 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. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 or performing higher than expected to a small degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of family income data, the 2011-12 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2010-11 results, the most recent one available.

## Results

ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students scored higher than expected to a large degree in the comparative performance analysis. Their Effect Size was 2.31, well above the target of 0.3.

### 2010-11 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		31	96.7	55.4	41.3	2.31
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
All	54	31	96.7	55.4	41.3	2.31

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

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

## Additional Evidence

2010-11 was the first year a comparative performance analysis could be made at ICAHN 4. Results show the school scored higher than expected to a large degree

### Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2007-08	-	-	-	-	-	-
2008-09	-	-	-	-	-	-
2009-10	-	-	-	-	-	-
2010-11	3	85.7	31	96.7	55.4	2.31

#### 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 2011-12 and also have a state exam score in 2010-11. 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 school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students taking a state exam in both years.

#### Results

ICAHN 4 4<sup>th</sup> grade students scored higher in 2011-12 than in 2010-11 by 3.3 points.

#### Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2010-11 to 2011-12

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2010-11	Target	2011-12	
4	31	96.7	75	100	YES
All	31	96.7	75	100	YES

#### Evaluation

The measure was met.

#### Additional Evidence

#### Cohort Performance on State Mathematics Exam

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2008-09	-	-	-
2009-10	-	-	-
2010-11	-	-	-
2011-12	4	1	1

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

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

**Method**

ICAHN 4 tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which ICAHN 4 had tested students and the result of grades 3 and 4 in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

ICAHN 4 significantly exceeded all surrounding similar schools.

2011-12 NYS Math – Comparison of All Student Performance on the Math assessment – Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 – Icahn 4 with District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 103, PS/IS 194						
Grade	District	School				
	11	PS 103	PS 83	PS 106	PS/IS 194	Icahn CS 4
3	45.5	35.9	71.4	60.1	50.4	100
4	46.2	44.7	75.5	79.9	56.7	100
Total	45.8	40.3	73.4	70.0	53.5	100

**Summary of the of the Mathematics Goal**

ICAHN 4 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> grade students performed in a manner, which resulted in all measures being met.

They surpassed the first absolute measure of 75% by 25% as they scored 100%.

The Performance Index value achieved by ICAHN 4 students was 198 and surpassed the AMO by 40 points

ICAHN 4 students outscored their peers in District 11, and in the following schools: PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/IS 194.

ICAHN 4 students achieved an Effect Size value of 2.31 the 2010-11 comparative performance analysis. Their achievement was 2.00 above the required value of 0.3.

ICAHN 4 4<sup>th</sup> grade students achieved 100% in 2011-12 as compared with 96.7 in 2010-11 thereby demonstrating growth in math performance.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students 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 enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved
Growth	On the 2011-12 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2010-11 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Achieved
Optional	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/IS 194	Achieved

### Action Plan

ICAHN 4 will continue utilizing the NYC Math Project as well as ongoing assessment and remediation as needed. In addition, we will continue to align our curriculum and provide current texts as the NYS Education Department modifies its mathematic strands. Additionally we will use Pearson's SuccessMaker to meet every child's individual needs in mathematics.

### SCIENCE

#### Goal 3: Science

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

#### Background

The Icahn Charter School 4 science curriculum is aligned with the NYS standards and utilizes McGraw-Hill/National Geographic text.

#### Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

#### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4<sup>th</sup> in spring 2012. The school converted each student’s raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

**Results**

Grades have not been released.

**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						
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year						

**Evaluation**

The measure cannot be assessed until data are released.

**Additional Evidence**

Science assessment data have not been released. 2011-12 is the first year ICAHN 4 students take the assessment.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4								
All								

**Goal 3: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the percent of all tested students 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**

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

**Results**

Data have not been released, a comparison cannot be made.

**2011-12 State Science Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4				

**Evaluation**

The measure cannot be assessed.

**Additional Evidence**

Since 2011-12 is the first year of the Science assessment has been administered at ICAHN 4 the content of the table below will be the same as the table above.

**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							
	2008-09		2009-10		2010-11		2011-12	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	-	-	-	-	-	-		
All	-	-	-	-	-	-		

**Summary of the Science Goal**

A summary cannot be made until data are available

Type	Measure	Outcome
------	---------	---------

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

We shall continue our efforts to ensure that our students are provided with available resources such as the TA program, afterschool and the Saturday Academy Program and their instruction is aligned with the NYS standards.

## NCLB

### Goal 5: NCLB

The School will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

### 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 No Child Left Behind (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 4 has made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2011-12 thus it is a school in good standing.

### Evaluation

The measure was met.

### Additional Evidence

Given the requirement for AYP in two consecutive years, 2011-12 was the first year Good Standing status could be determined.

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2007-08	-
2008-09	-
2009-10	-
2010-11	-
2011-12	Good Standing

## APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

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

### Goal S: Parent Satisfaction

Parents will demonstrate a strong commitment to the school.

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

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

### Method

A parent survey is provided to all parents/guardians of students who attend Icahn Charter School 4. 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 2012

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**

Ninety-two responses were received from one hundred twenty one families. The response was 100%.

Questions	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Excellent	N/A
1	0	5	22	153	0
2	0	7	23	150	0
3	1	3	22	154	0
4	0	4	10	166	0
5	0	3	30	147	0
6	0	0	21	159	0
7	0	2	18	160	0
8	0	3	19	158	0
9	0	4	22	154	0
10	0	4	26	150	0
11	0	4	35	141	0
12	3	8	36	133	0
13	0	3	15	123	39
14	0	5	15	160	0
15	0	6	24	129	1
All	6	61	338	2,237	40

**2011-12 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate**

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
180	80	100%

**2011-12 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results**

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
Receive Progress Reports and Notices	100%
Homework is a valuable contribution to child’s learning	100%
Students have enough supplies and materials for learning	100%
Students are receiving a quality education	100%
School clearly defines goals	100%

## Evaluation

The measure was met

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

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

## Method

Tracking of ICAHN 4 students is maintained by the Principal, using attendance records, and interactions with parents. Student attrition data are also maintained.

## Results

95.2% of ICAHN 4 students enrolled in 2010-11 returned to the school for the 2011-12 school year.

### 2011-12 Student Retention Rate

2010-11 Enrollment	Number of Students Who Graduated in 2010-11	Number of Students Who Returned in 2011-12	Retention Rate 2011-12 Re-enrollment ÷ (2010-11 Enrollment – Graduates)
147	-	140	95.2%

## Evaluation

The measure was met.

## Additional Evidence

Year	Retention Rate
2008-09	-
2009-10	-
2010-11	97.2%
2011-12	95.2%

### Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 95 percent.

## Method

When a student is absent, the school contacts the parent/guardian by 9:15am and records the parent/guardian's response for tracking purposes.

## Results

Students in grades 3 and 4 made the measure, while those in grades 1 and 2 did not. The overall school average for the year was 1 point below the measure, thus the school did not meet its measure.

### 2011-12 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	93
2	92
3	95
4	96
Overall	94

## Evaluation

The measure for the school was not met.

## Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2008-09	-
2009-10	94.5
2010-11	95.4
2011-12	94.0

## APPENDIX C: SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

### **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**

2009-2010 is the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 4. In 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12 pre- and post- English Language Arts assessments were administered. 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**

2009-2010 was the first year of operation at ICAHN 4, which served Kindergarten through grade 2. In 2010-11 grade 3 was added then in 2011-12 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, 2, and 3 were made. New cohorts were added: New Cohort (1) in 2010-11, and New Cohort (2) in 2011-12.

<b>ITBS Reading and Language (ELA) Pre and Post Assessment Scores for 2009-10, 2010-10, and 201-12 – Test given in June each year</b>				
<b>NCE Scores</b>				
<b>2009-10</b>				
<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students</b>	<b>Reading Total</b>	<b>Language</b>	<b>Core Total</b>
Kindergarten - Cohort 1	36	43	48	46
First - Cohort 2	35	58	34	35
Second - Cohort 3	38	39	33	32
<b>2010-11</b>				
Kindergarten – New Cohort (1)	39	56	50	58
First Grade – Cohort 1	40	63	42	49
Second Grade – Cohort 2	34	46	42	42
Third Grade – Cohort 3	31	71	69	71
<b>2011-12</b>				
Kindergarten – New Cohort (2)	39	87	67	82
First Grade – New Cohort (1)	37	63	59	76
Second Grade – Cohort 1	39	42	39	38
Third Grade – Cohort 2	33	61	66	67
Fourth Grade – Cohort 3	32	64	64	65

<b>June to June Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE Reading scores – For NCE values below 50, cohort must score 50% or more of the half the difference between the 2009-10 score and 50. For NCS values higher than 50, the cohort must show and increase</b>				
	<b>New Cohort (1)</b>	<b>Cohort 1</b>	<b>Cohort 2</b>	<b>Cohort 3</b>
2009-10 to 2010-11	-	+3	+7	+39
Outcome	-	Measure Made	Measure Made	Measure Made
2010-11 to 2011-12	+18	-11	+25	-6
Outcome	Measure Made	Measure Not Made	Measure Made	Measure Not Made

### **Evaluation**

Success in meeting the measure related to year to year change for each cohort. Cohort 1, 2, and 3 made the measure in the year-to-year comparison 2009-10 to 2010-11. In the second comparison: 2010-11 to 2011-12 there were mixed results. New cohort (1), and Cohort 2 made the measure, while Cohorts 1 and 3 did not.

**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**

2009-2010 is the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 4. In 2009-10 and 2010-11 pre- and post- Mathematics assessments were administered. 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**

2009-2010 was the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 4, which served Kindergarten through grade 2. In 2010-11 grade 3 was added then in 2011-12 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, 2, and 3 were made. New cohorts were added: New Cohort (1) in 2010-11, and New Cohort (2) in 2011-12

<b>ITBS Math Pre and Post Assessment Scores for 2009-10, 2010-10, and 201-12 – Test given in June each year</b>		
<b>NCE Scores</b>		
<b>2009-10</b>		
<b>Grade</b>	<b># Students</b>	<b>Math</b>
Kindergarten - Cohort 1	36	53
First - Cohort 2	35	40
Second - Cohort 3	38	29
<b>2010-11</b>		
Kindergarten – New Cohort (1)	39	61

First Grade – Cohort 1	40	48
Second Grade – Cohort 2	34	40
Third Grade – Cohort 3	31	67
<b>2011-12</b>		
Kindergarten – New Cohort (2)	39	73
First Grade – New Cohort (1)	37	62
Second Grade – Cohort 1	39	36
Third Grade – Cohort 2	33	74
Fourth Grade – Cohort 3	32	66

<b>June to June Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE Reading scores – For NCE values below 50, cohort must score 50% or more of the half the difference between the 2009-10 score and 50. For NCS values higher than 50, the cohort must show and increase</b>				
	<b>New Cohort (1)</b>	<b>Cohort 1</b>	<b>Cohort 2</b>	<b>Cohort 3</b>
2009-10 to 2010-11	-	-5	No gain or loss	+38
Outcome	-	Measure Not Made	Measure Not Made	Measure Made
2010-11 to 2011-12	-2	-12	+34	-1
Outcome	Measure Not Made	Measure Not Made	Measure Made	Measure Not Made

### **Evaluation**

Success in meeting the measure related to year to year change for each cohort. Cohort 3 made the measure in the year-to-year comparison 2009-10 to 2010-11, while Cohorts 1, and 2 did not. In the second comparison: 2010-11 to 2011-12 there were mixed results. New cohort (1), and Cohort 1 and 3 did not make the measure, while Cohort 2 did.