

**ICAHN CHARTER SCHOOL 4**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN**

**PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 31, 2011

By Michelle Allen

1551 East 172<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Second Floor Room 210  
Bronx, New York 10472  
Telephone: (718) 620-8710  
Fax: (718) 620-8711

Michelle Allen 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	Officer
Seymour Fliegel	Officer
Edward J. Shanahan	Officer
Karen Mandelbaum	Officer

**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
2006-07	N/A	N/A	N/A											
2007-08	N/A	N/A	N/A											
2008-09	N/A	N/A	N/A											
2009-10	36	35	38	N/A	N/A	N/A								109
2010-11	37	40	38	31	N/A	N/A								146

**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**  
 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.<sup>1</sup>

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade in April 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. 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 scores<sup>1</sup>, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	657

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.

<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).

**2010-11 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	31	6	8	0	31
All	31	6	8	0	31

**Results**

2009-2010 was the first year of operation serving Kindergarten through grade 2. The first grade 3 results were obtained in spring 2011.

The measure was met both by all students and by those enrolled for two years.

**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	87%	31
	<u>Students in At Least 2<sup>nd</sup> Year</u>	87%	31
All	All Students	87%	31
	<u>Students in At Least 2<sup>nd</sup> Year</u>	87%	31

**Evaluation**

The measure was met both by all students and by those enrolled in at least their second year

**Additional Evidence**

As 2010-2011 was the first year Icahn Charter School 4 served 3rd grade student comparisons with other years could not be made.

**English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	87%	31
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	87%	31

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

<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.

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**

The 3rd grade charter school performance compared to the district performance is shown in the table below. Icahn Charter School 4 - 3rd grade students out scored all district students.

**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 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District 12 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	80.6%	31	30.3%	1833
All	80.6%	31	30.3%	1833

**Evaluation**

The measure was met. Icahn Charter School 4 exceeded the aggregate district performance by 50.3%.

**Additional Evidence**

2010-11 was the first year Icahn Charter School 4 students participated in NYS ELA testing, thus comparisons with previous years cannot be made.

**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	N/A	N/A	80.6	30.3
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.6	30.3

**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**

Since 2010-11 was the first year Icahn Charter School 4 students participated in NYS ELA testing, grade-level 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						

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

**Evaluation**

Since 2010-11 was the first year Icahn Charter School 4 students participated in NYS ELA testing, grade-level comparisons cannot be made.

**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**

Since 2010-11 was the first year Icahn Charter School 4 students participated in NYS ELA testing, grade-level comparisons cannot be made.

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

**Not Applicable**

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4					
5					
All					

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

**Not Applicable**

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

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

Each year, the percent of all tested students performing at or above Level 3 on the Social Studies exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools with local School district 8: PS 47, PS 195; PS 196

**Method**

Icahn Charter School 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 Charter School 4 had tested students and the result of grade 4 in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

Icahn Charter School 4 significantly exceeded all surrounding similar schools.

2010-11 NYS ELA – Comparison of All Student Performance – Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 – Icahn 4 with District 12, PS 47, 195, and 196					
Grade	District	School			
3	12	PS 47	PS 195	PS 196	Icahn CS 4
Total	30.3	29.6	42.1	47.8	80.6

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

Icahn Charter School 4 met its first absolute measure. The second absolute measure will not be addressed until after NYSED has determine this year’s AMO, thus the Performance Index cannot be determined..

The school met its first comparative measure by outscoring district students by 50.3%. Its second comparative measure and growth measure could not be measured in 2010-11.

Since Icahn Charter School 4 has administered the NYS ELA examination only once the growth measure could not be addressed.

The school met its optional measure by outscoring similar schools.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	N/A
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	N/A
Optional	Each year, the percent of all tested students performing at or above Level 3 on the Social Studies exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools with local School district 8: PS 47, PS 195; PS 196	Achieved

**Action Plan**

Icahn Charter School 4 had its first testing year. Icahn Charter School 4 students outscored their peers in District #12 and the schools identified by Icahn Charter School 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 2: Mathematics

Students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts

### Background

Our Mathematics curriculum follows the Core Knowledge sequence and is comprised of 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 examination<sup>3</sup>.

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 scores<sup>1</sup>, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3

<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).

3	656
---	-----

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 <sup>4</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	31	6	8	0	31
All	31	6	8	0	31

### Results

2009-2010 was the first year of operation serving Kindergarten through grade 2. The first grade 3 results were obtained in spring 2011.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	100	31
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	31
All	All Students	100	31
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<u>100</u>	31

### Evaluation

The measure was met.

### Additional Evidence

A comparison with previous years could not be made as the school administered its first NYS Math assessment in 2010-11.

---

<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

**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	N/A	N/A	100	31
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100	31

**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**

96.7% of Icahn Charter School 4 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students scored at Levels 3 or 4 as compared with 36.1% among 3<sup>rd</sup> grade students in District 12.

**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 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	96.7	31	36.1	1877
All	96.7	31	36.1	1877

**Evaluation**

The school met its measure and outscored all District 12 students by 60.6 %

**Additional Evidence**

As 2010-11 was the first year of NYS mathematics assessment testing, a comparison with previous years could not be made.

**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	N/A	N/A	96.7	36.1
All	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	96.7	36.1

**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**

Since 2010-11 was the first year Icahn Charter School 4 students participated in NYS Math testing, grade-level comparisons cannot be made.

**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						

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

**Evaluation**

The first results will be presented in the 2011-12 Accountability Plan Progress Report.

**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**

The first results will be available in the 2011-12 Accountability Plan Progress Report

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

**Not Applicable**

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All					

**Evaluation**

The first results will be available in the 2011-12 Accountability Plan Progress Report

**Additional Evidence**

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

**Not Applicable**

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

**Goal 1: Optional Measure**

Each year, the percent of all tested students performing at or above Level 3 on the Social Studies exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools with local School district 8: PS 47, PS 195; PS 196

**Method**

Icahn Charter School 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 Charter School 4 had tested students and the result of grade 4 in the surrounding schools.

**Results**

Icahn Charter School 4 significantly exceeded all surrounding similar schools.

2010-11 NYS Math – Comparison of All Student Performance – Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 – Icahn 4 with District 12, PS 47, 195, and 196					
Grade	District	School			
		PS 47	PS 195	PS 196	Icahn CS 4
3	12	PS 47	PS 195	PS 196	Icahn CS 4
Total	36.1%	64.6%	35.5%	53.8%	96.7%

**Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

Icahn Charter School 4 met its first absolute measure. The second absolute measure will not be addressed until after NYSED has determine this year’s AMO, thus the Performance Index cannot be determined..

The school met its first comparative measure by outscoring district students be 60.6%. Its second comparative measure and growth measure could not be measured in 2010-11.

Since Icahn Charter School 4 has administered the NYS Math examination only once the growth measure could not be addressed.

The school met its optional measure by outscoring similar schools.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	N/A
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	N/A
Optional	Each year, the percent of all tested students performing at or above Level 3 on the Social Studies exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following similar schools with local School district 8: PS 47, PS 195; PS 196	Achieved

**Action Plan**

Icahn Charter School 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 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 did not administer the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in the 4<sup>th</sup> grade in spring 2010.

#### **Results**

2010-2011 is our second year of operation serving Kindergarten through grade 3, and we will not have grade 4 results until spring 2012.

### **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**

2010-2011 is our second year of operation serving Kindergarten through grade 3, and we will not have grade 4 results until spring 2012.

#### **Summary**

2010-2011 is our second year of operation serving Kindergarten through grade 3, and we will not have grade 4 results until spring 2012.

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.	Not Applicable
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.	Not Applicable

**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 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**

2009-2010 is the first year of operations at Icahn Charter School 4 thus no statistics are available to determine the school's AYP for the year. The NYS ELA and Math assessments were administered to 3rd grade students in 2010-11 for the first time. Thus the school has not met the criteria for NCLB standing determination.

**Evaluation**

Icahn Charter School 4 administered the NYS ELA and Math assessments to its 3rd grade students. In its first assessment administration, the school made its AYP in both ELA and Math. Since the school does not have two years of NYS ELA and Math assessment data its NCLB standing cannot be determine. The first NCLB status will be determined in 2011-12.

**Additional Evidence**

2010-11 was the first year NYS ELA and Math assessments could be administered at Icahn Charter School 4, thus statements pertaining to NCLB status are not applicable for the previous four years.

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2009-10	Not Applicable
2010-11	Not Applicable

## 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 commitment to the school.

### Goal 6: Absolute Measure

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

### Method

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

Ninety-two responses were received from one hundred twenty one families. The response was 76%.

**2010-11 Parent Satisfaction Survey Responses**

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
92	121	76%

**2010-11 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results**

Question	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
<b>Excellence</b>	61	69	59	70	58	65	68	58	71	57	56	71	54	11	66
<b>Good</b>	23	14	30	21	26	25	22	33	17	25	31	16	13	20	20
<b>Satisfactory</b>	8	9	3	1	8	2	2	1	4	9	5	5	9	1	5
<b>Poor</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
<b>N/A</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	1

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. As demonstrated by the responses, the percentage of respondents rated the school’s academic programs as from satisfactory to excellent was 100%. All respondents indicated that they would recommend their child’s school to other parents and that their child will return to school, except for those who are moving out of state. Over 96% of parents rated the school good to excellent the quality of education (Question 9) their children are receiving and expressed how homework assignments contributed in extending learning at home on an independent level. All respondent indicated they would recommend their child’s school to other parents and that their child will return to school, except for those who are moving out of state or have family that would require them to attend schools closer to home.

**Goal 6: Absolute Measure**  
 Each year, the school will have a monthly student’s retention rate of at least 90%

**Method**

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

**Results**

Icahn Charter School 4 began operations in September 2009 with a K-2 enrollment of 109 students. In 2010-11 106 or 97.2% of those students returned for their second year at Icahn Charter School 4.

**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)
109	0	106	97.2%

**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	97.2%

**Goal 6: 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**

Close monitoring of student attendance with daily telephone calls to parents/guardians of absent students has helped us exceed our attendance average in all grades.

**2010-11 Attendance**

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	95.5
2	95.7
3	96.4
Overall	95.4

**Evaluation**

The measure was met for each grade and for the school.

**Additional Evidence**

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	N/A
2009-10	94.5
2010-11	95.4

## 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

2009-2010 is the first year of operation at Icahn Charter School 4. In 2009-10 and 2010-11 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 Charter School 4, which served Kindergarten through grade 2. In 2010-11 grade 3 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.

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	# Students	Reading	Language	Math	Core Total
Kindergarten - Cohort 1	36	43	48	53	46
First - Cohort 2	35	58	34	40	35
Second - Cohort 3	38	39	33	29	32
2010-11					
Kindergarten – New Cohort	39	56	50	61	58
First Grade – Cohort 1	40	63	42	48	49
Second Grade – Cohort 2	34	46	42	40	42
Third Grade – Cohort 3	31	71	69	67	71

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 and increase			
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 3
2009-10	43	58	39
2010-11	58	63	73
Outcome	Measure Made	Measure Made	Measure Made

<b>June to June Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE Language scores - For NCE values below 50, cohort must score 50% or more of the difference between the 2009-10 score and 50. For NCS values higher than 50, the cohort must show and increase</b>			
	<b>Cohort 1</b>	<b>Cohort 2</b>	<b>Cohort 3</b>
2009-10	48	34	33
2010-11	42	42	69
Outcome	Measure Not Made	Measure Made	Measure Made

**Evaluation**

Each of the three cohorts, 1, 2 and 3 met the measure for Reading and Language.

**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. 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.

<b>ITBS Mathematics Pre and Post Assessment Scores for 2009-10 and 2010-10 – Test given in June of 2010 and 2011</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	39	61
First Grade – Cohort 1	40	48
Second Grade – Cohort 2	34	40
Third Grade – Cohort 3	31	67

<b>June to June Comparison of ITBS ELA NCE Mathematics scores - For NCE values below 50, cohort must score 50% or more of the difference between the 2009-10 score and 50. For NCS values higher than 50, the cohort must show and increase</b>			
	<b>Cohort 1</b>	<b>Cohort 2</b>	<b>Cohort 3</b>
2009-10	53	40	29
2010-11	48	40	67
Outcome	Measure Not Made	Measure Not Made	Measure Made

**Evaluation**

Cohorts 1 and 2 did not meet the measure, while Cohort 3 did. Cohort 1 decreased by 5 NCEs, while Cohort 2 remained the same at 40. Cohort 3 demonstrated a significant increase of 38 NCEs.