

**Harlem Success Academy 3
CHARTER SCHOOL**

2009-10

**ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 3, 2010
By Jonathan Winstone

141 East 111th Street, 3rd Floor
New York, NY 10029
(646) 747-6700

Jonathan Winstone prepared this 2009-10 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Ben Appen	
Rob Azeke	Secretary
Bryan Binder	Treasurer
Kathryn Croft	
Diana Elghanayan	
Joel Greenblatt	Chairman
Doug Hirsch	
Daniel Nir	VP
Jason Peralta	Parent Representative
John Rennie	

INTRODUCTION

The mission of Harlem Success Academy Charter School 3 is to provide New York City elementary students, particularly those from economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, with the knowledge, skills, character, and disposition to meet and exceed New York State standards and give them the resources to lead and succeed in the school, college, and life.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2005-06														
2006-07														
2007-08														
2008-09	101	79												
2009-10	76	103	70											

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will demonstrate proficiency in reading, writing, and comprehending the English language.

Background

Harlem Success Academy Charter School 3 (HSA3) believes that all children can succeed, going above and beyond state standards and gaining a foundation for, ultimately, college graduation. The school uses the Success Charter Network's custom-designed THINK Literacy program, an enhanced balanced literacy program that is based on the core belief that all children can become effective readers and writers. The SCN Instructional Development and Literacy teams continually improve and provide high-level professional development to support the implementation of the program. Activities in literacy help children develop both decoding and comprehension skills in order to become successful readers. Teachers model fluency; students practice their skills independently and in small groups. In order to ensure that scholars' comprehension needs are met, the school supplements the program with Success For All, a proven early literacy program, as well as additional independent reading, guided reading, and writer's workshop. At the heart of the literacy program is 100 minutes of daily, uninterrupted reading instruction for grades 1 through 5. Kindergartners participate through KinderCorner, SFA's standards-aligned kindergarten program. KinderCorner integrates literacy throughout the day into varying blocks that are suitable yet challenging to kindergartners' developmental needs. Every eight weeks, students are assessed and progress to the next instructional reading level when ready; thus children are assigned to appropriate reading levels based on reading performance, not age or grade.

Harlem Success Academy 3 employs one lead teacher in each classroom. A lead teacher typically has at least three years of classroom experience, New York State teaching certification, and a Master's degree. Each grade level also has assistant teachers who have less classroom experience who provide additional instruction support. The school also employs specialty teachers such as science teachers, special education teachers (who work as independent contractors), art teachers, chess teachers, dance teachers, and athletic coaches.

Harlem Success Academy 3 enforces specific protocols for how schools collect, distribute, and analyze data. These protocols work to help teachers and school leaders freely access information in real-time. In a fast-paced and constantly changing school environment, having data at one's fingertips empowers the staff to better decide how to expend time and resources so as to maximize student achievement. In order to maximize classroom time, the school also constantly seeks out more efficient ways to raise student test scores by carefully examining high-stakes tests like the New York State English Language Arts Test. Dissecting these tests helps the instructional development team determine how best to quickly teach students how to ace these tests, giving the teachers more time to focus on teaching those skills and transcending the binary math-reading school day.

Harlem Success Academy 3 views its teachers as Olympic athletes who must constantly train and improve their skills. Professional development is a regular part of their professional responsibilities as it develops skills, provides content area knowledge, and improves pedagogical techniques so that the teachers are prepared to "win the race" that is educating children.

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, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State English language arts examination.

Method

The school did not administer the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in April 2010.

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.

**2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All					

Results

The school cannot yet provide results.

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		

¹ 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.

5	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
6	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
7	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
8	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
All	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

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 of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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 2009-10 is 155.² 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 school cannot yet provide results

Calculation of 2009-10 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathbf{PI} & = & & + & & + & = \\
 & & & + & & + & = \\
 & & & & & \mathbf{PI} & =
 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

Does not apply.

² With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

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		
2006-07							122	
2007-08							133	
2008-09							144	
2009-10							155	

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 school cannot yet provide results.

2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

**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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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 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 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 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

The school cannot yet provide results.

2009-10 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

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

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:
English Language Arts results cannot be compared at this time.

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

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

Goal 1: Growth Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 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 on the current year’s state English language arts exam. 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.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-09, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those

students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be 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

Results for this goal cannot be provided.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4					N/A
5					N/A
6					N/A
7					N/A
8					N/A
All					N/A

We are not able to comment at this time whether the goal was met because we did not take the ELA test.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2006-07			
2007-08			
2008-09			
2009-10			

<p>Goal 1: Optional Measure Does not apply.</p>
<p>Method</p> <p>Results</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>Additional Evidence</p>

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Does not apply.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State examination.	N/A
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.	N/A
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	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	N/A

Action Plan

While progress cannot yet be measured quantitatively, the school remains confident that the program and curriculum described here and in the charter will lead to academic achievement that meets the goals outlined in the Accountability Plan. In the event that data were to arise that indicated that the school were not on track to meet its goals, specific and targeted interventions would be undertaken immediately.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will show competency in their understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

Background

Harlem Success Academy 3 uses the Investigations math program. Some of its key elements are described below:

- **Problem Solving** – The Investigations math program offers students a chance to solve real word, contextualized mathematical programs using both conceptual understanding and procedural and computational fluency. Students learn the basics of problem solving strategies by solving daily word problems that require cooperative learning and critical thinking. Under the guidance of the teacher, students employ problem-solving strategies to math problems that are posed in various ways within the same topic. Students work together and individually to determine the math concept addressed in the problem, and then use their familiarity with procedures and number facts to solve the problem accurately and quickly.
- **Assessment** – The Investigations math program contains diagnostic assessment tools to determine the progress of students with respect to program topics as well as state and national standards of student mathematical learning. Harlem Success Academy 3 has also developed NY State Standards aligned unit assessments and interim assessments that target student understandings. This ensures that teachers have the tools necessary for all students to successfully master the mathematical skills aligned with the New York State Standards.
- **Common Core State Standard Alignment** – Harlem Success Academy 3 has mapped the scope and sequence of the Investigations math program to closely align with the Common Core State math standards. This scope and sequence closely follows the state and national requirements of what students should know and be able to do at each administration of the grade 3, 4 and 5 state math assessments. By aligning closely with state standards and assessments, we will have a much better sense of where our students stand in our goal of preparing all of our students for college-track higher level mathematics in middle and high school.
- **Conceptual Understanding** – Investigations math places an emphasis on fact fluency and computational procedures, but also offers open-ended exploration and interactive learning components to each lesson to let students make sense of mathematics by building on ideas and observations from previous experiences. By learning mathematical ideas and procedures that is grounded in meaning, students are able to apply their thinking to new situations and unfamiliar problems. The Investigations program uses daily world problems to give students meaning, understanding, and application to the math they learn.
- **Differentiation** – the Investigations program has a differentiated instructional program that allows teachers to routinely deliver formative assessments in each lesson and

provide additional activities and homework that are in line with student understanding of the topic. For students who are struggling, re-teaching activities are provided to help students fully understand the material by delivering the information in a different way. For students who have internalized the lesson, there are additional activities designed so students can further analyze that lesson's topic. In addition, teachers are provided with extensive resources to encourage teaching to different modalities, including Smart Board integrated virtual manipulatives as well as hands-on manipulatives.

- Computational Fluency – Harlem Success Academy 3 uses Singapore math to supplement Investigations for facts practice because we recognize the importance of regular computational fluency. Students use the procedural and computational practice found in Investigations and reinforced with Singapore math activities to conduct the necessary mathematical operations with accuracy and speed.
- Supplemental Material – In addition to Investigations, Harlem Success Academy 3 will also implement Singapore Math to ensure that all New York State Standards are covered over the course of the year. Singapore Math is a comprehensive, activity-based program designed to provide students with a strong foundation in mathematics. Mathematical concepts are introduced through a spiral progression building on concepts that students have already learned. Singapore focuses on repetition to reinforce mathematics facts and concepts, and at the end of each unit a Review and Assess section determines student mastery of key learning objectives. Teachers will use Singapore Math to reach struggling students as well as to push more advanced students forward. Finally, Singapore teaches a selection of concepts that are essential to rigorous instruction such as identifying time, naming the elements of a calendar, counting and labeling money, comparing sets of objects and numbers, and understanding simple addition and subtraction problems.

Goal 2: 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, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State mathematics examination.

Method

The school has not administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. Through 200809 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, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

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.

**2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ³			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
All					

Results

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
4	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
5	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
6	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
7	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
8	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		
All	All Students		
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		

Evaluation

Does not apply.

³ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

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 a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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, which for 2009-10 is 135⁴. 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.

⁴ With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

Results

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

Calculation of 2009-10 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	

$$\begin{array}{cccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & & + & + & = \\
 & & & + & + & = \\
 & & & & & \text{PI} =
 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

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		
2006-07							86	
2007-08							102	
2008-09							119	
2009-10							135	

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

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

**2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
All				

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

**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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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 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 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 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

2009-10 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

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

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:
The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06						
2006-07						

2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						

Goal 2: Growth Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 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 on the current year’s state mathematics exam. 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.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-09, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be 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 school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4					N/A
5					N/A
6					N/A
7					N/A
8					N/A
All					N/A

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2006-07			
2007-08			
2008-09			
2009-10			

<p>Goal 1: Optional Measure The Accountability Plan does not include an Optional Measure.</p> <p><u>Method</u></p> <p><u>Results</u></p> <p><u>Evaluation</u></p> <p><u>Additional Evidence</u></p>
--

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State examination.	NA
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.	NA
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.	NA
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	NA
Growth	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	NA

Action Plan

While progress cannot yet be measured quantitatively, the school remains confident that the program and curriculum described here and in the charter will lead to academic achievement that meets the goals outlined in the Accountability Plan. In the event that data were to arise that indicated that the school were not on track to meet its goals, specific and targeted interventions would be undertaken immediately.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
 Students will understand and apply scientific principles at a proficient level.

Background

The school’s curriculum is unique in its attention to science, including unprecedented daily instruction. The school uses a discovery-based, experiential approach to science, guided by the most influential authorities on elementary science education today, the American Association for the Advancement of Science Benchmarks and the National Resource Council National Science Education Standards. Taught by specialized science teachers, students have hands-on experience with objects, materials, and organisms to understand the natural world. The curriculum provides students with a solid foundation in discovery-based science to ensure that they can excel in middle and high school science classes.

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. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 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 nd Year						
8	All Students						
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year						

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4								
8								
All								

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

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

**2009-10 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

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

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

**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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4								
8								
All								

Summary

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

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.	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.	N/A

Action Plan

While progress cannot yet be measured quantitatively, the school remains confident that the program and curriculum described here and in the charter will lead to academic achievement that meets the goals outlined in the Accountability Plan. In the event that data were to arise that indicated that the school were not on track to meet its goals, specific and targeted interventions would be undertaken immediately.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 4: Social Studies
 Students will demonstrate proficient understanding and application of social studies principles.

Background

The social studies curriculum also combines active learning with age-appropriate content and weekly geography for all students. This comprehensive social studies program will allow students to identify themselves as members of their community and citizens of the world. Arts and activities usually considered “enrichment” programs are incorporated as part of the core school day. Every student will participate in chess, team sports, the arts, and physical activity on a regular basis to foster the development of well-rounded interests while simultaneously reinforcing the values and habits that the school prioritizes.

Goal 4: 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 social studies examination.

Method

The school did not administer the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State Social Studies 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	
5	All Students						
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year						
8	All Students						
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year						

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

**Social Studies Performance
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5								
8								
All								

Goal 4: 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 social studies 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

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

**2009-10 State Social Studies Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5				
8				

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

**Social Studies 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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
5								
8								
All								

Summary

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

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.	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.	N/A

Action Plan

While progress cannot yet be measured quantitatively, the school remains confident that the program and curriculum described here and in the charter will lead to academic achievement that meets the goals outlined in the Accountability Plan. In the event that data were to arise that indicated that the school were not on track to meet its goals, specific and targeted interventions would be undertaken immediately.

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

The school cannot yet measure progress towards these goals.

Evaluation

Does not apply.

Additional Evidence

Does not apply.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2005-06	N/A
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	N/A
2009-10	N/A