

A Reader's Guide: Accountability Plan Progress Reports for SUNY Authorized Charter Schools, 2010-11 School Year

As set forth in the *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees*, the single most important factor that the Charter Schools Institute and the SUNY Board of Trustees consider in making renewal determinations is the school's record in generating successful student achievement outcomes. In order to determine whether a school has met that high standard, each charter school that the SUNY Board of Trustees authorizes is required to enter into an accountability agreement, known as an academic **Accountability Plan**, which ultimately becomes part of its charter. Each plan must include SUNY standard measures for achievement in mathematics and English language arts (absolute, comparative, growth, NCLB). Plans may also include measures unique to the mission or goals of an individual school.

The Charter Schools Institute closely monitors each school's progress toward achieving the goals outlined in its Accountability Plan. In addition, as part of its annual reporting requirements, each SUNY authorized charter school must submit an Accountability Plan Progress Report which, from its vantage point, addresses each of the goals and outcome measures contained in its Accountability Plan. The information presented in these Progress Reports constitutes important evidence that a school is keeping its promises to its students, parents and community, and is critical to making its case for renewal at the end of its charter period. The most important parts of Progress Reports are student achievement results on state exams and other assessments. However, not all schools will have tested grade levels for a particular state exam. Each year, the state administers English language arts and mathematics tests to 3rd through 8th grade, science tests to the 4th and 8th grades, and, up through 2009-10, social studies tests to the 5th and 8th grades.

Important Notes:

- The Accountability Plan Progress Report is authored by the charter school. In reporting school progress toward meeting the outcome measures set forth in the Accountability Plan, schools are encouraged to build a case for the effectiveness of their program, and to lay the groundwork for writing a Renewal Application and ultimately for charter renewal.
- The school's evaluation of its own progress does not necessarily reflect the conclusions of the Institute. Further, the Institute does not affirm the completeness or accuracy of the report's data and may not endorse the school's characterization of the progress it has made toward achieving its Accountability Plan goals.
- Throughout the life of the school's charter, the Institute will visit each school, generating Institute School Visit Reports and, at the end of each charter period, a Renewal Report (click on the school name in the list at the following link to see all Institute prepared reports for a given school: <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/parentSchoolList.htm>). These reports include detailed summaries of the Institute's observations of the school, as well as its evaluation of student performance and progress toward meeting the academic subject goals in its Accountability Plan.

**The UFT
CHARTER SCHOOL
2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY
PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

October 13th, 2011

Elementary Academy
300 Wyona Street
Brooklyn, NY 11207
Phone (718) 922-0438
Fax (718) 922-0543
Michelle Bodden-White-School Leader

Secondary Academy
800 Van Siclen Avenue
Brooklyn, NY 11207
Phone (718) 927-5540
Fax (718) 649-0653
Marty Weinstein-School Leader

<u>Trustee's Name</u>	<u>Board Position</u>
Michael Mulgrew	UFT Representative and Chairman
Randi Weingarten	Chairperson UFT Representative Former President of the UFT President of the AFT
Dr. Leo Casey	UFT Representative UFT Vice President
Evelyn DeJesus	UFT Representative UFT District 2 Representative
Michelle Bodden-White	School Leader Elementary Academy
	School Leader Secondary Academy
Burton Sacks	External/Community Representative Deputy Chief Operating Officer for Management Services for the City University of New York
Kelly Nowlin	Educator Representative from the Elementary Academy
Justin Davis	Educator Representative from the Secondary Academy
	Parent Representative UFT Elementary Academy
Sharon Carter	Parent Representative UFT Secondary Academy

INTRODUCTION

During the 2010-11 school year, the UFT Charter School continued to strengthen its rich array of programs that nurture its students and ensure their mastery of the state standards. We also spent substantial time planning to support our students' future needs. We will continue to expand the school to serve an additional grade until the school reaches full enrollment in 2012 - 2013 with a K-12 program.

The UFT Charter School enthusiastically embraces the state's new proficiency calculations in math and ELA as an additional impetus to help our students achieve at the highest possible levels. We are proud that our students performed at levels substantially higher than our home district on the most recent NYS ELA assessment. The overall proficiency rate for the 4th grade students in ELA this year was 17 percentage points better than our home district and 12 percentage points better than the 4th grade citywide rate. In science, the Elementary Academy also exceeded its accountability goals by achieving 91 percent proficiency.

At the UFT Charter School, we have a shared commitment to high expectations and excellence in instruction and overall programming. Our rigorous liberal arts curriculum helps students build deep and extensive interests, knowledge, and ideas and exposes them to a broad range of academic disciplines. Core subjects of reading, writing, math, science, and social studies are integrated into all aspects of the curriculum which also includes technology, the arts, physical fitness, music, and numerous other enrichment opportunities.

This past year the school implemented the Treasures program as an additional tool for literacy instruction in Kindergarten through 5th grade. Teachers used the 7 Instructional Practices by Jay McTeghe and Ken O'Connor (2005), enabling them to take more ownership of their learning. A key focus of professional development was developing teachers' differentiated instruction. Teachers honed their skills through weekly grade level meetings, classroom visits and one-on-one sessions with staff developers. At monthly professional development meetings, staff reviewed specific areas of focus to ensure consistency in the delivery of instruction.

This year, the U.F.T. Secondary Charter School will launch several initiatives and best practices. We will be focusing on the Common Core Standards placing particular emphasis on reading and writing across the curricula with the infusion of interdisciplinary strands. We will also raise expectations for Learning Objectives clearly indicating process/ activities the students will engage in during the lesson and desired lesson outcomes. All lessons will be expected to following the Model Classroom Prototype (Whole-Small-Whole progression). Other initiatives include Balanced Literacy for all grade levels (Readers' and Writers' Workshop Model) and the creation of leveled libraries in all content areas. The Secondary Academy will also focus on higher order questioning following Socratic methodology, interdisciplinary discussions and accountable talk discussions. Differentiated Instruction based on data-driven learning strategies will be emphasized across the subjects. We will also expect our learning strategies to include journal writing and authentic assessments (i.e., cross-curricula projects and portfolios). Additionally, we have included Earth Science for 8th graders and have programmed Integrated

Algebra to augment the 8th graders' standard math program. We have revamped our High School programming to include a variety of electives focused around the Arts and College Preparation. The school will have in place a running program for all grades and for all students of all ability levels. This program will be supported by the New York Road Runners Foundation.

Professional development opportunities will be determined and driven by a vehicle known as the Teachers' Learning Community Walkthroughs (a.k.a. TLC's). These walkthroughs are intended to be a non-evaluative means to support and bolster pedagogical practices on all grade levels and across all content areas. Differentiated professional development opportunities based on both informal evaluations (TLC walkthroughs) and formal observations will drive our support of the teachers.

Families are our most important partners in supporting student learning. They serve as classroom volunteers, event coordinators and members of our dedicated Parent Teacher Association (PTA). They also serve as on the Board of Trustees. Staff and families work together to help students develop character and values such as empathy, integrity and resilience.

Our programs help students feel safe and respected and teach them the importance of good citizenship. All members of the community—staff, families and students—adhere to the school's core values of CREST: Community, Respect, Excellence, Scholarship, and Trustworthiness.

Our students gain knowledge and skills through experiential learning approaches using technology. We connect learning to the outside world and expand students' ambitions and opportunities through field trips and project learning opportunities. As one of the original schools at the forefront of the charter movement, we are very proud of our accomplishments—many of which were made under the support of a teacher's union that strongly believes in teachers' ability to organize education for student success. We are very excited to make our vision of a strong and supportive K-12 school a reality.

School Mission Statement and Key Design Elements

The UFT Charter School will prepare all students to achieve academic and personal excellence. The Elementary Academy of the UFT Charter School will graduate students fully prepared for a demanding secondary education. The Secondary Academy of the UFT Charter School will graduate students fully prepared for a demanding college education. Both academies will help to prepare students for meaningful lives as full democratic citizens in a free society.

Key Design Elements: Educational Design Elements

The UFT Charter School focuses not on producing receptacles of information, but of cultivating reflective students who not only possess great knowledge, but who also possess personal and societal skills to effectively influence the world around them. In order to create such students, the UFT Charter School focuses on academic and personal excellence instructional design elements with the result of producing well-rounded, engaged citizens of society. The instruction design elements that follow are those that the school feels sufficiently and effectively assist students on their passage to this tangible aspiration.

Academic Instructional Design

The school believes in providing students with various means of delivering compelling, interactive coursework with results-oriented feedback that help ensure academic performance. To assist achieving this belief, the school has incorporated several elements designed to assist all students in the academic achievement of New York State Learning Standards, as well as the newly-adopted Common Core

standards, along with personal academic goals of the student. The following outline how the school ensures to provide this opportunity to all students:

Co-Teaching Model: To help facilitate a low student-teacher ratio and to ensure a more personal student-teacher relationship with its youngest members, the school implements a co-teaching model that encompasses the early childhood instruction program, which starts in Kindergarten continues through the 2nd grade. This two-teacher model enables teachers to personalize and tailor instruction for each student within their classroom, providing the necessary supports for all students within small groups, with one-on-one student conferencing, and with enrichment activities. Beginning in 3rd Grade, general education classrooms in the Elementary Academy consist of one teacher assisted with a paraprofessional to help scaffold student independence as they prepare for the greater personal responsibility of their secondary education.

AIS Services: The school believes all students should be afforded appropriate and targeted opportunities for academic assistance and intervention, and provides a strong system of support for students through its AIS services. These support services are provided to students who are identified as at risk of not meeting New York State Learning Standards. Each academy has a staff person who is responsible for ensuring that the AIS program meets the needs of its students on an ongoing basis. This support may be provided indirectly in the form of consultation with classroom teachers, as in-class support, or through direct services to students. Levels of support depend on each student's needs, ranging from occasional, informal support to more structured services provided throughout the school day. This instructional support is monitored closely by all staff involved with the student, from classroom teachers, content specialists, school counselors, and administration. Support is modified as necessary and continues as long as needed to ensure a student's success in meeting the New York State Learning Standards.

Response to Intervention (RtI): To meet the needs of all students, the Elementary and Secondary Academy has established a comprehensive continuum of multi-layered and tiered systems with the purpose of providing preventative, intervention, and enrichment services. This continuum includes academic options of varying intensity that are linked to specified educational needs and enrichments that are aligned with student mastery of the state standards. To ensure that these specified options are provided in an appropriately-timed manner to students with qualifying criteria, and to ensure that every student is actively engaged within a program that promotes their personal academic success, the Elementary Academy has implemented a uniform, school-wide RtI process which is directed by a dedicated RtI specialist. This specialist is responsible for the establishment and implementation of a comprehensive process that a.) identifies students who are exhibiting specific educational needs, b.) tapers strategies and supports, c.) aligns strategies and supports to targeted students, and d) evaluates data and outcomes throughout the process. This process involves the participation of all personnel within a grade level, in which they convene into smaller RtI groups based on the targeted strategies and supports. Students are divided throughout the grade level, regardless of class homeroom, in order to optimize academic instruction and success.

Enrichment Sessions (Excellence Academy/Saturday Revolution/Summer Program): The school holds the belief that individualized attention to students and their academic goals leads to significant improvements in their academic ability. With this belief, the UFT Charter School provides various enrichment opportunities outside of regular school hours. At the elementary level, students identified as needing additional academic services, which is based on various interim teacher assessments, are enrolled in an after-school enrichment program which assists students in targeting the areas in which they need additional support. At the secondary level, students are offered specialized academic tutorials in subject areas targeted at specialized

academic goals. In addition, both academies provide enrichment sessions targeted at preparation for various standardized tests, including state and college entrance assessments. Both academies also provide summer programs which target specific academic performance goals for various groups.

Drop Everything and Read (DEAR time): Because those who embrace a love of reading are able to provide themselves with a lifetime of learning opportunities, the Elementary Academy instills a selected time that promotes the voluntary ability to explore self-selected reading texts outside of the curriculum program. However, despite being outside the program, this dedicated time allows students to practice learnt skills within meaningful, personal readings. This scheduled time also allows students to practice, maintain, and grow their sustained reading ability. While this free, self-selected reading time is focused on our students, it also serves as a prime opportunity for administrators, teachers, office staff, and other adults in the school to model the reading habit to and with students.

College Now: Dedicated to preparing students for a demanding college education program and building upon the Elementary Academy's focus of building lifelong learners through reading, the school provides opportunities for students within the Secondary Academy to accumulate college credit in conjunction with Kingsborough Community College. Advanced students who currently have more than 5 Regents earned are placed in an Advisory College Prep Course in the Fall to ensure a smooth transition into the Kingsborough Community College environment in the Spring.

Personal Excellence Instructional Design

The UFT Charter School holds that all are deserving of respect and are inherently motivated to grow in how to appropriately express respect to others within a community. The school also holds that this growth occurs best within a participatory learning community where students are actively engaged in their own learning and interaction with their fellow students. This learning should not only build capacity for the future, but should address current problems and challenges facing individuals and society. With these beliefs, the school has designed an instructional design focused on personal excellence that revolves around personal and community reflection. The following items outline the paths in which personal excellence is embraced and cultivated:

The CREST: Central to the design of the school's culture are selected core principles which help guide students towards active citizenship within the ever-changing global environment of the 21st century. These core principles are made known to the students as the acronym CREST - **C**ommunity, **R**espect, **E**xcellence, **S**cholarship, and **T**rustworthiness. This acronym is used to help students reflect on their academic progress, as well as reflect on the progress of their personal excellence, in order to help set self standards. To implement this self-guided reflection, a CREST curriculum has been added as part of the current instructional program within the Elementary Academy. This curriculum is implemented by a dedicated teacher who assists students in identifying ethical and social skills that promote success within their school community, their home community, and their future endeavors. In addition, each academy has developed their own appropriate rituals and routines reflective of the developmental ages of the student body. Both academies share a common code of conduct that serves to familiarize students with the habits of mind and thought, which the school deems critical towards success as both 21st century and lifelong students and citizens.

Peer Mediation: In focusing on the CREST values and holding forth that personal excellence requires relatable peers models, the school has put into operation a system of peer mediation to further assist students towards their own goals. These peer mediators study appropriate,

successful methods of conflict resolution for implementation in real-time events or in requested situations. By enabling students in the ability to assist in conflict resolution, the school guides students towards self-reliance and social independence.

Town Hall: Each month, both academies hold a meeting dedicated to celebrating the academic and personal excellence achievements of those within the school – both student and staff members. All members of the academy, both student and staff, wear the selected school uniform to help signify unity and support to the academy as a whole. Within the gathering, classes highlight their success with selected performances or presentations. Selected students also are able to highlight their progress through various avenues, such as the school step team, student-produced broadcast news pieces, and various arts integration programs. In addition, special guest speakers share an outside perspective of the CREST values through the sharing of personal experiences and achievements.

Student Government: In order to promote and engage students towards active citizenship within the world around them, the school promotes student engagement and voice with an elected student government. Students run for various offices that include, but are not limited to, president, vice-president, treasurer, secretary, and grade representative. Elections include campaigning, public speeches, and confidential ballot voting. Throughout the school year, elected student officials meet to discuss school matters concerning their constituents and to conduct school fundraisers for various means.

Key Design Elements: Professional Growth

In addition to the school's academic program, the UFT Charter School operates with a focus on the inclusion of teacher personnel within academic decisions that may directly affect their craft and growth; decisions often left solely to administrative personnel in other models. The school prides itself with how successfully it has embraced and implemented this focus. This focus is achieved by the school operating and reflecting upon its procedures, outcomes, and future goals as a professional learning community. In accordance with this behavior, teachers are held to high accountability standards - within their classrooms, within their grade teams, and within their academy - and kept abreast of current school-wide data, regardless of instructional position. In doing such, teachers are suitably positioned to participate in active collaboration within appropriate, decision-making situations. To accommodate such, the school has in place several key structures and resources that are intended to provide reflection, support, and guidance to teachers that will assist them in meeting and accommodating the needs of their students.

Teacher-Collaborative School Design

The overview of each academy is headed by an administrative leader who is responsible for the operation, management, and guidance of the school as an entity. Included in this design is this opportunity for non-administrative personnel – i.e. teaching personnel – to voice their needs, desires, and opinions within appropriate, decision-making situations. These opportunities present themselves in various venues across the schools. These venues include: seats within the Board of Trustees, grade band leader meetings, caucus, and formed committees.

Board of Trustees seats: There are two seats available for teacher personnel within the Board of Trustees. These seats are reserved for one representative from each academy: Elementary and Secondary. Representatives are nominated and, if approve nomination, elected to the position by their peers for a term of no less or no longer than three (3) years. During this term, representatives attend all board meetings – executive and open – and cast ballots on motions put forth to a vote. These votes are to be reflective of the staff's voice from each representative's academy.

Grade Band Leader meetings: Each grade level is headed by one teacher from within the grade band teaching personnel. This leader is responsible for overlooking the grade band, ensuring vital data is recorded and passed on to the necessary personnel, as well as communicating information between administration and the grade band regarding student and curriculum needs, concerns at hand, and professional desires.

Caucus: Each month, a meeting is held outside of school hours where all school personnel have the capacity to present topics, concerns, and proposals to the staff. Agendas are community-created prior to the start of the meeting, and the meeting roles of facilitator, time keeper, and recorder are attending staff volunteers. Attendance and participation are voluntary, with recorded notes indicating discussed topics and decisions sent to the entire staff.

Committees: At times, a current need, concern, or desire may require more research and examination before appropriate and educated decisions can be made by the staff. These topics may be resultant from observations by administrative staff or derivative from conversations within caucus. Committees consist of available staff members who hold an interest or expertise in the topic at hand, and who volunteer their time and services towards the cause. Committees may either come to a conclusion and write a proposed course of action, or they may present the staff with several options ready for a vote.

Multi-Faceted Professional Development Design

The school holds deeply that the development and realization of knowledge in students cannot commence without the development and realization of knowledge in school personnel. With this belief, the school organizes and provides a provision of activities designed to actively engage staff participants in effective, applicable, research-based professional topics with regards to short- and long-term benchmarks relative to school performance and student academic achievements. To achieve this, the school holds regularly scheduled professional development sessions throughout its academic calendar. In addition to this, the school also provides several opportunities for parents, guardians, and families to engage in sessions beneficiary towards their own development as caregiver. These following professional development outlets allow comprehensive and continuous process of growth that ultimately benefits the entirety of the school community.

Summer Institute: In order to efficiently prepare and align objectives across the entirety of the school, teaching personnel and administrators from both academies meet for a variety of engaging workshops on current, research-based strategies and participate in various, intensive data analysis regarding school-wide and grade-level trends prior to the start of the academic school calendar. These meetings help ensure that school-wide instructional, assessment, and performance goals are embedded within a resilient foundation shared by all personnel involved. This then allows a seamless transition for grade bands and academic departments to position their own pertinent focal point as they take a closer look at how the data applies to and shapes their specific domain's outlook for the upcoming year.

Teacher Center: The school is fortunate to have two staff development personnel provided by the UFT Teacher Center. These seasoned educators bring their experience and proficiency to the school's Secondary Academy, where their professional expertise is directed towards continual teacher support and professional development. These Teacher Center personnel also provide teachers with individual, differentiated mentorship based either on need or request. The Teacher Center personnel collaborate with the administrative staff of the Secondary Academy to focus on and provide academy-wide workshops, as well as provide additional professional development

opportunities for the staff. In addition, the Teacher Center personnel collaborate with the administrative staff of the Elementary and Secondary Academies to provide full-day, school-wide, professional development seminars, workshops, and guest presenters throughout the school year.

Coaches: Within the Elementary Academy, there are three specialists who are each dedicated to the overview, development, and support of their content area. These content areas include Literacy, Math, and Response to Intervention. Within these areas, coaches conduct observations, grade level meetings, and specialized professional development in response to school trends and student performance. Coaches are also responsible for mentoring new staff, along with supplementing the instructional performance of established teachers. In addition, these specialists meet with the Assessment Coordinator in order to conduct and analyze grade-wide assessments. Based on these meetings, the specialists identify individual needs and organize the implementation of intervention materials for focused, instructional groups aimed at student performance enhancement within their respected content areas.

Grade and Department Leads: To ensure aligned academic and instructional goals, each academy selects a point person on the grade and department levels. These point people teach within these areas and are respectively titled grade leaders and department leads. These leaders are responsible for ensuring vital data is recorded and passed onto necessary personnel, as well as communicating information between administration and related staff regarding student and curriculum needs, concerns at hand, and professional desires. These leaders also communicate and coordinate any needed professional development needs with coaches and/or Teacher Center personnel. This may lead to specialized professional development sessions during their scheduled grade or department meetings, or lead to a focus with scheduled school-wide workshops.

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	71	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150
2006-07	73	76	68	0	0	0	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	344
2007-08	96	76	70	58	0	0	118	118	0	0	0	0	0	536
2008-09	95	95	72	63	56	0	109	121	107	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	718
2009-10	49	103	89	71	60	53	79	98	112	82	N/A	N/A	N/A	796
2010-2011	86	46	91	82	75	55	128	87	90	71	74			

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will meet or exceed the New York Elementary and Intermediate Standards (as applicable) in English Language Arts

Background

The UFT Charter School develops lifelong readers who enjoy reading a wide range of literature and factual material to make sense of the world and influence its direction. Literacy is integrated throughout the day in a print-rich environment that fosters a love of reading. At the Elementary Academy, students select their own independent reading books, based on their reading level, and are encouraged to read during the school-wide DEAR (Drop Everything and Read) time. In addition to the language arts block, morning meetings are rich opportunities for teachers to model various reading strategies to students. Nonfiction content-area reading is also included in the Core Knowledge curriculum.

The core ELA instructional program at the Elementary Academy is Macmillan/McGraw-Hill *Treasures*. Macmillan/McGraw-Hill *Treasures* was selected to meet the need for a high-quality K-5 comprehensive core reading program. *Treasures* includes research-based practices to guide instruction of the 7 components of literacy. These include the five components of Reading which are: Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension. In addition, skills specialized in Listening/Viewing/Speaking and Writing are addressed.

The program builds upon skills beginning in kindergarten to fifth grade, incorporates small and whole group instruction, and is linked to the NYS ELA assessments. *Treasures* is designed to address all tested benchmarks by the 20th week of instruction, and provides opportunities for students to demonstrate mastery of these benchmarks.

The English language arts curriculum for the UFTCS, Secondary Academy was developed from the New York State ELA Standards and Core Curriculum, using the Understanding by Design model. There are six units of study in each grade centered on a genre, with objectives formulated from the New York State performance indicators. Students are immersed in readings within the genre, learn to identify the literacy elements of the genre, and compose responses to the literature they read. They explore essential questions related to the genre in written and oral discussion. The summative assessment for each unit is a performance task in which students produce their own examples of the genre or write a literacy analysis of works studied. Units include: memoir, informational text, myths and legends, poetry, realistic fiction, folklore, drama and historical fiction.

Sixth grade students receive an additional period of instruction each day in an effort to bridge the gaps in the reading achievement of many of our incoming youngsters. Teachers explicitly teach and model the strategies, and students apply them in independent reading books on the appropriate level. In the seventh and eighth grades, strategies instruction is embedded in the genre study.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English language arts examination.

In 2009-10 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State English Language arts examination.¹

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3 through 8 grade in April 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	657
4	654
5	654
6	654
7	652
8	652

The table below summarizes participation information for this year’s test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have been enrolled for less than one year.

**2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ^[1]			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	81	0	0	0	81
4	75	0	0	0	75
5	55	0	0	0	55
6	125	0	0	3	128
7	87	0	0	1	88
8	90	0	0	0	90
All	513	0	0	4	517

¹ In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school’s Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan’s standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

The following table presents the state English language arts test results for all students and for those students enrolled in at least their second year in 3rd through 8th grade. In 2010-2011, 88 percent of our 4th grade students and 76 percent of our 5th grade students enrolled in their second year, scored at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score. The overall percent of students in at least their second year achieving a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 is 59 percent.

**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	60	81
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>57</u>	75
4	All Students	89	75
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>88</u>	69
5	All Students	76	55
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>76</u>	54
6	All Students	47	125
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>41</u>	32
7	All Students	58	87
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>60</u>	70
8	All Students	32	90
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>33</u>	87
All	All Students	60	513
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>59</u>	387

Evaluation

With 59 percent of students scoring at Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3, the school was 16 percentage points below the target of 75 percent proficient and therefore did not meet the measure. While only 57 percent of all third grade students met the Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3, 88 percent of fourth grade students enrolled in their second year at Scale Score or above the Time Adjusted Level 3, indicating considerable gains for students who remain in our school. These results demonstrate the efficacy of our ELA curriculum in the Elementary Academy. We still have work to do, however, in order to achieve the target of 75 percent at or above the new Proficiency Score.

Additional Evidence

Fourth grade experienced increased growth, going from 59 percent of students scoring at Scale Score at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 in 2009-2010, to 88 percent in 2010-11. This is a jump of nearly 30 percent and shows increased levels of educational productivity among students. These results are directly from a pilot program that, due to the success of the fourth grade program, will now be implemented throughout the Elementary Academy and there is now a very strong chance of growth throughout the school. The Academy as a whole remained stable, showing no decrease in students

meeting their ELA criteria and is expected to have exceptional enrichment and advancement in the time to come.

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	79 %	57	48%	62	72%	71	<u>57</u>	75
4	N/A	N/A	77%	56	59%	58	<u>88</u>	69
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	91%	52	<u>76</u>	54
6	0%	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	78	<u>41</u>	32
7	62%	108	76%	118	75%	95	<u>60</u>	70
8	N/A	N/A	59%	107	37%	106	<u>33</u>	87
All	69%	166	65%	343	59%	331	<u>59</u>	387

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state’s learning standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s English language arts AMO.

As SED has not yet determined this year’s AMO, schools need not calculate their Performance Index and may omit reporting on this measure.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

well as between the total result of students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.

Results

The aggregate charter school performance was below the district performance in the same tested grades for four grades tested (6th, 7th and 8th grades).

**2010-11 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	39	75	36.3	2199
4	57	69	40.2	2215
5	39	54	34.8	2102
6	22	32	33.9	1898
7	10	70	22.9	1893
8	11	87	22.9	2006
All	30	387	32	12,313

Evaluation

The aggregate charter school performance was below the district performance in the same tested grades. The exception to the previous statement is the third grade performance being over 2.7% higher than the district performance, the 4th grade being 16.8% higher than the district performance, and the 5th grade being 4.2% higher than the district performance.

Additional Evidence

Third through Fifth grade experienced tremendous growth, averaging near 8 percent higher than the district performance and demonstrating the ability for higher academic output by students and educators alike. We can see that the chance for further upgrades in academic performance is strong and that the Academy posses a keen, focused agenda to utilize its resources for student benefit.

**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	82.5%	56.2%	48%	62.1%	48%	39.3%	39%	36.3
4	n/a	n/a	76%	59.4%	25%	32.1%	57%	40.2
5	n/a	n/a	N/A	n/a	50%	22.4%	39%	34.8
6	0.0%	45.3 %	N/A	n/a	N/A	n/a	22%	33.9
7	63%	56.4%	76%	57.3%	20%	24%	10%	22.9
8	n/a	n/a	59%	42.9%	22%	22.4%	11%	22.9

All	69.3%	52.8%	68%	58.9%	31%	28%	<u>30%</u>	32%
-----	-------	-------	-----	-------	-----	-----	------------	-----

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.

Results

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. Based on the data from the table below, the effect score of -0.65, the school scored 10.9 percent points below our predicted outcome.

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		71	47.9	45.0	2.9	.21	
4		59	25.4	44.3	18.9	-1.24	
5		53	50.9	42.0	8.9	0.59	
6		78	16.7	38.7	-22.0	-1.36	
7		95	20.0	34.7	-14.7	-0.87	
8		106	21.7	35.7	-14.0	-0.78	
All		65.8	462	28.4	39.3	-10.9	-0.65

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:
<i>Lower than expected to a medium degree</i>

Evaluation

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. It is evident, through the data, that the UFT Charter School’s aggregate Effect Size for 2009-2010 school year, did not exceed 0.3. Our outcome was a negative number based on our 4th grade and middle school scores.

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	3, 6, 7	70.86	290	65.49	53.65	0.80
2008-09						
2009-10	3-8	65.8	462	28.4	39.3	-0.65

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

There are no cohorts that achieved their target, and the school did not achieve the overall performance target.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	69	46	61	57	NO
5	54	28	52	39	NO
6	32	19	47	22	NO
7	67	19	47	10	NO
8	83	22	49	12	NO
All	305				NO

Additional Evidence

There was an average increase of 8 percent in Grades Fourth through Sixth, showing signs of growth. While we do not reach the target, we have shown considerable growth in the Elementary Academy,

with Fourth Grade almost reaching the target level. There is a need for reflection and focus on how to achieve similar progress within the Secondary Academy. However, with implementation of our new RTI program this coming school year, we are positive that future goals can be met.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	6,7	1	2
2008-09	4,7,8	1	3
2009-10	4-8	4	5
2010-11	4-8	0	5

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.	Did Not Achieve
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.	Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	N/A
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Upon release of the results this year, the UFT Charter School held several education planning meetings to address the state test scores. As a result of these meetings, the elementary academy has implemented the following:

- All teachers are receiving mentoring and support in using data to drive instruction.
- Teacher are being supplied with thorough data analysis from the English Language Arts examination and are working with the assessment coordinator and Literacy Specialist to further refine instruction in identified skills.
- Unit tests scores across all subjects will be monitored on a consistent basis.
- All teachers are receiving professional development from full time Literacy and Math Specialist on staff.
- Paraprofessionals are being deployed to work in targeted skills with all students who have a Scale Score below 650.
- A Response to Intervention period has been implemented during the instructional day (30 minutes) to focus work with students in Tier II/Tier III.

Upon release of the test results this year, The UFT Charter School held several education planning meetings to address the state test scores. As a result of these meetings, the secondary academy has implemented the following:

- Academic Intervention Services were renamed from AIS to CorePlus classes to destigmatize the classes.
- CorePlus classes were also flanked with Enrichment courses to serve as a motivating force for students.
- All students scoring below a Scale Score of 650 will be placed on biweekly progress reports for consistent monitoring.
- All students scoring below a Scale Score of 650 will be given access and assignments on the PLATO educational support system.
- An emphasis has been placed on vocabulary retention across all grades.
- The teachers have been asked to set academic goals on a quarterly basis for their students
- All teachers have also been provided with a class list of their students with scale scores, multiple intelligence strength, and areas in need of improvement.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will become proficient in the application of mathematical skills and concepts.

Background

Our Elementary students receive 60 minutes of daily mathematics instruction through the *Everyday Mathematics* curriculum. *Everyday Mathematics* is a comprehensive, academically rigorous kindergarten through fifth grade mathematics curriculum developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project, and published by Wright Group/McGraw-Hill. The federal government's What Works Clearinghouse gave *Everyday Mathematics* the highest rating of any commercially published elementary mathematics curriculum (Everyday Mathematics, 2010). Through its revolutionary and progressive focus on real-life problem solving, self-directed learning, facilitation of school-family cooperation, emphasis on balanced, small group and differentiated instruction, our Elementary students receive 75 minutes of daily mathematics instruction through the *Everyday Mathematics* curriculum.

After each 4-6 week unit, all Elementary students take *Everyday Mathematics* Unit Tests, which allow us to determine what each student learned, knows and is able to do, in terms of mastery of standards and skills. Additionally, we use the results from these assessments to establish strategic action plans for re-teaching, intervention, enrichment, one-on-one tutoring, and targeted practice

Our Secondary Academy utilizes the New York State Mathematics Standards as its base. The course of study for each grade is organized into six units based on the five mathematics content strands: Number Sense and Operations, Statistics and Probability, Geometry, Measurement, and Algebra. Units are written in the Understanding by Design format, engaging students in exploration of essential mathematical questions as they master the New York State performance indicators for their grade. On-going, teacher-developed formative assessment is a cornerstone of the mathematics curriculum, as are performance tasks in which students demonstrate their mastery of content through projects that incorporate problem solving, representation, and mathematical communication skills.

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 examination².

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3 through 8 grade in May 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	656
4	655
5	653
6	653
7	651
8	652

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 ³			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	81	0	0	0	81
4	75	0	0	0	75
5	55	0	0	0	55
6	126	0	0	2	128

² 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 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

7	87	0	0	1	88
8	90	0	0	0	90
All	514	0	0	3	517

Results

The following table presents the state Mathematics examination results for all students enrolled in at least their second year in grades 3 through 8. In 2010-2011, 90 percent of students tested who were enrolled in at least their second year scored at or above a Scale Score or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	100	81
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>100</u>	75
4	All Students	95	75
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>99</u>	69
5	All Students	82	55
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>82</u>	55
6	All Students	87	126
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>91</u>	32
7	All Students	70	87
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>82</u>	82
8	All Students	83	90
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>85</u>	85
All	All Students	86	514
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>90</u>	398

Evaluation

Mathematics continues to be a strong cornerstone of achievement in both Elementary and Secondary Academies. Third and 4th grade finished with 100 percent of all students in at least their second year finishing at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Scores. Overall, 90 percent of Elementary and Secondary Academy students finished at or above the Adjust Level 3 Cut Score, a truly remarkable feat.

Additional Evidence

The school’s performance has remained excellent over the last several years with 3rd Grade alone boasting a nearly 98 percent average success rate since 2008-09 to 2010-11. Further adding to these tremendous figures is the increase from 79 percent to 85 percent success rate in 8th Grade, one of the

highest levels of increased performance in the last several school years. By maintaining the educational foundation we have established, we are assured of strong continued results for the future.

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			98	59	95	61	100	75
4					93	57	100	69
5							82	55
6							91	32
7			68	117	82	119	82	82
8					79	106	85	85
All			78	176	85	343	90	398

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.

Results

The following table presents the state Mathematics test results for all students in 3rd through 8th grade. In 2010-11, 94 percent of tested students scored at a Level 2 or above and 47 percent of all tested students scored at a Level 3 or above.

Calculation of 2010-11 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3 - 8	6%	47%	38%	9%	514

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= 47 + 38 + 9 = 94 \\
 &+ 38 + 9 = 47 \\
 \text{PI} &= 141
 \end{aligned}$$

Evaluation

The school’s Performance Index on the State Mathematics examination **did meet** the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. Our PI of 141 **did exceed** the AMO of 132 for 2010-2011.

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 aggregate charter school performance as above the district in the same tested grades for most grades tested.

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	64	75	41.7	2236
4	61	69	49.8	2253
5	51	55	45.3	2134
6	47	32	44.9	1943
7	28	82	37.2	1925
8	40	85	35.2	2028
All	48	398	42.4	12,519

Evaluation

The Comparative measure for 2010-2011 was met. The UFT Charter School surpassed the aggregate district performance by 5.6%. The Elementary Academy continues to show growth, with 3rd grade surpassing the district by an average of roughly 11 percent since 2008-09. Mostly recently, 3rd grade had surpassed the district by nearly 13 percent in 2010-11. In 2008-09 and 2010-11, 4th grade had surpassed the district by an average of nearly 13 percent, showcasing an increase of nearly 21 percent from the previous school year. 8th grade shows promising signs of recovery, having rebounded to 40 percent in 2010-11 from 13.2 percent in 2009-10. 7th grade shows a need for further reflection, but with the growth and success of other grades in surpassing the district, the outlook continues to be one of positivity and encouragement.

**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			95	90.2	60.6	44.5	64	41.7
4			93	78.8	40.7	47.7	61	49.8
5			-	-	44	44.7	51	45.3
6			-	-			47	44.9
7			96	70	33.7	39.2	28	37.2
8			79	58.4	13.2	30.7	40	35.2
All			83.8	76.6	34.1	41.2	48	42.4

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 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

Data is not available as of September 23, 2011

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		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
4		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

6		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
All		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
<i>Data from NYS as of September 23, 2011</i>

Evaluation

N/A

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007-08	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008-09	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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 data tables represents the number of cohorts that achieved their target. The cohorts that achieved their targets was the 4th and 6th grades. The school did not meet its overall performance.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	69	62	68.5	70	YES

5	55	44	59.5	51	NO
6	32	22	48.5	50	YES
7	87	25	50	26	NO
8	90	37	56	39	NO
All	427	38	56.5	47.2	NO

Evaluation

Since 2007-08, there has been growth among the Cohorts. Initially, zero cohorts reached their respective targets on the Mathematics Exam. However, in 2010-11, two cohorts were able to reach their goals, showcasing that growth is occurring. Whereas not all the cohorts may be meeting targets, the statistics clearly show that there is an over-all advancement towards successful mathematic implementation. This not only displays signs of growth, but shows that the Academies are heading on the correct path towards a mutual goal of student progress.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2007-08	6,7	0	2
2008-09	4-8	1	3
2009-10	4-8	1	4
2010-11	4-8	2	5

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	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.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Upon release of the results this year, the UFT Charter School held several education planning meetings to address the state test scores. As a result of these meetings, the elementary academy has implemented the following:

- All teachers are receiving mentoring and support in using data to drive instruction.
- Teachers are being supplied with thorough data analysis from the NYS Math examination and are working with the assessment coordinator and Math Specialist to further refine instruction in identified skills.
- Unit tests scores across all subjects will be monitored on a consistent basis.
- All teachers are receiving professional development from full time Math Specialist on staff.
- Paraprofessionals are being deployed to work in targeted skills with all students who have a Scale Score below 650.
- A Response to Intervention period has been implemented during the instructional day (30 minutes) to focus work with students in Tier II/Tier III.

Upon release of the test results this year, The UFT Charter School held several education planning meetings to address the state test scores. As a result of these meetings, the secondary academy has implemented the following:

- Progression from teacher- dominated lessons to student-centered activities with the utilization of manipulatives in place for the preponderance of lessons will be encouraged and monitored.
- Reading and writing in the mathematics content area will be the order of the day versus computational activities.
- Mathematical journals will be emphasized in all classes.
- The 8th grade students are now taking Integrated Algebra and an opportunity to earn Regents credit.
- Academic Intervention Services renamed from AIS to CorePlus classes to minimize possible negative connotations associated with the designation AIS. Core Plus classes are designed for grades 6-8.
- CorePlus classes for grades 6-8 flanked with Core Challenge courses to serve as a motivating catalyst for students.
- All teachers provided with data analysis for the NYS Mathematics examination and data workshops.
- Administration has defined the “ lowest third” achievers and has provided these students with multiple interventions including Core Foundation classes, RTI modalities, Testing Anxiety Minimization, Social/Emotional, and Academic Focus support groups.
- All students scoring beneath the Time-Adjusted Scale Score will be placed on biweekly progress reports for consistent monitoring.
- Students falling beneath the Time-Adjusted Scale Score will receive RTI modalities twice a week.
- There are multiple school-wide formative assessments administered during the course of the school year. These examinations will serve as benchmarks to provide data for administrators, teachers, students and parents. The ultimate goal is to provide our students with the requisite skills for success.
- Administrators, faculty and staff will serve as advisors for the school-wide population.

- Reading and writing across the curricula will be emphasized and embedded in all pedagogical practices in keeping with the basic tenants of the Common Core State Standards.
- All teachers will be encouraged to infuse authentic evaluative procedures such as continuously updated student portfolios.
- Field trips will be specifically designed to enhance real world connections in mathematics.
- Inter-disciplinary strands will be emphasized and encouraged across the curriculum.
- School- wide, grade specific and individualized professional development offerings will be in place throughout the course of the school year to ensure the foregoing.
- (The seminal work of Danielson and Marzano will anchor these initiatives.)

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will meet or exceed the New York Elementary or Intermediate Standards (as applicable) in Science as indicated by New York State Standardized Assessments.

Background

The Elementary Academy believes that every student should learn the fundamentals of science and the world around us, basic principles of government, important events of world history, essential elements of mathematics and of oral and written expression, widely acknowledged masterpieces of art and music from around the world, and stories and poems passed down from generation to generation. The Core Knowledge curriculum covers scientific concepts that build from grade to grade. Students at the Elementary Academy experience science in a hands-on manner as well as study and apply the processes used by scientists through this core curriculum.

Each middle school grade at the UFT Charters School studies two units in each of the major branches of Science, the living environment and the physical setting. Each unit is designed in the Understanding by Design model with an emphasis on experimentation and inquiry. Units of study include: Weather, Simple and Complex machines, Geology, Reproduction and Genetics, Astronomy and Environmental Science. Students form and test hypotheses in lab investigations; they gain knowledge of scientific facts and concepts through individual and group research. Students' progress is monitored through a variety of formative assessments including lab reports, research projects, quizzes, with a summative performance assessment wrapping up each unit.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

The following table presents the state Science examination results for all students enrolled in at least their second year in 4th and 8th grade. In 2010-2011, 91% of tested students in the fourth grade performed at or above a Level 3 and 36% of tested students in the eighth grade performed at or above a Level 3.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	0%	9%	56%	35%	91%	75
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0%	9%	56%	35%	91%	75
8	All Students	11%	53%	36%	0%	36%	90
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	11%	53%	36%	0%	36%	90

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4			98	57	95	59	91	75
8			65	105	51	102	36	90
All			77	162	67	148	61	165

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

Method

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

Results

District information for science is not available at this time.

**2010-11 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	91	75	n/a	n/a
8	36	90	n/a	n/a

Evaluation

District information is not available at this time and thus no comparisons can be made.

**Science Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4			98%	N/A	95	N/A	91	N/A
8			65%	N/A	51	N/A	36	N/A
All			82%		73%		64%	

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.	Did Not Achieve
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

Fourth grade students continue to surpass the proficiency rate in science. Teachers implement science using the Core Knowledge curriculum. Students are exposed to science concepts through a variety of texts and use science tools to conduct investigations.

Upon release of the test results this year, The UFT Charter School held several education planning meetings to address the state test scores. As a result of these meetings, the secondary academy has implemented the following:

- Progression from teacher- dominated lessons to student-centered activities with the utilization of lab activities, hands-on experiments and manipulatives as an intrical component of daily lessons will be encouraged and monitored.
- Reading, writing and journals in the science content area will be emphasized in all classes.
- The 8th grade students are now taking Earth Science and they will be afforded the opportunity to earn Regents credit.
- Administrators, faculty and staff will serve as advisors for the school-wide population.
- Reading and writing across the curricula will be emphasized and embedded in all pedagogical practices in keeping with the basic tenents of the Common Core State Standards.
- All teachers will be encouraged to infuse authentic evaluative procedures such as continuously updated student portfolios.
- Field trips will be specifically designed to enhance real world connections in science.

- Inter-disciplinary strands will be emphasized and encouraged across the curriculum.
- School- wide, grade specific and individualized professional development offerings will be in place throughout the course of the school year to ensure the foregoing.
- (The seminal work of Danielson and Marzano will anchor these initiatives.)

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB
 Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

Goal 5: Absolute Measure
 Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

Method

Since *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet the state standard in and of themselves aside from the overall school results. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards which indicate each school’s status under the state’s NCLB accountability system. For a school’s status to be “Good Standing” it must not have failed to make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for two consecutive years.

Results

The UFT Charter School is a school in Good Standing under the New York State No Child Left Behind accountability system. The school has made Adequate Yearly Progress overall and within each subgroup.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2005-06	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	Good Standing
2009-10	Good Standing
2010-11	Good Standing

APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES

Note: NO INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME

9th grade 2008-2009

10th grade 2009-2010

11th grade 2010-2011

High School Cohorts

Accountability Cohort

The state’s Accountability Cohort consists specifically of students who are in their fourth year of high school after having entered the ninth grade. For example, the 2007 state Accountability Cohort is comprised of students who entered the 9th grade in the 2007-08 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state’s annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2010-11 school year, and either remained in the school for the rest of the year or left for an acceptable reason. (See New York State Education Department’s website for their accountability rules and cohort definitions: <http://www.emsc.nysed.gov/irts/accountability/home.shtml>)

The following table indicates the number of students in Accountability Cohorts who are in their fourth year of high school, and were enrolled on BEDS Day in October and on June 30th.

Fourth-Year High School Accountability Cohorts

Fourth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 th Grade	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on BEDS Day in October of the Cohort’s Fourth Year	Number Leaving During the School Year	Number in Accountability Cohort as of June 30 th
2007-08	2004-05	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008-09	2005-06	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	2006-07	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	2007-08	2007	N/A	N/A	N/A

Graduation Cohort

Students are included in the Graduation Cohort based on the year they first enter the 9th grade. However, students who have spent at least five months in the school after entering the 9th grade are part of the Graduation Cohort unless they transfer to another diploma-granting program. A student will be included in the school’s Graduation Cohort if the student’s reason for discharge is *not* transfer to another district or school, died, transferred by court order, or left the U.S.

Fourth Year High School Graduation Cohorts

Fourth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 th Grade	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 th of the Cohort’s Fourth Year (a)	Additional Students Still in Cohort ⁴ (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
--------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------	--	--	-----------------------------

⁴ Number of students who had been enrolled for at least five months prior to leaving the school and who were discharged for unacceptable reasons.

2007-08	2004-05	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008-09	2005-06	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	2006-07	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	2007-08	2007	N/A	N/A	N/A

Fifth Year High School Graduation Cohorts

Fifth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 th Grade	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 th of the Cohort's Fifth Year (a)	Additional Students Still in Cohort ⁵ (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2008-09	2004-05	2004	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009-10	2005-06	2005	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010-11	2006-07	2006	N/A	N/A	N/A

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents English exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Comprehensive English exam that students must pass to graduate. Regents are scored on a scale from 0 to 100, and students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure examines the percent of the Accountability Cohort that passed the exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to do so.

Results

In June 2010, the New York State Regents Comprehensive English exam was administered to our 10th grade students and we achieved a 73% passing rate.

English Regents Performance Level and Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort⁶

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level ⁷				Percent Passing ⁸
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

English Regents Passing Rate by Cohort and Year

Cohort	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
--------	---------	---------	---------	---------

⁵ Number of students who had been enrolled for at least five months prior to leaving the school and who were discharged for unacceptable reasons

⁶ Based on the highest score for each student on any mathematics Regents exam

⁷ Level 1 = less than 55; Level 2= at least 55, but less than 65; Level 3 at least 65, but less than 85; Level 4 = at least 85.

⁸ With a score of at least 65

Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
 Each year, the Performance Index (PI) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort 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 in the Accountability Cohort must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s English language arts AMO, which for 2009-2010 is 177. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of students in the Accountability Cohort at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of students at Level 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200. The Regents exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 54 is Level 1, 55 to 64 is Level 2, 65 to 84 is Level 3, and 85 to 100 is Level 4.

Results

**English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)
 of 2006 High School Accountability Cohort**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level										N/A	
	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4					
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2003	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	159
2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	165
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	171
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	177

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing the Regents English exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district.

Method

The performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort is compared to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the most recently available district results are presented.

**English Regents Passing Rate
of Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Evaluation

Additional Evidence

(§) Goal 1: Growth Measure

Each year, the group of students in their second year of high school who have taken a norm-referenced reading test for two years will reduce by one-half the difference between their previous year’s average NCE and an NCE of 50. Groups that have already achieved an NCE of 50 in the previous year will show an increase in their average NCE.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from their first year in high school to their second year on a norm referenced reading test. Each cohort consists of those students who took a norm-referenced reading test in their second year of high school in 2009-10 and also have a score from their first year in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in 2009-10 and the 50th NCE in 2010-11. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50 in 2009-10, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year.

Results

First to Second Year Cohort Growth on the Norm Referenced Reading Test

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		First Year Baseline	Second Year Target	Second Year Result	
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES/NO
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES/NO
2008	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES/NO
2009	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	YES/NO

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the measure was met, i.e. whether all of the cohorts achieved their targets. In addition, the evaluation may include how close each cohort came to its target, which cohorts’ performance increased or decreased, and the overall performance of all cohorts.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides an analysis of year-to-year cohort performance including the previous year.

Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Reading Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort met target?
2007-08	N/A
2008-09	N/A
2009-10	N/A
2010-11	N/A

MATHEMATICS

The following measures should be included under the Accountability Plan mathematics goal.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Math A, Math B, Geometry, Integrated Algebra and Algebra 2 exams. Regents are scored on a scale from 0 to 100, and students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass any one of the Regents mathematics exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a

particular Regents mathematics exam multiple times or have taken multiple mathematics exams; once they passed a mathematics exam, their performance on subsequent exams did not affect their status as passing. Students have until the summer of their fourth year to pass a mathematics exam.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure.

Mathematics Regents Performance Level and Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort⁹

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level ¹⁰				Percent Passing ¹¹
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing passing rates on individual assessments, and additional analysis of the data such as performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards meeting the measure’s target. An optional table for this section on performance disaggregated by cohort and mathematics exam can be used. The table shell can be found on page 57 in the Appendix.

Regents Mathematics Passing Rate by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2008	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2009	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2010	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

⁹ Based on the highest score for each student on any mathematics Regents exam

¹⁰ Level 1 = less than 55; Level 2= at least 55, but less than 65; Level 3 at least 65, but less than 85; Level 4 = at least 85.

¹¹ With a score of at least 65

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the Performance Index (PI) on the Regents mathematics exams of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort 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 in the Accountability Cohort must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s mathematics AMO, which for 2010-11 is 173. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of students at Level 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200. The Regents exams are scored on a scale from 0 to 100; 0 to 54 is Level 1, 55 to 64 is Level 2, 65 to 84 is Level 3, and 85 to 100 is Level 4.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**Mathematics Performance Index (PI)
of 2006 High School Accountability Cohort**

Cohort Size	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	?	?	?	?

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

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

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

Cohort	Cohort Size	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2003	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	153
2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	159

2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	165
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	173

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a Regents mathematics exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school accountability cohort from the local school district.

Method

The performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort is compared to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the most recently available district results are presented.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**Mathematics Regents Passing Rate
by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2004	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2005	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2006	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2007	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

(§) Goal 2: Growth Measure

Each year, the group of students in their second year of high school who have taken a norm-referenced mathematics test for two years will reduce by one-half the difference between their previous year’s average NCE and an NCE of 50. Groups that have already achieved an NCE of 50 in the previous year will show an increase in their average NCE.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from their first year in high school to their second year on a norm referenced mathematics test. Each cohort consists of those students who took a norm-referenced mathematics test in their second year of high school in 2010-11 and also have a score from their first year in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in 2009-10 and the 50th NCE in 2010-11. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50 in 2010-11, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year.

Include a brief narrative that describes the type of test administered, to which grades, the date of administrations, etc.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure, e.g. the number of cohorts that achieved their target, and overall performance.

First to Second Year Cohort Growth on the Norm Referenced Mathematics Test

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		First Year Baseline	Second Year Target	Second Year Result	
2006					YES/NO
2007					YES/NO
2008					YES/NO
2009					YES/NO

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the measure was met, i.e. whether all of the cohorts achieved their targets. In addition, the evaluation may include how close each cohort came to its target, which cohorts’ performance increased or decreased, and the overall performance of all cohorts.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides an analysis of year-to-year cohort performance including the previous year.

Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Mathematics Test by School Year

School Year	Cohort met target?
2007-08	
2008-09	
2009-10	
2010-11	

SCIENCE

The following measures should be included under the Accountability Plan science goal.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Method

New York State administers multiple high school science assessments; current Regent exams are Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. The school administered Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics. Regents are scored on a scale from 0 to 100, and students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass any one of the Regents science exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents science exam multiple times or have taken multiple science exams; once they passed a science exam, their performance on subsequent exams did not affect their status as passing. Students had until the summer of their fourth year to pass a science exam.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure.

Science Regents Performance Level and Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort¹²

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level ¹³				Percent Passing ¹⁴
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2004						
2005						
2006						
2007						

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing passing rates on individual assessments, and additional analysis of the data such as performance on individual tests and of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year. This

¹² Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

¹³ Level 1 = less than 55; Level 2= at least 55, but less than 65; Level 3 at least 65, but less than 85; Level 4 = at least 85.

¹⁴ With a score of at least 65

is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Science Regents Passing Rate by Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2005								
2006								
2007								
2008								
2009								
2010								

(§) Goal 3: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing a Regents Science exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district.

Method

The performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort is compared to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the most recently available district results are presented.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**Science Passing Rate
 of Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2004				
2005				
2006				
2007				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show

the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance. An optional table for this section on performance disaggregated by cohort and science exam can be used. The table shell can be found on page 57 in the Appendix.

SOCIAL STUDIES

The following measures should be included under the Accountability Plan social studies goal.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure
 Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents U.S. History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Method

New York State administers two high school social studies assessments: U.S. History and Global History. In order to graduate, students must pass both of these Regents exams with a score of 65 or higher. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass the U.S. History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken the exam multiple times, and had until the summer of their fourth year to pass it. Once students passed it, performance on subsequent administrations of the same exam did not affect their status as passing.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure.

**U.S. History Regents Performance Level
 and Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level				Percent Passing
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2004						
2005						
2006						
2007						

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific grades and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the state data such as performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Regents U.S. History Passing Rate by Accountability Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2005								
2006								
2007								
2008								
2009								
2010								

(§) Goal 4: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing the Regents U.S. History exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district.

Method

The performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort is compared to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the most recently available district results are presented.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**U.S. History Passing Rate
of Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2004				
2005				
2006				
2007				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on the New York State Regents Global History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Method

This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass the Global History exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken the exam multiple times, and had until the summer of their fourth year to pass it. Once students passed it, performance on subsequent administrations of the same exam did not affect their status as passing. Cohorts are labeled by the year in which the students entered the 9th grade, and in 2010-11 the 2007 Cohort finished its fourth year.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly addresses the measure.

**Global History Regents Performance Level
and Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level				Percent Passing
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2004						
2005						
2006						
2007						

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific grades and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the state data such as performance of cohorts that have not yet completed their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Regents Global History Passing Rate by Accountability Cohort and Year

Cohort Designation	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2005								
2006								

2007								
2008								
2009								
2010								

(§) Goal 4: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the percent to students in the high school Accountability Cohort passing the Regents Global History exam with a score of 65 or above will exceed that of the high school Accountability Cohort from the local school district.

Method

The performance of students in their fourth year in the charter school Accountability Cohort is compared to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, the most recently available district results are presented.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

**Global History Passing Rate
 of Accountability Cohorts by Charter School and School District**

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort
2003				
2004				
2005				
2007				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance in specific cohorts and populations. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of the data such as trends over time, or the interim performance of cohorts that have not yet reached their fourth year. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Reporting on this goal should be included following the portion of the report addressing the school’s Social Studies Accountability Plan goal.

GOAL 5: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION

Write the school's graduation goal here.

(§) Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will pass their core academic subjects by the end of August and be promoted to the next grade.

Method

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of high school cohorts and examines their progress toward graduation based on annual credit accumulation. The measure requires that, based on the school's promotion requirements, 75 percent of students in each cohort are promoted to the next grade by the end of August.

Write in school's promotion requirements here; include a list of all core academic subjects and other relevant information.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Percent of Students Promoted by Cohort in 2010-11

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted
2007		
2008		
2009		
2010		

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing results from previous years and analysis of trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

(§) Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will score at least 65 on at least three different New York State Regents exams required for graduation by the completion of their second year in the cohort.

Method

This measure serves as a leading indicator of the performance of high school Cohorts and examines their progress towards graduation based on Regents exam passage. The measure requires that 75 percent of students in each Cohort have passed at least three Regents exams by their second year in the cohort. In August of 2010, the 2008 cohort will have completed its second year.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Percent of Students in their Second Year Passing Three Regents Exams by Cohort

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2007		
2008		
2009		

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Present a narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Method

This measure examines students in the high school Graduation Cohort who enter the 9th grade in the same year and graduate four years later. In 2010-11 the 2007 Cohort completed its fourth year of high school. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams in English language arts, mathematics, science, U.S. History and Global History. Students had until the summer of their fourth year to complete their graduation requirements.

Write in school’s graduation requirements here.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Percent of Students in Graduation Cohort who have Graduated After Four Years

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2004		
2005		
2006		
2007		

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

(§) Goal 5: Absolute Measure
 Each year, 95 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fifth year in the cohort.

Method

This measure examines students in the high school Graduation Cohort who enter the 9th grade in the same year and graduate four years later. In 2010-11 the 2006 Cohort completed its fifth year of high school. At a minimum, these students have passed five Regents exams in English language arts, mathematics, science, U.S. History and Global History.

Write in school’s graduation requirements here.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Percent of Students in Graduation Cohort Who Have Graduated After Five Years

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2004		
2005		
2006		

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Goal 5: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort graduating after the completion of their fourth year will exceed that of the Graduation Cohort from the local school district.

Method

The graduation rate of students completing their fourth year in the charter school accountability cohort is compared to that of the respective cohort of students in the local school district. Given that students may take Regents exam up through the summer of their fourth year, district results for the current year are generally not available at this time.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Percent of Students in the Graduation Cohort who Graduate in Four Years Compared to Local District

Cohort Designation	Charter School		School District	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2004				
2005				
2006				
2007				

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

Summary

Narrative discussing which measures were and were not achieved, and then whether the school met, came close to meeting or did not meet the overall goal in the Accountability Plan.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will pass their core academic subjects by the end of August and be promoted to the next grade.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will score at least 65 on at least three different New York State Regents exams required for graduation by the completion of their second year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Absolute	Each year, 95 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fifth year in the cohort.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Comparative	Each year, the percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort graduating after the completion of their fourth year will exceed that of the Graduation Cohort from the local school district.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the specific results and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing special support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented.

COLLEGE PREPARATION

Reporting on this goal should be included following the portion of the report addressing the school’s High School Graduation Accountability Plan goal.

(§) GOAL 6: COLLEGE PREPARATION
Write the school’s college preparation goal here.

(§) Goal 6: Comparative Measure
Each year, the average performance of students in the 10th grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics.

Method

This measure tracks student performance one of the most commonly used early high school college prep assessment. Students receive a scale score in critical reading, writing and mathematics. Scale scores range from 200 to 800 on each subsection with 1800 as the highest possible score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times during the year, only the highest scores on each subsection are considered when reporting on this measure. School averages are compared to the New York State average for all 10th grade (sophomore) test takers in the given year.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

10th Grade PSAT Performance by School Year

School Year	Number of Students in the 10 th Grade	Number of Students Tested	Critical Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						
2010-11						

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

We administered the PSAT to 118/ 173 students in the 9th-11th grade on October 15th, 2011. The results will be released to the schools in early December 2011

(§) Goal 6: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the average performance of students in the 12th grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics.

Method

This measure tracks student performance on one of the most commonly used high school college prep assessments.

For the SAT include this description: The SAT is a national college admissions examination. Students receive a scale score in reading, writing and mathematics. Scale scores range from 200 to 800 on each subsection with 1800 as the highest possible score. As students may choose to take the test multiple times during the year, only the highest scores are considered when reporting on this

measure. School averages are compared to the New York State average for all 12th grade (senior) test takers in the given year.

For the ACT include this description: The ACT is a national college admissions and placement examination. Students receive scaled scores in reading, mathematics, English and Science. Scaled scores range from 1 to 36 on each section and are averaged to calculate a student’s composite score.. As students may choose to take the test multiple times during the year, only the highest scaled scores for each section are considered when reporting on this measure. School averages are compared to the New York State average for all 12th grade (senior) test takers in the given year.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

12th Grade SAT/ACT Performance by School Year

School Year	Number of Students in the 12 th Grade	Number of Students Tested	Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2007-08						
2008-09						
2009-10						
2010-11						

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Additional Evidence

Narrative discussing additional analysis of data such as trends over time, performance disaggregated by student characteristics, etc. This is an opportunity to show the school is making progress towards or maintaining a high level of performance.

(§) Goal 6: School Created College Prep Measure
 Each Year, the school will demonstrate the preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design.

Method

Brief Description of the measure.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

(§) Goal 6: School Created Measure
 Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design.

Method

Brief Description of the measure.

Results

Brief narrative highlighting results in the data tables that directly address the measure.

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether the measure was met and discussing by how much the school fell short of or exceeded the measure, and notable performance. This section can also be used to explain the results in the context of the school program, attributing the results to effective practices or problem areas.

Summary

Narrative discussing which measures were and were not achieved, and then whether the school met, came close to meeting or did not meet the overall goal in the Accountability Plan.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 10 th grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 12 th grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Absolute/Comparative/Growth	Each Year, the school will demonstrate the	Achieved/

	preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design.	Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
Absolute/Comparative/Growth	Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design.	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve/ Not Applicable
	Write in optional measure here	Achieved/ Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the specific results and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing special support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented.

APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following sections are for optional goals; data tables are provided for commonly used optional measures.

Goal 6: Parent Satisfaction

Write the school's goal here.

Goal 6: Absolute Measure

Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school's program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

Method

Our parents received the NYC Department of Education 2010-2011 School Survey.

*Note-*The surveys go home in a Board of Education envelope and many of our parents disregard the survey.

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction Survey Responses

Number of Responses	Number of Families	Response Rate
212	803	28%

2010-11 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Item	Percent of Respondents Satisfied
The education my child has received this year	90%
My opportunities to be involved in my child's education	93%
How well the school communicates with me	91%
The school has high expectations for my child	87%
I feel welcome in my child's school.	85%

Evaluation

Our parent survey responses increased from 14% in 2009 and 24% in 2010 to 28% in 2011. Our responses on the above items increased an average of 5% from 2010 to 2011.

Goal 6: Absolute Measure

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

Method

Narrative explaining how students are tracked year to year

Results

Narrative describing number of students in various categories and the retention rate.

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)
#	#	#	%

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the measure was met and how close the retention rate was to the target.

Additional Evidence

Year	Retention Rate
2006-07	%
2007-08	%
2008-09	%
2009-10	
2010-11	

Goal 6: Absolute Measure

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

Method

Narrative explaining how student attendance is tracked and daily attendance rate calculated.

Results

Narrative describing parents responses.

2010-11 Attendance

Grade	Average Daily Attendance Rate
1	%
2	%
3	%
4	%
5	%
6	%
7	%
8	%
Overall	%

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the measure was met, and how close the attendance rate was to the target.

Additional Evidence

Year	Average Daily Attendance Rate
2006-07	%
2007-08	%
2008-09	%
2009-10	%
2010-11	

APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The following optional tables may be used in the Additional Evidence sections. They are organized by subject and measure. Table titles need to be adapted to reflect the appropriate subject area, i.e. English language arts, mathematics, etc.

Additional Data Tables for English Language Arts and Mathematics

Absolute Measure

In 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.

This table examines whether performance changes the longer students are enrolled in the school. In a successful school, student performance should increase with prolonged participation in the academic program.

2010-11 English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

Grade	Percent of Students at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

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

While schools are required to compare themselves to the local school district, there may be individual schools that also provide a compelling comparison. These might be schools in the same neighborhood, with the same demographics, or having similar programs. Two tables are provided: one featuring a grade level breakdown for 2010-11, the other with annual aggregate results over time.

**2010-11 English Language Arts Performance of
Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools Scoring at or above Level 3 on State Exam							
	Charter School		District School 1	District School 2	District School 3			
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
All								

Growth Measure (state exams)

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.

This table provides the opportunity to examine year-to-year changes in the same students’ performance levels. It shows how many students in a particular performance level in 2009-10 remained at the same level, moved to a higher level, or moved to a lower level in 2010-11. It shows the number of students, not percentages. Students in the upper right quadrant are those who moved from below proficiency in 2009-10 to proficiency in 2010-11. Do not include students who were tested in one year but not in the other. Multiple tables could be used for individual grades.

**Change in English Language Arts Performance Levels
from 2009-10 to 2010-11**

		Number of Students at Each Performance Level				
		2010-11				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Number
2009-10	Level 1					
	Level 2					
	Level 3					
	Level 4					
	Total Number					

Growth Measure (national norm-referenced assessment)

Each year, on a national norm-referenced assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

If the school has administered a norm referenced test, e.g. Terra Nova, ITBS, Stanford 10, it should report cohort growth results in a similar fashion to the growth measure based on state tests.

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 desirable outcome of grade level or an NCE of 50. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the same norm-referenced exam in 2009-10 and 2010-11. It includes students who repeated the grade. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took the exam in both years.

Include a brief narrative that describes the type of test administered, to which grades, the date of administrations, etc.

Results

Cohort Growth on Cohort Growth on XXX Test from Spring 2010 to Spring 2011

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above NCE of 50			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
1					YES/NO
2					YES/NO
3					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

Evaluation

Narrative explicitly stating whether or not the measure was met, i.e. whether all of the cohorts achieved their targets. In addition, the evaluation may include how close each cohort came to its target, which cohorts' performance increased or decreased, and the overall performance of all cohorts.

Additional Evidence

Narrative provides an analysis of year-to-year cohort performance including the previous year.

Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Reading Test

by School Year

School Year	Cohort met target?
2007-08	
2008-09	
2009-10	
2010-11	

Cohort Growth on **XXX Test from Spring 2010 to Spring 2011**

Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
K					YES/NO
1					YES/NO
2					YES/NO
3					YES/NO
4					YES/NO
5					YES/NO
6					YES/NO
7					YES/NO
8					YES/NO
9					YES/NO
10					YES/NO
11					YES/NO
12					YES/NO
All					YES/NO

Cohort Performance on **XXX Test by School Year**

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2005-06	?-?		
2007-08	?-?		
2008-09	?-?		
2009-10	?-?		
2010-11	?-?		

Additional Data Tables for Science

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 examination.

2010-11 Science Performance by Grade Level and Years Attending the School

Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 According to Number of Years in School								
One		Two		Three		Four or More		
Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	

		Tested		Tested		Tested		Tested
4								
8								

Additional Data Tables for High School Measures

Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Mathematics Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2004	2005	2006	2007
Math A				
Math B				
Integrated Algebra				
Geometry				
Algebra 2				

Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

Cohort Passing Rate by Regents Science Exam

Exam	Cohort			
	2004	2005	2006	2007
Living Environment				
Earth Science				
Chemistry				
Physics				