

## Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2009-10 School Year

### Reader's Guide

#### *SUNY Authorized Charter Schools*

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 Accountability Plan**, which ultimately becomes part of its charter.

**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 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade, science tests to the 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades, and, up through 2009-10, social studies tests to the 5<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades.

Important Note: **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 (select the <back> button in your browser to return to the school profile to see any/all available reports). 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.

**UFT  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2009-10  
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

9/30/2010

By Danny Wilcox  
Michelle Bodden-White

800 Van Siclen Avenue  
Brooklyn, NY 11207  
P: 718- 927-5540 F:718-649-0653

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

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Michael Mulgrew	UFT Representative and Chairman
Danny Wilcox	School Leader- Secondary Campus
Michelle Bodden-White	School Leader- Elementary Campus
Deatrice Bacchus	Educator Representative- Secondary Campus
Dr. Leo Casey	UFT Representative-Vice President of UFT
Cali Cole	Community Representative
Evelyn DeJesus	UFT Representative-District 2 Representative to the UFT
Jeffrey Leeds	External/Community Representative-President and Co- Founder of Leeds Equity
Bertha Lewis	External/Community Representative-CEO and Chief Organizer of ACORN
Zakiyah Shaakar-Ansari	Parent Representative-UFT Elementary Academy
Randi Weingarten	Chairperson, UFT Representative-Former President of the UFT, President of the AFT
Kelly Nowlin	Educator Representative from the Elementary Academy
Dr. Sheila Evans Trantum,	Executive Director

## INTRODUCTION

### **I. School Background**

The UFT Charter School was founded on the belief that teacher leadership and quality, collaboration, and professionalism are together the surest path to sustained student achievement. Over the past four years, the challenges inherent to the launch of a new school have tested this proposition. Yet despite these challenges, the school has established a solid foundation, has demonstrated by and large strong student achievement, and has a leadership team and faculty that is poised to exemplify the school's philosophy and meet its mission of preparing students for success in college and life.

### **A. 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: Academic Design Elements**

The UFT Charter School is committed to providing students with intensive support to reach proficiency and beyond and has developed a rich academic program that includes several key program elements that contribute to the school's success.

*CREST Values:* Central to the school are the core principles upon which the school culture is built, the acronym of which is CREST (Community, Respect, Excellence, Scholarship, Trustworthiness). Each campus has developed a set of rituals and routines and a code of conduct that serves to inculcate students with the habits of mind and habits of thought critical to being a successful student and citizen.

*Co-Teaching Model:* Students benefit from a low student-teacher ratio as a result of the co-teaching model that starts in Kindergarten continues through 3<sup>rd</sup> grade. The two teacher model enables teachers to personalize and differentiate instruction, providing the necessary supports for students in small groups, one-on-one student conferencing and intervention and enrichment activities within the classroom. At the Secondary Academy, the Co-teaching model allows teachers to provide student centered instruction and assessments, differentiated assignments, and interdisciplinary projects.

*AIS Services:* The school has a strong system of support for students through its AIS services. Each campus has one staff person who is responsible for ensuring that the AIS program meets students' needs on an ongoing basis. The Assessment director uses the schools internal benchmarks and NY State exam Scores to individualize curriculum for the CorePlus course. This AIS Coordinator is responsible for working with teachers to provide additional support to teachers so that they can meet students' needs in the classroom.

*Excellence Academy:* Students that are identified as needing additional academic services—based on the school's various interim assessments as well as teachers' assessment of student performance in the classroom—are enrolled in an after-school enrichment program. At the elementary campus students meet during after school program hours. At the secondary campus students are offered specialized academic tutorial in the subject area in which they are struggling. This tutorial meets after school.

### **Key Design Elements: Professional Growth**

In addition to the school’s academic program, the UFT Charter School prides itself on the role teachers’ play within the school. The school has sought to develop a professional learning community in which teachers are held to high standards and play a central role in the school’s decision-making. As such, it has in place several key structures and resources that are intended to provide support and guidance to teachers such that they can meet the needs of their students.

*Teacher-Led School Design*

The UFT is committed to a school model in which teachers are central to the decision making process. This is based on the belief that teachers are best positioned to know what their students need, and what they themselves need. In turn, while each school has instructional leadership who are responsible for the management and guidance of the school, teachers are at the table when key decisions are made that will have an impact on their practice or their students’ learning. Teachers participate in committees at each school focused on various aspects of school life (e.g. curriculum, citizenship, culture, and assessment).

*Teacher Center*

Each campus benefits from the experience and expertise of a seasoned educator through the UFT Teacher Center whose sole role is to provide teachers with ongoing support and professional development, and help teachers individually on an as-needed basis. The Teacher Center specialists have played a unique and critical role in developing teacher capacity at each campus. They are core to the school’s development of curriculum, assessments, and unit and lesson plans. Working in partnership with the principal, the aim of the Teacher Center specialists is to provide differentiated support to teachers on an as-needed basis in addition to providing more uniform professional development.

*Weekly or Bi-Weekly Professional Development*

Teachers participate in regular professional development focused on lesson-plan writing, study of student work, analysis of assessment data, instructional strategies and methods for increasing student performance, and addressing other school-wide instructional issues. Professional Development sessions occur weekly for 50 minutes at the Secondary Academy and for 100 minutes every two weeks at the Elementary Academy.

*Summer Institute*

Each summer the faculty meets for one week to plan curriculum and set goals for the upcoming school year. Two days of summer institute is dedicated to the two campuses coming together to set campus-wide goals and to build community among current and new faculty members.

**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

UFT Charter School 2009-10 Accountability Plan Progress Report

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

## 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 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.

At the Elementary Campus, the English language arts curriculum consists of all aspects of reading development which includes phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency. Students are exposed to a variety of reading genres and taught specific strategies to navigate the different text structures and to comprehend utilizing higher-order thinking skills. Through teacher- developed writing units of study, writing instruction is taught in tandem with the reading instruction to support students in writing genres.

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

### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3 through 8 grade in April 2010. 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, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown

of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have been enrolled for less than one year.

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>1</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	71	0	0	0	71
4	59	0	0	0	59
5	53	0	0	0	53
6	78	0	0	1	79
7	95	0	0	3	98
8	106	0	0	6	112
All	462	0	0	10	472

**Results**

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 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade. In 2009-10, 59 percent of tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year scored at or above a Scale Score of 650.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students	72%	71
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>71%</b>	70
4	All Students	59%	59
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>59%</b>	58
5	All Students	93%	53
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>92%</b>	52
6	All Students	67%	78
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		0
7	All Students	75%	95
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>75%</b>	95
8	All Students	37%	106
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>37%</b>	106
All	All Students	64%	462
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>64%</b>	381

<sup>1</sup> Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.



**Evaluation**

With 64 percent of students scoring at or above a Scale Score of 650, the school was 11 percentage points below the target of 75 percent proficient and therefore did not meet the measure. Our sixth grade was not included in this calculation because those students had only been enrolled in the school for approximately eight months at the time the English language arts exam was administered. While only 67 percent of all sixth grade students scored at or above a Scale Score of 650, 75 percent of seventh grade students enrolled in their second year scored at or above a Scale Score of 650, indicating considerable gains for students who remain in our school. Also, 71 percent of all third grade students who have been enrolled in their second year scored at or above a Scale Score of 650. These results demonstrate the efficacy of our English curriculum in both K-2 and 7<sup>th</sup> grade. 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**

The school’s performance has minimally decreased over the last two years with 69% proficient in 2007-2008, 66% proficient in 2008-2009, and 64% percent scoring at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-2010. Our greatest gains have occurred in third grade where the students have received quality instruction from our school for four consecutive years. Our middle school program has experienced several changes in leadership and the results indicate lower levels of performance.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	N/A	N/A	79 %	57	48%	62	72%	71
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	59%	58
5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	91%	52
6	N/A	N/A	0%	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	78
7	N/A	N/A	62%	108	76%	118	75%	95
8	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	59%	107	37%	106
All			69%	166	66%	287	59%	331

**Goal 1: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

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

Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s English language arts AMO, which for 2009-10 is 155.<sup>2</sup> The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

**Results**

The following table presents the state English language arts test results for all students in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade. In 2009-10, 86 percent of tested students scored at a Level 2 or above and 29 percent of all tested students scored at a Level 3 or above.

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

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3 - 8	15%	57%	26%	3%	462

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \mathbf{PI} & = & 57 & + & 26 & + & 3 & = & 86 \\
 & & & + & 26 & + & 3 & = & 29 \\
 & & & & & & \mathbf{PI} & = & \mathbf{115}
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

The school’s Performance Index on the State English language arts examination did not meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. Our PI of 115 did not exceed the AMO of 155 for 2009-2010.

---

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

**Additional Evidence**

The 2009-2010 Performance Index for the school shows a decrease compared to the two previous years of testing. The percent of students at Level 1 has increased from 1% in 2007-2008 to 15% in 2009-1010. The percent of students at Level 2 has increased from 34 percent in 2007-2008 to 57 percent in 2009-2010.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07	6	126	2%	52%	43%	3%	n/a	122
2007-08	3, 6-7	290	1	34	63	2	164	133
2008-09	3,4,6,7,8	448	0	32	66	2	168	144
2009-10	3-8	462	15	57	26	3	115	155

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

The aggregate charter school performance was below the district performance in the same tested grades for most grades tested. The exception to the previous statement is the third grade performance being 9 % higher than the districts performance.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	48%	71	39.3%	2184
4	25%	59	32.1%	2215
5	50%	52	22.4%	2055
6	N/A	N/A		
7	20%	95	24%	1922

8	22%	106	22.4%	2055
All	<b>31%</b>	383	<b>28%</b>	10431

**Evaluation**

The Comparative measure for the 2009-2010 school year was met. The UFT charter school outperformed District 19’s percent of students performing at Level 3 and 4 by 3 percentage points.

**Additional Evidence**

As evidenced by our state scores there is work to do in our fourth grade and sixth grades at the UFT Charter School.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	n/a	52%	82.5%	56.2%	48%	62.1%	48%	39.3%
4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	76%	59.4%	25%	32.1%
5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	N/A	n/a	50%	22.4%
6	n/a	42.1 %	0.0%	45.3 %	N/A	n/a	N/A	n/a
7	n/a	36.2%	63%	56.4%	76%	57.3%	20%	24%
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	59%	42.9%	22%	22.4%
All	n/a	43.7%	69.3%	52.8%	68%	58.9%	31%	28%

**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**

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	0.21
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

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

**Evaluation**

It is evident, through the data, that the UFT Charter school's aggregate Effect size for the 2009-2010 school year, did not exceed 0.3. Our outcome was a negative number based on our 4<sup>th</sup> 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**

Each year through 2008-09, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's state English language arts exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's state English language arts exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

**Results**

There is one cohort that did not achieve their target.

The growth measure has not been achieved because all cohorts did not meet their targets.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4	59	48	54	59	YES
5	53	75	84	92	YES
6	78	0	33.5	67	YES
7	95	75	75	75	YES
8	108	76	57	37	NO
All	393				NO

**Summary of the English Language Arts 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 a Scale Score of 650 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.	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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	Did Not Achieve

## Action Plan

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 UFT secondary campus 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 teachers were provided with data analysis for the English language arts examination and Data workshop.
- All students scoring below a Scale Score of 650 will be placed on biweekly progress reports for consistent monitoring.
- Students with a Scale Score below 650 on both the state English language arts examination and the state Mathematics examination will be pulled- out of an elective course for additional small group tutoring.
- All students scoring below a Scale Score of 650 will be given access and assignments on the PLATO educational support system.
- There will be three school- wide state English language examinations given as benchmarks to provide data to classroom teachers and students designed to prepare students for the exam.
- The School Student Support Team will be utilized to assist at-risk students.
- There will be a standard writing procedure used across the grades.
- An emphasis has been placed on vocabulary retention and acquisition across all grades and curriculum.
- The teachers have been asked to set academic goals on a quarterly basis for their students
- All teachers have been provided with a class list of their students with scale scores, multiple intelligence strengths, and areas in need of improvement.

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

- Unit tests across all subjects that are monitored on a consistent basis.
- All teachers are receiving mentoring and support in using data to drive instruction.
- Paraprofessionals are being deployed to work in targeted skills with all students who have a Scale Score below 650.
- Teachers are being supplied with thorough data analysis from the English Language Arts examination and are working with the assessment coordinator and Teacher Center specialist to further refine instruction in identified skills.
- A full time teacher has been added to the staff to provide further instruction in writing.
- The RTI approach is being used in all classes. In two teacher classrooms, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are provided by one of the classroom teachers. In classes with one teacher, a specialist has been deployed to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.

- The School Student Support Team will be utilized to assist at-risk students.
- Treasures is a complete reading language arts program. Treasures will be implemented with fidelity in grades K – 5. In order to facilitate implementation, teachers attended professional development facilitated by Treasures during the Summer Institute. In addition, more workshops to address program components, student placement in reading groups, assessment, and writing are scheduled throughout the year.
- As part of the Treasures Program, students will take unit tests to assess learning on various language arts areas, including reading comprehension, grammar, decoding, and writing.
- Students in grades 3 – 5 will use Achieve 3000 to supplement reading instruction. Achieve 3000 is an internet based reading tool that provides current news on students' reading levels. Students must read the articles and complete assignments related to the articles. Since all articles reflect current news, Achieve 3000 will help to support students' reading and understanding of non-fiction texts.
- Excellence Academy will be provided as an after-school program to support students who are not making sufficient gains, as evidenced by achievement on unit tests, Children's Progress (3<sup>rd</sup> grade only), Fountas and Pinnell, and practice exams.
- To increase expectations, the grading system has been changed from a 4-point scale to a 100 point scale. The passing criteria has been set at 85%. This change will provide more detailed information about a student's performance on a given assessment or task.



## MATHEMATICS

### Goal 2: Mathematics

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

#### Background

The mathematics curriculum for the UFT Charter School, Secondary Academy uses 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.

The mathematics curriculum for the Elementary Academy uses the Everyday Mathematics program to plan daily mathematics instruction that teachers align to the NYS learning standards. Focusing on the five content strands, number sense and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and statistics and probability, lessons also incorporate the five process strands, problem solving, reasoning, communications, connections, and representation. Mathematics instruction incorporates hands-on activities, cooperative learning through partner and small group instruction, problem solving opportunities, and skill development through mathematical games.

The Everyday Math unit assessments are used to monitor student progress along with M-class mathematics assessment. Benchmark scores in kindergarten and first grade were used to identify students in need of intensive, strategic academic support. This information is also used to identify areas for re-teaching. In addition to the core math curriculum, the Elementary Academy uses a daily thirty minute block of math warm ups to provide additional targeted time on mathematical concepts and problem. These questions are developed by the math team who meet regularly to design activities that help students master the NYS standards.

### Goal 2: Absolute Measure

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

In 2009-10, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State mathematics examination.

#### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3 through 8 grade in May 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. Through 2008-2009 the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS information of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown

of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have been enrolled for less than one year.

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>3</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	71	0	0	0	71
4	59	0	0	0	59
5	53	0	0	0	53
6	81	0	0	0	81
7	95	0	0	3	98
8	106	0	0	6	112
All	465	0	0	9	474

**Results**

The following table presents the state Mathematics examination results for all students enrolled in at least their second year in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade. In 2009-2010, percent of tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year scored at or above a Scale Score of 650.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above 650	Number Tested
3	All Students	99%	71
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>99%</b>	70
4	All Students	90%	59
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>90%</b>	58
5	All Students	89%	53
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>88%</b>	52
6	All Students	63%	81
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		0
7	All Students	78%	95
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>78%</b>	95
8	All Students	59%	106
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>59%</b>	106
All	All Students	77%	465
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	<b>80%</b>	381

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

## **Evaluation**

With 77 percent of students scoring at or above a Scale Score of 650, the school was 2 percentage points above the target of 75 percent proficient and therefore did meet the measure. Our sixth grade was not included in this calculation because those students had only been enrolled in the school for approximately eight months at the time the Mathematics exam was administered. While only 63 percent of all sixth grade students scored at or above a Scale Score of 650, 78 percent of seventh grade students enrolled in their second year scored at or above a Scale Score of 650, indicating considerable gains for students who remain in our school. Also, 99 percent of all third grade students, 90 percent of all fourth grade students, and 89 percent of all fifth grade students who have been enrolled in their second year scored at or above a Scale Score of 650. These results demonstrate the efficacy of our Mathematics curriculum in both K-5 and 7<sup>th</sup> grade.

**Additional Evidence**

The school’s performance has remained consistent over the last two years with 78% proficient in 2007-2008, 85% proficient in 2008-2009, and 77% percent scoring at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-2010. Our greatest gains have occurred in seventh grade where the students have gained ten percentage points over the last two years.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3			98	59	95	61	99	70
4					93	57	90	58
5							88	52
6								
7			68	117	82	119	78	95
8					79	106	59	106
All			78	176	85	343	80	381

**Goal 2: Absolute Measure**

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

**Method**

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state’s learning standards in Mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s Mathematics AMO, which for 2009-10 is 135<sup>4</sup>. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

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

**Results**

The following table presents the state Mathematics test results for all students in 3<sup>rd</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grade. In 2009-10, 88 percent of tested students scored at a Level 2 or above and 34 percent of all tested students scored at a Level 3 or above.

**Calculation of 2009-10 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)**

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3 - 8	12	54	29	5	465

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= 54 + 29 + 5 = 88 \\
 &+ 29 + 5 = 34 \\
 \text{PI} &= 122
 \end{aligned}$$

**Evaluation**

The school’s Performance Index on the State Mathematics examination did not meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. Our PI of 122 did not exceed the AMO of 135 for 2009-2010.

**Additional Evidence**

The 2009-2010 Performance Index for the school shows a decrease compared to the two previous years of testing. The percent of students at Level 1 has increased from 2% in 2007-2008 to 12% in 2009-1010. The percent of students at Level 2 has increased from 25 percent in 2007-2008 to 54 percent in 2009-2010.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2006-07	6	123	7	30	52	11	156	86
2007-08	3,6,7	293	2	25	59	14	171	102
2008-09	3,4,6,7,8	448	0	32	66	2	168	119
2009-10	3-8	465	12	54	29	5	122	135

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

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

**Results**

The aggregate charter school performance was below the district performance in the same tested grades for most grades tested. The exception to the previous statement is the third grade performance being 16 % higher than the districts performance and the fifth grade performance being equal to the district performance.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	60.6	70	44.5	2224
4	40.7	58	47.7	2249
5	45	52	44.7	2159
6				
7	33.7	95	39.2	1960
8	13.2	106	30.7	2063
All	<b>34</b>	331	<b>41.2</b>	12611

**Evaluation**

The Comparative measure for the 2009-2010 school year was not met. The UFT charter school fell short by 7 percentage points as compared to District 19’s percent of students performing at Level 3 and 4.

**Additional Evidence**

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3					95	90.2	60.6	44.5
4					93	78.8	40.7	47.7
5					-	-	44	44.7
6					-	-		
7					96	70	33.7	39.2
8					79	58.4	13.2	30.7
All					83.8	76.6	<b>34.1</b>	<b>41.2</b>

**Goal 2: Comparative Measure**

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a

regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school’s actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

**Results**

Data was not received by SUNY.

**2009-10 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

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

<b>School’s Overall Comparative Performance:</b>
<i>Data not received.</i>

**Evaluation**

Data not received.



**Additional Evidence**

Data not received

**Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Goal 2: Growth Measure**

Each year through 2008-09, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year’s state mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year’s state mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

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

**Method**

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

**Results**

The only cohort that achieved the growth target was 7<sup>th</sup> grade.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above 650			Target Achieved
		2008-09	Target	2009-10	
4	59	95	93	90	NO
5	53	93	91	89	NO
6	81			63	N/A
7	95	69	72	75	YES
8	106	82	71	60	NO
All	465	92	93	76	NO

**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 a Scale Score of 650 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.	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.	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.	Did not receive.
Growth	Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam.	Did Not Achieve

## **Action Plan**

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 teachers were provided with data analysis for the Mathematics examination and a Data workshop.
- All students scoring below a Scale Score of 650 will be placed on biweekly progress reports for consistent monitoring.
- Students with a Scale Score below 650 on both the state English language arts examination and the state Mathematics examination will be pulled- out of an elective course for additional small group tutoring.
- All students scoring below a Scale Score of 650 will be given access and assignments on the PLATO educational support system.
- There will be three school- wide state Mathematics examinations given as benchmarks to provide data to classroom teachers and students designed to prepare students for the exam.
- The School Student Support Team will be utilized to assist at-risk students.
- The Student Achievement task Force will be revising our current Mathematics curriculum to provide depth and a minimal standard that all teachers are expected to exceed.
- 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.

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 elementary academy has implemented the following:

- Unit tests across all subjects that will be monitored on a consistent basis.
- All staff is receiving additional professional development with specialists in the Every Day Math program.
- Grade level teams of teachers are working with the School Leader and Teacher Center Specialist to refine math lessons with the goal of increasing the amount of challenging work given to students.
- Paraprofessionals are being deployed to work in targeted skills with all students who have a Scale Score below 650.
- Teachers are being supplied with thorough data analysis from the Mathematics examination and are working with the assessment coordinator and Teacher Center specialist to further refine instruction in identified skills.

- Bi-monthly interim assessments are being given in Mathematics. These assessments will be analyzed and the results will be used to further tailor instruction.
- The RTI approach is being used in all classes. In two teacher classrooms, Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions are provided by one of the classroom teachers. In classes with one teacher, a specialist has been deployed to provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions.
- The School Student Support Team will be utilized to assist at-risk students.
- All teachers are receiving mentoring and support in using data to drive instruction.
- All classes are employing differentiated Morning Math work in addition to regular periods of math instruction.
- Everyday Math is the mathematics curriculum for the Elementary Academy. During the Summer Institute, teachers attended a professional development workshop offered by Everyday Mathematics. The workshop addressed program components, effective implementation, math games, and assessment. Everyday Math includes unit exams that assess content taught in each unit. Teachers will analyze data from unit exams to make instructional decisions.
- Excellence Academy will be provided as an after-school program to support students who are not making sufficient gains, as evidenced by achievement on unit tests, Children's Progress (3<sup>rd</sup> grade only), and practice exams.
- To increase expectations, the grading system has been changed from a 4-point scale to a 100 point scale. The passing criteria has been set at 85%. This change will provide more detailed information about a student's performance on a given assessment or task.

## 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

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 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> 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 in 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 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade. In 2009-2010, 95 percent of tested students in the fourth grade performed at or above a Level 3 and 51 percent of tested students in the eighth grade performed at or above a Level 3.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	2%	3%	42%	53%	95%	59
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	2%	3%	43%	52%	95%	58
8	All Students	8%	41%	44%	7%	51%	102
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	8%	41%	44%	7%	51%	102

**Evaluation**

With 67 percent of all students tested in the fourth and eighth grade enrolled in at least their second year scoring at or above a Level 3, the school was 8 percent points below the target of 75 percent proficient and therefore did not meet the measure. While only 51 percent of all eighth grade students scored at or above a Level 3, 95 percent of fourth grade students who have been enrolled in their second year performed at or above a Level 3.

**Additional Evidence**

The school’s performance has decreased from 2008-2009 by 10 percent points in the 2009-2010 school year. Our fourth grade students enrolled in at least their second year had a 3 percent decrease in students performing at a Level 3 and 4. Our eighth grade students experienced a change of teachers resulting in the 14 percent point decrease in their scores.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4					98	57	95	59
8					65	105	51	102
All					77	162	67	148

**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 the 2009-2010 State Science exam is not available at this time.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	95	59	n/a	n/a
8	51	102	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

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

**Additional Evidence**

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							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4					98	n/a	95	n/a
8					65	n/a	51	n/a
All					77		67	

**Summary**

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
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.	Did Not Receive

**Action Plan**

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:

- All students scoring below a Level 3 will be given access and assignments on the PLATO educational support system.
- There will be one school- wide state Science examination given as a benchmark to provide data to classroom teachers and students as well.
- The School Student Support Team will be utilized to assist at-risk students.
- The Student Achievement Task Force will be revising our current Science curriculum to provide depth over breadth to focus students on Mastery of Material essential to high achievement on the NY State exams.
- An emphasis has been placed on vocabulary retention across all grade levels.
- 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 strengths, and content areas in need of improvement.



## SOCIAL STUDIES

### Goal 4: Social Studies

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

### Background

The Social Studies curriculum of the UFT Charter School follows the scope and sequence of Social Studies outlined by the Department of Education of New York state in its core curriculum. Eastern civilizations are the focus in grade 6; United States and New York History is studied in grades 7 and 8. Each year is divided into six units of study designed in the Understanding by Design model. Students attempt to answer essential questions about a civilization or era in each unit through class discussion and written exposition. They demonstrate mastery of the New York state performance indicators in projects, written tests and quizzes, and document- based writings.

### Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

### Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in 5<sup>th</sup> grade in November 2009 and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in June 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 in the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

### Results

The following table presents the state Social Studies Exam results for all students in fifth and eighth grade enrolled in at least their second year. In 2009-2010, 59 percent of tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above a Level 3. 98 percent of 5<sup>th</sup> grade students who were enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above a Level 3.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
5	All Students	0	2	60	38	98	53
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0	2	61.5	36.5	<b>98</b>	52
8	All Students	38	24	34	4	38	95
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	38	24	34	4	<b>38</b>	95

**Evaluation**

With 59 percent of students scoring at or above a Level 3, the school was 16 percentage points below the target of 75 percent proficient and therefore did not meet the measure.

**Additional Evidence**

Insufficient information is available at this time to discuss year-to-year trends during the Accountability Period.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5					n/a	n/a	98	52
8					n/a	n/a	38	95
All							38	95

**Goal 4: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

District information for the 2009-2010 State Social Studies exam is not available at this time.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	98	52	n/a	n/a
8	38	95	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

District information for the 2009-2010 State Social Studies exam is not available at this time thus we are unable to acquire data on the Comparative measure.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
5							98	n/a
8							38	n/a
All							59	

**Summary**

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

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:

- All students scoring below a Level 3 will be given access and assignments on the PLATO educational support system.
- The School Student Support Team will be utilized to assist at-risk students.
- 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.

**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 Sate 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
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	Good Standing
2009-10	Good Standing

## APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES

# NO INFORMATION IS AVAILABLE

### 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 2006 state Accountability Cohort is comprised of students who entered the 9<sup>th</sup> grade in the 2006-07 school year, were enrolled in the school on the state's annual enrollment-determination day (BEDS day) in the 2009-10 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 30<sup>th</sup>.

#### Fourth-Year High School Accountability Cohorts

Fourth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 <sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>th</sup>
2006-07	2003-04	2003	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

#### Graduation Cohort

Students are included in the Graduation Cohort based on the year they first enter the 9<sup>th</sup> grade. However, students who have spent at least five months in the school after entering the 9<sup>th</sup> 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 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 <sup>th</sup> of the Cohort's Fourth Year (a)	Additional Students Still in Cohort <sup>5</sup> (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2006-07	2003-04	2003	n/a	n/a	n/a
2007-08	2004-05	2004	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008-09	2005-06	2005	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

2009-10	2006-07	2006	n/a	n/a	n/a
---------	---------	------	-----	-----	-----

**Fifth Year High School Graduation Cohorts**

Fifth Year Cohort	Year Entered 9 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Cohort Designation	Number of Students Enrolled on June 30 <sup>th</sup> of the Cohort's Fifth Year (a)	Additional Students Still in Cohort <sup>6</sup> (b)	Graduation Cohort (a) + (b)
2007-08	2003-04	2003	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008-09	2004-05	2004	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009-10	2005-06	2005	n/a	n/a	n/a

**ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

There is no information available at this time.

**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**

There is no information available at this time.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level <sup>7</sup>				Percent Passing <sup>8</sup>
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

<sup>6</sup> Number of students who had been enrolled for at least five months prior to leaving the school and who were discharged for unacceptable reasons

<sup>7</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup> With a score of at least 65

**English Regents Passing Rate by Cohort and Year**

Cohort Designation	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2004	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	n/a	n/a
2007			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009							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**

There is no information available at this time.

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

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= \text{n/a} + \text{n/a} + \text{n/a} = \text{n/a} \\
 & \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{n/a} + \text{n/a} = \text{n/a} \\
 & \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{PI} = \text{n/a}
 \end{aligned}$$

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**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.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

**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
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.



**(§) 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 2008-09 and also have a score from their first year in 2007-08. 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 2008-09 and the 50<sup>th</sup> NCE in 2009-10. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50 in 2008-09, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year.

There is no information available at this time.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

**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	n/a
2007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Reading Test by School Year**

School Year	Cohort met target?
-------------	--------------------

2006-07	n/a
2007-08	n/a
2008-09	n/a
2009-10	n/a

**MATHEMATICS**

There is no information available at this time.

**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**

There is no information available at this time.

**Mathematics Regents Performance Level and Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>9</sup>**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level <sup>10</sup>				Percent Passing <sup>11</sup>
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

<sup>9</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on any mathematics Regents exam

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> With a score of at least 65

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**Regents Mathematics Passing Rate by Cohort and Year**

Cohort Designation	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2004	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	n/a	n/a
2007			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009							n/a	n/a

**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 2009-10 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**

There is no information available at this time.

**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
	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= \text{n/a} + \text{n/a} + \text{n/a} = \text{n/a} \\
 & \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{n/a} + \text{n/a} = \text{n/a} \\
 & \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{PI} = \text{n/a}
 \end{aligned}$$

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**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**

There is no information available at this time.

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

Cohort	Charter School		School District	
	Percent Passing	Cohort Size	Percent Passing	Cohort Size
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**(§) 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 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 2008-09 and the 50<sup>th</sup> NCE in 2009-10. 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.

There is no information available at this time.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

**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	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2007	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**Cohort Performance on the Norm Referenced Mathematics Test by School Year**

School Year	Cohort met target?
2006-07	n/a

2007-08	n/a
2008-09	n/a
2009-10	n/a

**SCIENCE**

There is no information available at this time.

**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**

There is no information available at this time.

**Science Regents Performance Level and Passing Rate by Fourth Year Accountability Cohort<sup>12</sup>**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent at Each Level				Percent Passing
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

<sup>12</sup> Based on the highest score for each student on any science Regents exam

**Science Regents Passing Rate by Cohort and Year**

Cohort Designation	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2004	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	n/a	n/a
2007			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009							n/a	n/a

**(§) 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**

There is no information available at this time.

**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
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**SOCIAL STUDIES**

There is no information available at this time.

**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. Cohorts are labeled by the year in which the students entered the 9<sup>th</sup> grade, and in 2008-09 the 2004 Cohort finished its fourth year.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

**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	
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

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

Cohort Designation	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2004	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	n/a	n/a
2007			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009							n/a	n/a



**(§) 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**

There is no information available at this time.

**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
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**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 9<sup>th</sup> grade, and in 2009-10 the 2006 Cohort finished its fourth year.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

**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	
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**Regents Global History Passing Rate by Accountability Cohort and Year**

Cohort Designation	2006-07		2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing
2004	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	n/a	n/a
2007			n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2008					n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2009							n/a	n/a

**(§) 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**

There is no information available at this time.

**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	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION**

There is no information available at this time.

**GOAL 5: HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION**  
Students will meet all of New York State graduation requirements.

**(§) 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.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

**Percent of Students Promoted by Cohort in 2009-10**

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent promoted

2006	n/a	n/a
2007	n/a	n/a
2008	n/a	n/a
2009	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**(§) 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**

There is no information available at this time.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Passing Three Regents
2005	n/a	n/a
2006	n/a	n/a
2007	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**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 9<sup>th</sup> grade in the same year and graduate four years later. In 2009-10 the 2006 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.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2003	n/a	n/a
2004	n/a	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a
2006	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**(§) 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 9<sup>th</sup> grade in the same year and graduate four years later. In 2009-10 the 2005 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.

There is no information available at this time.

**Results**

There is no information available at this time.

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

Cohort Designation	Number in Cohort	Percent Graduating
2003	n/a	n/a
2004	n/a	n/a
2005	n/a	n/a

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**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**

There is no information available at this time.

**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
2003	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There is no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There is no information available at this time.

**Summary**

There is no information available at this time.

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.	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.	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.	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.	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.	Not Applicable

**Action Plan**

There is no information available at this time.

**COLLEGE PREPARATION**

**(§) GOAL 6: COLLEGE PREPARATION**

All graduating students will be prepared for academic institutions of higher education.

**(§) Goal 6: Comparative Measure**  
 Each year, the average performance of students in the 10<sup>th</sup> 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 10<sup>th</sup> grade (sophomore) test takers in the given year.

**Results**

There no information available at this time.

**10<sup>th</sup> Grade PSAT Performance by School Year**

School Year	Number of Students in the 10 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Number of Students Tested	Critical Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
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

**Evaluation**

There no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There no information available at this time.

**(§) Goal 6: Comparative Measure**  
 Each year, the average performance of students in the 12<sup>th</sup> 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.

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 12<sup>th</sup> grade (senior) test takers in the given year.

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 12<sup>th</sup> grade (senior) test takers in the given year.

**Results**

There no information available at this time.

**12<sup>th</sup> Grade SAT/ACT Performance by School Year**

School Year	Number of Students in the 12 <sup>th</sup> Grade	Number of Students Tested	Reading		Mathematics	
			School	New York State	School	New York State
2003-04	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2004-05	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
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

**Evaluation**

There no information available at this time.

**Additional Evidence**

There no information available at this time.

**(§) 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**

There no information available at this time.

**Results**

There no information available at this time.

**Evaluation**

There no information available at this time.

**(§) 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**

There no information available at this time.

**Results**

There no information available at this time.

**Evaluation**

There no information available at this time.

**Summary**

There no information available at this time.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 10 <sup>th</sup> grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT test in Critical Reading and Mathematics.	Not Applicable
Comparative	Each year, the average performance of students in the 12 <sup>th</sup> grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics.	Not Applicable
Absolute/Comparative/Growth	Each Year, the school will demonstrate the preparation of its students for college through at least one measure of its own design.	Not Applicable
Absolute/Comparative/Growth	Each Year, the school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design.	Not Applicable

**Action Plan**

There no information available at this time.