

**SISULU-WALKER CHARTER
SCHOOL OF HARLEM**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY
PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 16, 2011

By Dr. Dawn Cejas, Principal

Sisulu-Walker Charter School of Harlem
125 W 115th St.
New York, NY 10026
(212)663-8216

Dr. Dawn Cejas prepared this 2010-11 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Martez Moore	Chair
Minnie Goka	Academic Committee, Governance & Legal Affairs
William Anthony Allen	Real Estate Committee
Kenneth McRay	Finance Committee
Amanda Payton	PTO President
Jeremy Harris	Board Member

INTRODUCTION

Established in 1999, The Sisulu-Walker Charter School of Harlem, New York State's first charter school is named for two great human rights leaders, Walter Sisulu and Dr. Wyatt Tee Walker, and their wives. Walter Sisulu, former Secretary General of the African National Congress, worked closely with Nelson Mandela and was at the forefront of the struggle against South African apartheid for over five decades. Dr. Wyatt Tee Walker, a renowned pastor, author, lecturer and advocate for human rights, served as the Chief of Staff to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. during critically important years of the American civil rights movement.

The mission of the school is to prepare K-5 students living in and around Central Harlem for matriculation to outstanding public, private and parochial middle and high schools by nurturing their intellectual, emotional, artistic and social development. The school is accomplishing this by offering a rigorous and challenging academic curricula taught by a highly-prepared and committed cadre of professional educators. Beginning in kindergarten, we prepare our students for college and a lifetime of achievement, honor and service. Sisulu-Walker is achieving this in a small and supportive learning environment that sets high expectations for all of our students and encourages strong parental and community involvement. The school currently serves 262 students. The student population is 89% African-American and 87% free and reduced lunch eligible.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	Total
2006-07	76	53	54	56	No grades 4-5		239
2007-08	28	79	50	51	54	No gr 5	262
2008-09	0	27	80	56	54	45	262
2009-10	28	26	30	78	54	52	268
2010-11	49	30	28	26	80	49	262

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at the school will become proficient in reading and writing of the English language.

Background

Sisulu-Walker’s English Language Arts curriculum is based on the Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Literacy (CABL). This curriculum approach consists of a reading and writing workshop. Through a collaborative partnership with Teachers’ College, Columbia University- *Reading and Writing Project* teachers and co-teachers are provided with intensive workshop methods of teaching writing across the curriculum. This professional development provides all staff with the mental arms around workshop teaching through many dimensions so that all pedagogues feel confident launching workshops in their classrooms. The reading workshop includes, engaging leveled text, shared reading, guided reading, interactive read-aloud(s), literature circles and word study. Our writing workshop consists of the six stages (i.e., brainstorm, plan, draft, revise, edit, publish) in the writing process as well as students publishing writing pieces in a variety of writing genres. Also, during the reading workshop, students learn a comprehension strategy or a skill of the week. While in writing workshop, students publish monthly in a specific writing genre. Overall, our English Language Arts is interdisciplinary and is driven by the NYS Common Core Standards thematic units, in order to provide all of our students with a well-rounded and an enriching literary experience.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

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

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3 through 5 grade in May 5 through 7 of 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3

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

3	657
4	654
5	654

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	26	0	0	0	26
4	80	0	0	0	80
5	49	0	0	0	49
All	155	0	0	0	155

Results

The following table presents the State English Language Arts test results for all students and for those enrolled in at least their second year in 3rd through 5th grade. Overall, 82.9% of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a Scale Score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	65.4%	26
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>73.9%</u>	23
4	All Students	82.5%	80
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>85.5%</u>	62
5	All Students	83.7%	49
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>84.1%</u>	44
All	All Students	80.0%	155
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>82.9%</u>	129

Evaluation

In 2010-11, the overall goal of 75% of all tested students in at least their second year meeting or exceeding the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score on the State ELA Exam was met. All grades scored

² 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.

at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score on the State ELA Exam except the 3rd grade, which missed the cutoff percentage by only 1.1 percentage points. There was a 21.7% increase in the 3rd grade performance with similar students from 2010. On the 4th grade, student growth in 2011 respectively increased from 1.4% in 2009 and 5.9% in 2011. On the 5th grade, similar students reflected limited growth from 2008 through 2011. Data inquiry report identifies the 1.1% of students as our students with disabilities subgroup and English Language Learners (ELL) who need further intervention and/or remediation services, in order to ensure that all students' academic targets are achieved. More rigorous and comprehensive work is needed to provide additional differentiated support to teachers through on-going feedback given during data team meetings, professional development, classroom walkthroughs, informal observations and formal observations.

Teachers in SETTS push-in/pull-out program, Title I daily pull-out program, academic and enrichment Afterschool Program, Saturday Academy, ESL, After School and Saturday Academy need to provide additional academic support to students-at-risk. Through data-driven, differentiated instruction and extended class periods, students will need increased rigor in the quality instruction provided and individualized intervention in order to succeed.

Additional Evidence

There was a 21.7% increase in the 3rd grade performance with similar students from 2010. On the 4th grade, student growth in 2011 respectively increased from 1.4% in 2009 and 5.9% in 2011. On the 5th grade, similar students reflected limited growth from 2008 through 2011.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	84.8%	46	100.0%	40	52.2%	69	73.9%	23
4	77.3%	44	84.1%	44	79.6%	49	85.5%	62
5	No grade 5		82.9%	35	78.6%	42	84.1%	44
All	81.1%	90	89.1%	119	67.5%	160	82.9%	129

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate³ Performance Index (PI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's 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

³ A student will be considered "in at least his second year" if he enrolled on or before the first Wednesday of October of the school year prior to that of the test.

standards in English Language Arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year’s English language arts AMO.

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

Goal 1: Comparative Measure
 Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} and performing at or above Level 3 on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district⁴.

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 chart below reports the results of this year’s assessment of students who were enrolled in at least their second year and are compared to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. The percent of Sisulu-Walker’s students scoring at or above Level 3 was higher than that of the district by 14.2 percentage points.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	60.9%	23	28.6%	935
4	50.0%	62	33.2%	985
5	31.8%	44	32.8%	892
All	45.7%	129	31.5%	2812

Evaluation

Sisulu-Walker has met the measure in 2010-11 by having a higher percentage in comparison to the NYC CSD #5. In 2010-11, Sisulu-Walker had 45.7% of all students (in at least their second year) at Level 3 or 4 while the District had only 31.5% of students at Level 3 or 4. The School exceeded the District by 14.2 percentage points. Sisulu-Walker’s percentage also exceeded that of the District in 2009-10 for all grade levels except grade 5. An analysis of grade 5 determines that the overall areas

⁴ “District” is defined as Community School District 5 within the New York City School District, the adjacent district with student demographics substantially similar to that of the school.

of growth require that students develop mastery in critical analysis, evaluation, interpretation, and perspective. Teachers, co-teachers, and SUNY student teachers need to be supported in their pedagogy to facilitate high quality instruction throughout the school. Classroom teachers review daily: the class schedule, their individualized students' instructional plans, the NYS Common Core State Standard(s), unit plans and their essential questions to ensure that learning time is maximized and clear expectations are established for what students should know and be able to do each and every day. These elements of high quality instruction promote a sense of urgency in teachers' lesson plans and ensure that day-to-day instruction is focused, well-paced and consistent in every classroom.

Additional Evidence

Overall, the average number of Sisulu-Walker students at Levels 3 and 4 has consistently exceeded the average of local district students in those grades. The one exception has been grade 5 this year, which will be addressed by the increased focus on individualized, high quality instruction noted above.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	84.8%	43.1%	100.0%	56.0%	40.6%	33.0%	60.9%	28.6%
4	77.3%	45.5%	84.1%	53.5%	53.1%	27.8%	50.0%	33.2%
5	No grade 5		82.9%	62.8%	40.5%	27.2%	31.8%	32.8%
All	81.1%	44.3%	89.1%	57.1%	44.4%	29.3%	45.7%	31.5%

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.⁵

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

⁵ In its June 2008 version of "Guidelines for Creating an Accountability Plan," CSI describes this as follows: "... school performance is examined in terms of the performance of all other public schools in the state with a similar level of poverty. In order to determine if schools are meeting this measure, the Charter Schools Institute conducts a regression analysis that yields a predicted percent of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 based on the grade-specific test performance and free-lunch statistics of all New York State public schools."

Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of poverty data, the 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

The school's overall comparative performance was 45.9%, which was slightly higher than the predicted 42.4%.

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	69.3%	79	44.3%	43.6%	0.7	0.05
4		53	51.0%	42.6%	8.4	0.55
5		53	43.3%	40.5%	2.8	0.19
All	69.3%	185	45.9%	42.4%	3.5	0.23

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
<i>Slightly higher than expected.</i>

Evaluation

While the overall comparative performance was higher than expected, the positive Effect Size of 0.23 did not meet the measure of exceeding the 0.3 Effect Size.

Additional Evidence

Sisulu-Walker has exceeded the predicted performance in each year since 2006-07.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3	69.0%	54*	64.8%*	54.4%	0.75
2007-08	3-4	67.69%	107	82.3%	59.5%	1.7
2008-09	3-5	72.8%	148	84.5%	67.8%	1.2
2009-10	3-5	69.3%	185	45.9%	42.4%	0.23

* School's records show 53 students tested, with 66.0% of the students at Level 3 or 4.

Data sources for 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2008-2009 & 2010-2011 are school's comparative Performance Analyses from CSI.

Goal 1: Growth Measure

Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students 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, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

The school did not meet the target percent of all grade-level cohorts of students at or above Level 3.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	62	48.4%	61.7%	50.0%	NO
5	44	47.7%	61.4%	31.8%	NO
All	106	48.1%	61.6%	42.5%	NO

Evaluation

The measure was not met for 2010-11, although the 4th grade cohort came closest to meeting the measure by being only 11.7 percentage points below the target.

Additional Evidence

Although Sisulu-Walker has outperformed district schools in ELA, the cohorts have not always met their targets in recent years. The numerous steps being taken to meet ELA targets are addressed below in the Action Plan section.

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

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

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

The absolute goal and one comparative goal were both achieved. The second comparative goal and the growth goal were not achieved this year, and Sisulu-Walker will address these issues via the action plan below.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Did Not Achieve
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Annual Goal	By 2011-12 school year, 75 percent or more of all tested students will meet or exceed proficiency on the New York State English Language Arts examination. ⁶
Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: All teachers and co-teachers will participate in targeted PD workshops at Columbia University, inter-intra visitations, and in-house PD facilitated by AP • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: Teachers, Co-teachers, AP and Principal will engage in professional development workshop at TC to build capacity for the use of strategies that increase achievement of Title 1 students, ELLs and SWDs • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: Teachers will participate in daily common planning/Co-teachers weekly planning to study student work to develop grade expectations aligned with NYS Common Core Standards to identify instructional strategies tailored to specific students • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: Teachers and Co-teachers will participate in weekly Response to Intervention (RTI) meetings focusing on Tiers 1-1V methodologies <p style="text-align: center;">1) Utilize collaborative planning, in-class modeling by AP,</p>

⁶ In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school's Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan's standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

	<p>TC coaches , and inter-visitations in the implementation of writing across the curriculum and critical thinking skills</p> <p>2) Utilize lead teachers/coaches collaboration to support teachers and co-teachers in effectively using rubrics to improve student performance on weekly tasks keys to essential question on curriculum maps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BOT Academic Committee and Principal will assess and monitor the selected intervention strategies to evaluate their effectiveness • September – October 2011: Grade leaders and AP will review student data on NYS ELA Assessments, Acuity—Interim Assessment #1(Grades 3-5), and Writing and Reading Assessment Performance (WRAP (2-5), Terra Nova, and Teacher-generated tests • November – December 2011: AIS, ELL/Title 1/SWD Coordinators will review student data (NYS ELA, Interim #s 1 & 2--Grades 3-5), WRAP (2-5), and Unit Assessments, analyze, and select specific area(s) based upon students’ overall needs • January – June 2012: Academic Committee will assess and monitor the selected intervention strategies to evaluate their effectiveness • Grade leaders/AIS, ELL/Title 1/SWD Coordinators will meet bi-monthly to review interventions/instructional strategies to increase students’ ELA and Math performance based upon State performance indicators • AP will monitor and disseminate monthly data charts and quarterly data wall related to ELA and Math growth • Administer ELA Interim Assessments 4 times within the 2011-2012 school year • Administer aligned NYS Common Core Standards Unit Assessments in ELA and Math (Grades 3-5), and WRAP Assessments (Grades 2-5) three times a year—Beginning, Middle and Final • Parent liaison facilitation to all parents related to their child’s academic progress and growth through parent workshops and new online Data.cation system on the NYS CCS in ELA • Spring Academy April 9 through April 13, 2012 • 4 Test Sophistication Assemblies
<p>Aligning Resources</p>	<p>Title I Funding General Operations Budget</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishments</p>	<p>Review of the NY State Performance Indicators, Acuity interim assessment data, curriculum maps, and unit assessments</p>

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

All students at the school will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematics computation and problem solving.

Background

Sisulu-Walker provides a daily extended block of Mathematics instruction. Our Mathematics curriculum is aligned with the NYS Common Core Standards- supported by the research- proven and standards-based Scott Foresman Mathematics (Grades K-2) and the Everyday Mathematics (Grades 3-5) programs. Through these programs and our partnership with Lehman’s College, students explore the mathematical process strands (problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections and representation) and the mathematical content strands (number sense and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement and statistics and probability) through investigations, inquiries as well as hands-on activities using the support of Everyday Mathematics manipulatives. Overall, students receive on-going informal and formal assessment to ensure that they are developing mastery of essential mathematical competencies, concepts, as well as developing essential problem-solving skills to succeed in this subject area.

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 and 2010-11, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores on the New York State mathematics examination⁷.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3 through 5 grade in May 2011. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state’s Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

Grade	Time Adjusted Cut Scores
	Level 3
3	656
4	655

⁷ In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school’s Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan’s standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

5	653
---	-----

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

**2010-11 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁸			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	26	0	0	0	26
4	80	0	0	0	80
5	49	0	0	0	49
All	155	0	0	0	155

Results

The following table presents the state Mathematics test results for all students and for those students enrolled in at least their second year in 3rd through 5th grade. Overall, 93.8% of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a scale score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

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

Grade	Population	Percent Scoring at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score	Number Tested
3	All Students	96.2%	26
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>95.7%</u>	23
4	All Students	92.5%	80
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>93.5%</u>	62
5	All Students	93.9%	49
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>93.2%</u>	44
All	All Students	93.5%	155
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>93.8%</u>	129

Evaluation

This measure was met, with each grade level exceeding the 75% proficiency target by at least 18.2 percentage points.

⁸ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam

Additional Evidence

Overall, the students tested in Mathematics have consistently exceeded the 75% of students at Levels 3 and 4. Some grades have even reached 100% of students at or above Level 3 in recent 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 at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	97.8%	45	100.0%	40	97.1%	69	95.7%	23
4	100.0%	43	100.0%	43	75.5%	49	93.5%	62
5	No grade 5		94.3%	35	100.0%	42	93.2%	44
All	98.9%	88	98.3%	118	91.3%	160	93.8%	129

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school’s aggregate ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} Performance Index (PI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year’s Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.

Method

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

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

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} and performing at or above Level 3 on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district⁴.

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 overall percentage of students in at least their second year was 65.1%. In all grades, the performance level of Sisulu-Walker students exceeds that of the district.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	56.5%	23	34.9%	959
4	71.0%	62	43.1%	1015
5	61.4%	44	42.1%	905
All	65.1%	129	40.1%	2879

Evaluation

The measure was met, and Sisulu-Walker Charter School exceeded the aggregate of the district performance by 25 percentage points. More instructional support is needed to ensure that teachers and co-teachers meet with small groups to support the students' diverse learning needs using differentiated materials and differentiated instructional methods (i.e., incorporating Bloom's Taxonomy methods and questioning in their lessons) to promote academic rigor, further develop higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills.

Additional Evidence

Sisulu-Walker's performance continues to exceed that of the local district in mathematics. Going back to 2007-08, each grade has exceeded its local district counterpart each year.

Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Local District By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	97.8%	76.1%	100.0%	81.6%	46.4%	38.7%	56.5%	34.9%
4	100.0%	66.9%	100.0%	68.6%	57.1%	38.1%	71.0%	43.1%
5	No grade 5		94.3%	75.5%	64.3%	38.5%	61.4%	42.1%
All	98.9%	71.5%	98.3%	75.3%	54.4%	38.4%	65.1%	40.1%

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.⁵

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school’s actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2010-11 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2009-10 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

The school’s overall comparative performance was 56.5%, which was higher than the predicted 51.0% to a small degree.

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	69.3%	79	50.7%	48.8%	1.9	0.11
4		54	55.6%	52.3%	3.3	0.18
5		53	66.0%	53.1%	12.9	0.70
All	69.3%	186	56.5%	51.0%	5.5	0.30

School’s Overall Comparative Performance:
Higher than expected to a small degree.

Evaluation

The measure was met, and the school’s overall comparative performance was higher than expected by a 0.3 Effect Size.

Additional Evidence

Sisulu-Walker has exceeded its target by at least a small Effect Size each year since 2006-07.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3	69%	58*	96.6%*	78.1%	1.32
2007-08	3-4	67.69%	106	98.2%	81.07%	1.42
2008-09	3-5	72.8%	149	98.0%	84.5%	1.18
2009-10	3-5	69.3%	186	56.5%	51.0%	0.30

* The school was unable to obtain the score for one of the 58 students tested in 2006-07.

For the 57 student scores in the school's records, 98.2% of the students were at Level 3 or 4.

Goal 2: Growth Measure

Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students 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, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2010-11 and also have a state exam score in 2009-10. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

One of two cohorts achieved their target, and the school-wide percent of cohort students at or above Level 3 was 67.0%, which exceeded the target of 65.4%.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	62	56.5%	65.8%	71.0%	YES
5	44	54.5%	64.8%	61.4%	NO
All	106	55.7%	65.4%	67.0%	YES

Evaluation

The measure was not met, as the 5th grade cohort was under their target of 64.8% by just 3.4 percentage points. However, the 4th grade cohort exceeded their target of 65.8% by 5.2 percentage points, and the school-wide target of 65.4% was still exceeded.

Additional Evidence

Although the overall mathematics performance has been good, Sisulu-Walker is still working toward all cohorts meeting their targets. This issue will be addressed by the action plan below.

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

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

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

All goals were achieved except the growth goal. The 5th grade cohort's goal was missed by 3.4 points. Sisulu-Walker will address this issue via the action plan below.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Achieved
Growth	On the 2010-11 state exam, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above level 3 on the 2009-10 state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3.	Did Not Achieve

Action Plan

Annual Goal	By 2011-12 school year, 75 percent or more of all tested students will meet or exceed proficiency on the New York State Math examination. ⁹
Action Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administer four (4) math interim assessment through Acuity • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: Targeted PD workshops at Lehman College, inter-intra visitations, and in-house PD facilitated

⁹ In order to abide by the measures to which schools are held accountable in their school's Accountability Plans, the Institute will continue to use the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores, which provide year-to-year consistency with the Plan's standard while accounting for the timing of the test administration (i.e., SED now gives the test later in the school year).

	<p>by Principal and AP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: Teachers, Co-teachers, AP and Principal will engage in professional development workshop at Lehman College to build capacity for the use of concepts and math strategies that increase achievement of ELLs and SWDs • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: Teachers will participate in daily common planning/Co-teachers weekly planning to study student work to develop grade expectations aligned with the NYS Common Core Standards to identify instructional strategies tailored to specific students • August 22, 2011 – June 14, 2012: Teachers and Co-teachers will participate in weekly meeting on Response to Intervention (RTI) Tiers 1-1V methodologies <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Utilize collaborative planning, in-class modeling 2) by AP and Lehman coach, and inter-visitations in the implementation of concept mastery, writing across the curriculum and critical thinking skills 3) Utilize lead teachers/coaches collaboration to support teachers and co-teachers in effectively using rubrics to improve student performance on weekly tasks keys to essential question on curriculum maps • BOT Academic Committee and Principal will assess and monitor the selected intervention strategies to evaluate their effectiveness • Principal, AP, and BOT Academic Committee conduct daily/weekly informal snapshots, walkthroughs, monthly formal observations, midyear, and annual evaluations to support and identify teachers and co-teachers developmental needs • Spring Academy, April 9 through 13, 2012 • 3 Test Sophistication Assemblies • Principal, AP, and teacher evaluations • NYS Teacher Professional Growth Data Survey • Teacher Recognition Award
<p>Aligning Resources</p>	<p>Title I Funding Title II Funding General Operations Budget</p>
<p>Indicators of Interim Progress and/or Accomplishments</p>	<p>NYS Math Assessment, Acuity interim assessment data, curriculum maps, and unit assessments, written formal and informal observation with feedback to teachers, PD sign-in sheets, agendas, and teacher surveys and evaluations</p>

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

All students at the school will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

Background

Sisulu-Walker provides an extended block of Science instruction three times a week. Our Science curriculum is New York State Standards based and is supported by the scientifically and standards based McGraw-Hill Science program along with FOSS Science resources and tools. Through this approach students are engaged in inquiry-based and experiential instruction in Earth and Space Science, Physical Science and Life Science. Ultimately, all students are regularly assessed informally and formally to ensure that they are developing essential academic skills as well as developing essential higher order thinking skills and problem-solving skills to succeed as life-long learners.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State science exam.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th grade in spring 2011. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

In 2010-11, 96.8% of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a Level 3 or 4 on the State Science Exam.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	1.3%	3.8%	35.0%	60.0%	95.0%	80
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0.0%	3.2%	33.9%	62.9%	96.8%	62

Evaluation

This measure was met, with 4th graders enrolled for at least two years exceeding the 75% target by 21.8 percentage points.

Additional Evidence

We noted a 4% drop in the number of students at Levels 3 & 4 from 2009 to 2010. However, in 2011 this number has increased 0.9 percentage points and overall achievement remains high.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100.0%	43	100.0%	42	95.9%	49	96.8%	62

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year ^{Error! Bookmark not defined.} and performing at or above Level 3 on a state science exam will be greater than that of 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 data for the State Science Exam has not yet been publicly released.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students*	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	96.8%	62	?	?

Evaluation

District data for the State Science Exam has not yet been publicly released.

Additional Evidence

As shown in the table below, Sisulu-Walker continues to out-perform the local district in all years where data is available.

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

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District*
4	100%	55%	100%	61%	95.9%	68%	96.8%	?

* District Comparison data for 2010-2011 Science is not yet available at the time of this report

Summary

The school achieved the absolute measure, but comparative district data is not available to determine whether the school has met the comparative measure.

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.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	N/A (District data not available)

Action Plan

- Informal classroom and Acuity benchmark assessments including teacher/student feedback, monitoring instruction, and re-teaching
- Student Conferences to monitor their individual growth areas
- Teacher-generated curriculum maps embedded with literacy and science methodologies aligned to the NYS Common Core Standards
- Tier 2—intervention with consultation (Special Education, ELL, Title 1 & AIS Coordinators, SBST, Lead Teachers, Assistant Principal and Principal)
- Parent Meetings
- Tier 3 intervention aligned with each student’s instructional plan and feedback loop to classroom teachers
- Grade level meetings to design continued support for the following year

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB

The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Goal 5: Absolute Measure

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

Method

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

Results

The NCLB status for the year is "Good Standing".

Evaluation

The measure was met for the most recent year an NCLB status is available, which was 2009-10.

Additional Evidence

Sisulu-Walker has been in good standing for the entire renewal period up to the 2010-11 school year.

NCLB Status by Year

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