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## Student Assessment Data

New York State Assessment Results
Grades 3-8 ELA and Math
2008-09 Annual Report

Name of Charter School: Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School

Grades 3-8 State ELA Assessments Results

| Year of Test | Grade 3 |  |  |  | Grade 4 |  |  |  | Grade 5 |  |  |  | Grade 6 |  |  |  | Grade 7 |  |  |  | Grade 8 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 |
| 2008-09 | 0 | 4 | 84 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 98 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 78 | 19 | 0 | 7 | 82 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 82 | 10 | 0 | 12 | 84 | 4 |
| 2007-08 | 0 | 17 | 64 | 19 |  | 11 | 81 | 8 | 11 | 84 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 90 | 6 | 0 | 12 | 87 | 1 | 0 | 36 | 57 | 7 |
| 2006-07 | 1 | 16 | 72 | 11 | 0 | 36 | 63 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 77 | 9 | 0 | 17 | 79 | 4 | 0 | 29 | 69 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 70 | 0 |
| 2005-06 | 0 | 19 | 76 | 4 | 0 | 12 | 82 | 6 | 0 | 11 | 74 | 15 | 0 | 24 | 65 | 10 | 0 | 29 | 71 | 0 |  |  |  |  |

Grades 3-8 State Math Assessments Results

| Year of Test | Grade 3 |  |  |  | Grade 4 |  |  |  | Grade 5 |  |  |  | Grade 6 |  |  |  | Grade 7 |  |  |  | Grade 8 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 |
| 2008-09 | 0 | 2 | 56 | 42 | 0 | 6 | 62 | 32 | 0 | 1 | 66 | 32 | 0 | 2 | 68 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 40 | 2 | 8 | 86 | 5 |
| 2007-08 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 40 | 0 | 3 | 82 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 83 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 46 | 52 | 0 | 3 | 66 | 31 | 2 | 13 | 75 | 10 |
| 2006-07 | 0 | 6 | 78 | 16 | 1 | 20 | 67 | 12 | 0 | 14 | 82 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 64 | 25 | 6 | 39 | 55 | 0 | 4 | 52 | 39 | 4 |
| 2005-06 | 1 | 7 | 70 | 21 | 0 | 6 | 57 | 37 | 4 | 25 | 62 | 9 | 14 | 31 | 49 | 6 | 0 | 58 | 38 | 4 |  |  |  |  |

ROOSEVELT CHILDREN'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

Grades 3-8 State Science Assessments Results

| Year of Test | Grade 3 |  |  |  | Grade 4 |  |  |  | Grade 5 |  |  |  | Grade 6 |  |  |  | Grade 7 |  |  |  | Grade 8 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 |
| 2008-09 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 14 | 68 | 18 |
| 2007-08 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 33 | 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 3 | 76 | 21 |
| 2006-07 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 4 | 65 | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 17 | 71 | 8 |
| 2005-06 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 8 | 92 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Grades 3-8 Social Studies Assessments Results

| Year of Test | Grade 3 |  |  |  | Grade 4 |  |  |  | Grade 5 |  |  |  | Grade 6 |  |  |  | Grade 7 |  |  |  | Grade 8 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 | L1 | L2 | L3 | L4 |
| 2008-09 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 26 | 74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007-08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 5 | 66 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 18 | 77 | 5 |
| 2006-07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 67 | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 4 | 79 | 17 |

## Other Student Assessment Data <br> 2008-09

Name of Charter School: Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School
Name of Test: TerraNova (K-10G, 1st-11G, 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }} \mathbf{- 1 2 G}$ ) Subtest: _ Reading

| Grade | Date of Test (DOT) | \# Enrolled <br> in Grade <br> on DOT | \# Absent on Grade on DOT | \# <br> Exempted in Grade by IEP | \# <br> Exempted in Grade by ELL Status | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Students } \\ \text { Assessed } \\ \text { in } \\ \text { Grade* } \end{gathered}$ | Score <br> (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE) | Qualitativ e Level and Percent Attaining* * | Other *** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | 10/08/2008 | 50 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 49 | Mean Scale $\text { Score }=449.2$ |  |  |
| K | 5/15/2009 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | Mean Scale <br> Score $=552.3$ |  |  |
| 1 | 10/08/2008 | 56 |  |  |  | 6 | NCE $=37.7$ |  | Only new $1^{\text {st }}$ $\& 2^{\text {nd }}$ grade students are assessed in fall |
| 1 | 5/15/2009 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | NCE $=54.2$ |  |  |
| 2 | 10/08/2008 | 50 |  |  |  | 3 | NCE $=44.7$ |  | See above |
| 2 | 5/15/2009 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | NCE $=60.5$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Other Student Assessment Data
2008-09
Name of Charter School: Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School
Name of Test: TerraNova (K-10G, 1st-11G, $\left.2^{\text {nd }}-12 G\right) \quad$ Subtest:_ Math

| Grade | Date of Test (DOT) | \# Enrolled in Grade on DOT | \# Absent on Grade on DOT | \# <br> Exempted in Grade by IEP | \# <br> Exempted in Grade by ELL Status | \# Students Assessed in Grade* | Score <br> (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE) | Qualitati ve Level and Percent Attaining ** | Other *** |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| K | 10/08/2008 | 50 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 48 | Mean Scale <br> Score $=412.9$ |  |  |
| K | 5/15/2009 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | Mean Scale Score $=538.3$ |  |  |
| 1 | 10/08/2008 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | NCE= 33.7 |  | Only new $1^{\text {st }} \& 2^{\text {nd }}$ <br> grade <br> students <br> are <br> assessed <br> in fall |
| 1 | 5/15/2009 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | NCE $=61$ |  |  |
| 2 | 10/08/2008 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | NCE $=38$ |  | See above |
| 2 | 5/15/2009 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | NCE $=54$ |  |  |

# ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN 

Roosevelt Children’s Academy Charter School

2006-07 and forward

## Academic Assessments

## English Language Arts

Goal 1: All students at the Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School will become proficient in reading and writing of the English Language.

## Absolute

Measure 1
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 ELA examination.

Measure 2
Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State ELA exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

## Comparative

Measure 1
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 ELA exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

Measure 2
Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State ELA 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.

## Value Added - Growth Goal

## Measure 1

Each year, 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 ELA exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA 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.

## Mathematics

Goal 2: All students at the Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School will become proficient in Mathematics.

## Absolute

Measure 1
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 Math examination.

## Measure 2

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

## Comparative

Measure 1
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 Math exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

## Measure 2

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State Math 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.

## Value Added - Growth Goal

Measure 1

Each year, 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 Math exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Math 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.

## Science

Goal 3: All students at Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

## Absolute

Measure 1

Each school year commencing in 2006-2007, 75 percent of fourth and eighth grade students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.

## Comparative

Measure 1
Each year, the percent of fourth and eighth grade 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 fourth and eighth grade students in the local school district.
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## Social Studies

Goal 4: All students at Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School will demonstrate proficiency in the social sciences.

## Absolute

Measure 1

Each school year commencing in 2007-08, 75 percent of fifth and eighth grade 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.

## Comparative

Measure 1

Each school year commencing in 2006-07, the percent of fifth and eighth grade 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 fifth and eighth grade students in the local school district.

## No Child Left Behind

Measure 1
Each year the school will be deemed in 'good standing' by the state's accountability system.
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2008-09<br>ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 1, 2009
By Roxanne Greco-Ashley
105 Pleasant Avenue
Roosevelt, NY 11575
Phone: (516) 867-6202
Fax: (516) 867-6206

Roxanne Greco- Ashley prepared the 2008-09 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's Board of Trustees:

| Trustee's Name | Board Position |
| :--- | :--- |
| Robert Francis | Chair |
| Steve Budhu |  |
| Philip A. Leconte | Treasurer |
| Denise Washington |  |
| Reginald Tuggle | Counsel |
| David M. Wirtz |  |
| Dr. King Cheek |  |

## ROOSEVELT CHILDREN'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

## INTRODUCTION

Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School (RCACS) opened in 2000 to a groundswell of community support for additional public school options in Roosevelt, New York. That support and community interest in this public charter school have been at the core of our parent involvement, our shared decision making, and we believe, our remarkable success. Now eight years later, RCACS begins its ninth year with a K-8 campus of five hundred students, and we have never been stronger academically. We are coming off yet another complete success in terms of exceeding the most critical absolute and comparative measures in our accountability plan. Even as our size has expanded over the years with adding grades, we have not lost our focus, as is seen when some schools attempt to be both elementary and middle schools. This has not happened in RCACS' case because we were as relentless in our pursuit of high standards with our middle school program as were with elementary.

We enter 2009-10 with the same excitement and enthusiasm as when we began nine years ago. Our purpose of providing a high quality public education alternative in our community is something we continue to cherish as a valued privilege and opportunity. In the following pages of this progress report, the reader will learn of our academic successes, and witness just how seriously we have taken this privilege.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School <br> Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2003-04$ | 50 | 50 | 50 | 75 | 50 | 25 |  |  |  | 300 |
| $2004-05$ | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 75 | 50 | 25 |  |  | 350 |
| $2005-06$ | 50 | 50 | 75 | 75 | 50 | 75 | 50 | 25 |  | 450 |
| $2006-07$ | 50 | 50 | 50 | 75 | 75 | 50 | 75 | 50 | 25 | 500 |
| $2007-08$ | 52 | 51 | 47 | 52 | 73 | 65 | 49 | 69 | 42 | 499 |
| $2008-09$ | 50 | 54 | 50 | 45 | 51 | 67 | 67 | 50 | 66 | 500 |

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

## Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students at the Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School (RCACS) will become proficient in reading and writing of the English Language.

All of our grades have unwrapped POWER STANDARDS for the ELA program. The entire staff along with Leadership and Learning Organization from Denver worked numerous hours to have a user friendliness and staff ownership in these unwrapping of the standards. With the continued support of the Assistant Instructional Principal, administration and staff, the ELA program and plan is strong at Roosevelt Children's Academy. Title I staff, Reading Resource Staff, and all support staff take part in the preparation of our children for life and for the ELA exam.

Below are just a few of the strategies used to support the children.

## ELA Schedule

11:15-12:15 Scott Foresman Reading
1:30-2:15 ELA/Literacy
Scott Foresman Reading is the basis of RCA's reading/ELA program Kindergarten $-6^{\text {th }}$ Grades and consists of the following components on a daily basis:

* Skill Lessons
* Vocabulary Building
* Building Background information activity
* Grammar lessons
* Spelling Pre-tests
* Preview and predict activity (picture walk)
. Reading the selection (story) for that particular week.
* Leveled Readers - the students are divided into three reading groups and the classroom teacher instructs the group in greatest need, while the cooperating teacher will teach the middle group. The highest group works with chapter books so that they will continue to be given the opportunity to interact with a text with a support staff member such as the Reading Resource Teacher.


## *** Offering the highest group the opportunity to interact with the chapter books is a new component

 added this year to our curriculum.Writer's Workshop: The students will work through the writing process from beginning to end with the teacher modeling the process as well as his/her thoughts.

* The Look Back and Write question at the end of the selection will be used as a basis for the writer's workshop. This will help to build a higher level of thinking when answering the questions and providing support for each answer.
*** The writer's workshop was a new component added this year to our curriculum on a weekly basis to help improve writing skills and our performance on the New York State ELA Assessments.
* Spelling Assessments
* Reading Comprehension/Vocabulary Assessment (Selection Test)
* Incorporating the BIG IDEA into the curriculum
* The BIG IDEA will change each month to be able to address all the ELA needs of the students necessary for success on each NYS ELA assessment. (See attached schedule for the BIG IDEA.)
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## ELA/LITERACY

1:30-2:15

This part of the schedules consists of lessons geared to the ELA skills needed to build strong ELA learners throughout all school subjects.

- In the afternoon, the writing part of the ELA program will be addressed together with the grammar component. The social studies curriculum topics focus of the writing activities.
- In addition, the teacher incorporates the End of Unit thought provoking questions from the DBQ Practice Book as a basis for their writing session.

The plan has been aligned with the Scott Foresman skill lessons.

## Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75\% of students in each assessed grade who have been continuously enrolled in the school for two or more years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English Language Arts (ELA) Assessment.

## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in January 2009. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. 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 .

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.

2008-09 State English Language Arts Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total | Not Tested $^{1}$ |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tested | IEP | ELL | Absent | Enrolled |
| 3 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 4 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 51 |
| 5 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 68 |
| 6 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| 7 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 50 |
| 8 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 |
| All | 346 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 348 |

[^0]
## Results

The overall percent of students in at least their second year performing at Levels $3 \& 4$ is $\underline{\mathbf{9 5 \%}}$.

> Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State English Language Arts 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 |  |
| 3 | All Students | 0 | 4\% | 84\% | 11\% | 96\% | 45 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 6\% | 83\% | 11\% | 94\% | 35 |
| 4 | All Students | 0 | 2\% | 98\% | 0 | 98\% | 51 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 2\% | 98\% | 0 | 98\% | 51 |
| 5 | All Students | 0 | 3\% | 78\% | 19\% | 97\% | 67 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 2\% | 83\% | 16\% | 98\% | 57 |
| 6 | All Students | 0 | 7\% | 82\% | 10\% | 93\% | 67 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 8\% | 79\% | 14\% | 93\% | 52 |
| 7 | All Students | 0 | 8\% | 82\% | 10\% | 92\% | 49 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 5\% | 82\% | 13\% | 95\% | 39 |
| 8 | All Students | 0 | 12\% | 84\% | 4\% | 88\% | 67 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 12\% | 83\% | 5\% | 88\% | 59 |
| All | All Students | 0 | 6\% | 84\% | 10\% | 94 | 346 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 6\% | 85\% | 10\% | 95\% | 293 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. We again had a successful year at Roosevelt Children's Academy. As seen from the table, 278 of our 293 cohort students (95\%) are proficient in English Language Arts. We do this with one of the largest campus wide enrollments in NYS Charter Schools, allowing more students to benefit from our fine program. We credit the hard work of our teaching staff for making this possible, and are proud to have met this accountability goal again this year. Further, each of our grades far surpassed the goal of $75 \%$ proficiency on the NYS ELA tests.

## Additional Evidence

Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School has performed overall at greater than $80 \%$ proficiency rate since 2006.

## ROOSEVELT CHILDREN'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

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 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2005-06$ |  | 2006-07 |  | $2007-08$ |  | $2008-09$ |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | $80.8 \%$ | 52 | $88 \%$ | 57 | $83 \%$ | 48 | $94 \%$ | 35 |
| 4 | $91 \%$ | 43 | $67 \%$ | 54 | $92 \%$ | 63 | $98 \%$ | 51 |
| 5 | $90 \%$ | 60 | $90 \%$ | 41 | $87 \%$ | 54 | $98 \%$ | 57 |
| 6 | $78.6 \%$ | 42 | $87 \%$ | 54 | $95 \%$ | 37 | $93 \%$ | 52 |
| 7 | $69.6 \%$ | 23 | $71 \%$ | 39 | $88 \%$ | 59 | $95 \%$ | 39 |
| 8 |  |  | $65 \%$ | 20 | $63 \%$ | 38 | $88 \%$ | 59 |
| All | $\mathbf{8 3 . 6 \%}$ | 220 | $\mathbf{8 0 \%}$ | 265 | $\mathbf{8 6 \%}$ | 299 | $\mathbf{9 5 \%}$ | 293 |

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 2008-09 is 133. 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 students of Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School achieved an aggregate PI score of 194, surpassing the goal AMO of 133 .

Calculation of 2008-09 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

| Grades | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |
| $3-8$ | 0 | 6 | 84 | 10 | 346 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. We tested 346 students and every single grade level surpassed the AMO mark set by NYSED.

## Additional Evidence

Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School's PI has far surpassed the target AMO since 2006.

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

| Year | Grades ${ }^{2}$ | Number Tested | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  | PI | AMO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |  |
| 2005-06 | 3-7 | 257 | 0\% | 18\% | 74\% | 8\% | 182 | 122 |
| 2006-07 | 3-8 | 337 | 0\% | 23\% | 71\% | 5\% | 175 | 122 |
| 2007-08 | 3-8 | 345 | 0\% | 14\% | 79\% | 8\% | 186 | 133 |
| 2008-09 | 3-8 | 346 | 0\% | 6\% | 84\% | 10\% | 194 | 133 |

## 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, Roosevelt Union Free 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, Roosevelt Union Free School District.

## Results

Overall, RCACS has a $95 \%$ proficiency rate compared to the district's $78.5 \%$ proficiency rate.
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## 2008-09 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 $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | 94\% | 35 | 77\% | 322 |
| 4 | 98\% | 51 | 86\% | 372 |
| 5 | 98\% | 57 | 90\% | 360 |
| 6 | 93\% | 52 | 72\% | 119 |
| 7 | 95\% | 39 | 62\% | 107 |
| 8 | 88\% | 59 | 60\% | 99 |
| All | 95\% | 293 | 78.5\% | 1379 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. From the table, the reader can see that Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School is surpassing the 'same grade' proficiency levels of the local school district, Roosevelt Union Free School District. Separation in performance is greatest at the middle school level (6-8). Overall, RCACS has a $95 \%$ proficiency rate to their $78.5 \%$ proficiency rate. We are encouraged to see the local district exceeding $75 \%$ overall proficiency as we wish their students success.

## Additional Evidence

Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School has outperformed the local district in overall proficiency rates in the four years represented in the table below. RCACS has also performed greater than $75 \%$ proficient in all four years.

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

| Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  | 2008-09 |  |
| Grade | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 3 | 80.8\% | 89.5\% | 87.7 | 75.2\% | 83\% | 75.9\% | 94\% | 77\% |
| 4 | 91\% | 84.7\% | 66.7\% | 89.6\% | 92\% | 81\% | 98\% | 86\% |
| 5 | 90\%\% | 83.5\% | 90.2\% | 82.6\% | 87\% | 85.6\% | 98\% | 90\% |
| 6 | 78.6\% | 80\% | 87\% | 76.9\% | 95\% | 65.1\% | 93\% | 72\% |
| 7 | 69.6\% | 34.1\% | 71.8\% | 40.3\% | 88\% | 60.4\% | 95\% | 62\% |
| 8 |  |  | 65\% | 38.6\% | 63\% | 41.5\% | 88\% | 60\% |
| All | 83.6\% | 74\% | 79.6\% | 66.11\% | 86\% | 68.56\% | 95\% | 78.5\% |
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## 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 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 2008-09 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2007-08 results, the most recent ones available.

## Results

Students at all levels exceeded the predicted proficiency rates. The overall Effect Size was 1.77 in 2008.

2007-08 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent <br> Eligible for <br> Free Lunch | Number Tested | Percent of Students at Levels 3\&4 |  | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Actual | Predicted |  |  |
| 3 |  | 52 | 82.70 | 62.82 | 19.88 | 1.54 |
| 4 |  | 73 | 89.00 | 63.79 | 25.21 | 1.95 |
| 5 |  | 64 | 89.10 | 71.45 | 17.65 | 1.56 |
| 6 |  | 49 | 95.90 | 56.49 | 39.41 | 2.63 |
| 7 |  | 69 | 88.40 | 60.29 | 28.11 | 1.69 |
| 8 |  | 42 | 64.20 | 44.00 | 20.20 | 1.15 |
| All | 58.47 | 349 | 85.95 | 60.95 | 24.99 | 1.77 |


| School's Overall Comparative Performance: |
| :---: |
| Higher than expected to a large degree |

## Evaluation

This outcome measure has been met. The overall Effect size was 1.77 , far surpassing the 0.3 . Every grade's proficiency rate was greater than $15 \%$ better than predicted, with an overall margin of greater by $24.99 \%$.

Goal 1: Growth Measure
Each year, 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.

## 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 proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2008-09 and also have a state exam score in 2007-08. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2007-08 and 75 percent proficient in 2008-09. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2007-08, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. 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

Overall the cohort group improved from an $89.2 \%$ proficiency rate in 2008 to a $94.4 \%$ rate in 2009. All cohort groups achieved above a $75 \%$ proficiency rate in 2008 so needed to show growth this year. All grades maintained the same rate or improved, with the exception of grade 8 . Grade 8 dropped only $1 \%$ to an $88 \%$ proficiency rate, which is still well above the $75 \%$ absolute measure.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2007-08 to 2008-09

| Grade | Cohort | Percent at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  | Target |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Size | $2007-08$ | Target | $2008-09$ | Achieved |
| 4 | 49 | $84 \%$ | Increase | $98 \%$ | Yes |
| 5 | 59 | $88 \%$ | Increase | $98 \%$ | Yes |
| 6 | 54 | $89 \%$ | Increase | $93 \%$ | Yes |
| 7 | 41 | $98 \%$ | Increase | $98 \%$ | Yes |
| 8 | 65 | $89 \%$ | Increase | $88 \%$ | No |
| All | 268 | $\mathbf{8 9 . 2 \%}$ | Increase | $\mathbf{9 4 . 4 \%}$ | Yes |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure in 2008-09. We are proud of the overall grades 4-8 cohort accomplishment of increasing proficiency by $5.2 \%$ on the ELA test to $94.4 \%$. Students in grade 8 were the only ones who did not maintain or improve their performance, however their proficiency rate is $88 \%$ and only down $1 \%$ from 2008.
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## Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

We exceeded every single measure with our English Language Arts goal.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in <br> at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on <br> the New York State examination. | Achieved |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on <br> the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective <br> (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled <br> in at least their second year and performing at or above Level <br> 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in <br> the same tested grades in the local school district. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of <br> performance on the State exam by a least a small Effect Size. | Achieved |
| Growth | Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the <br> gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous <br> year's State exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the <br> current year's State exam. | Achieved |

## MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics
All students at the Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematics computation and problem solving.

## Background

Roosevelt Children's Academy is fortunate to have a Lead Math Teacher who oversees the entire Math program as well as teaches Honors Math. The Lead Math teacher has bi-weekly math meetings with staff members, grade levels, and administration. The grade levels, with her supervision, have created a Mathematics Pacing Calendar. This calendar guides instruction of math and has the entire grade levels specifically paced weekly with the performance indicators, big ideas, and resources used to obtain high scores. The staff turns in monthly assessment reports to administration and discusses these reports at monthly grade level and data team meetings.

Goal 2: 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 mathematics examination.

## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in March 2009. 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.

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.

2008-09 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total | Not Tested $^{3}$ |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tested | IEP | ELL | Absent | Enrolled |
| 3 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 45 |
| 4 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| 5 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 69 |
| 6 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 67 |
| 7 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 50 |
| 8 | 65 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 66 |
| All | 329 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 347 |

[^2]
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## Results

The overall percent of students in at least their second year performing at Levels $3 \& 4$ is $96 \%$.

> Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State Mathematics 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 |  |
| 3 | All Students | 0\% | 2\% | 56\% | 42\% | 98\% | 45 |
|  | Students in At Least ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 3\% | 57\% | 40\% | 97\% | 35 |
| 4 | All Students | 0\% | 6\% | 62\% | 32\% | 94\% | 50 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 6\% | 62\% | 32\% | 94\% | 50 |
| 5 | All Students | 0\% | 1\% | 66\% | 32\% | 98\% | 68 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 2\% | 68\% | 30\% | 98\% | 56 |
| 6 | All Students | 0\% | 2\% | 68\% | 31\% | 99\% | 65 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 2\% | 66\% | 32\% | 98\% | 50 |
| 7 | All Students | 0\% | 0\% | 60\% | 40\% | 100\% | 50 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 0\% | 54\% | 46\% | 100\% | 39 |
| 8 | All Students | 2\% | 8\% | 86\% | 5\% | 91\% | 66 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 2\% | 7\% | 88\% | 3\% | 91\% | 58 |
| All | All Students | 0\% | 3\% | 67\% | 29\% | 97\% | 344 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 2.88\% | 67.36\% | 28.81\% | 96\% | 288 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. We are pleased to have again met our most important math measure. All of our grade averages exceeded the $75 \%$ mark. $100 \%$ of our $7^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved $100 \%$ proficiency rates. The overall proficiency rate of all students tested was $97 \%$, with a slightly lower rate of $96 \%$ for the overall cohort group.

## Additional Evidence

The percent of overall students enrolled in at least their second year performing at levels 3 and 4 on the NYS Math test have increased since 2006 from $75 \%$ (2006) to $79 \%$ (2007) to $98.3 \%$ (2008) and a slight dip to $97 \%(2009)$. We are very proud of our students' achievements in mathematics.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2005-06$ |  | $2006-07$ |  | $2007-08$ |  | $2008-09$ |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | 89.5 | 48 | 94.6 | 77 | 100 | 48 | $97 \%$ | 35 |
| 4 | 95.2 | 42 | 73.6 | 69 | 100 | 62 | $94 \%$ | 50 |
| 5 | 72.8 | 59 | 90.2 | 50 | 96.1 | 52 | $98 \%$ | 56 |
| 6 | 58.1 | 43 | 89 | 72 | 100 | 36 | $98 \%$ | 50 |
| 7 | 43.5 | 23 | 55.3 | 49 | 98.3 | 58 | $100 \%$ | 39 |
| 8 |  |  | 45 | 23 | 88.9 | 36 | $91 \%$ | 58 |
| All | $\mathbf{7 5}$ | 215 | 79 | 340 | $\mathbf{9 7 . 5}$ | 292 | $96 \%$ | 288 |

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 2008-09 is 197. 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 aggregate PI score for the 2009 math exam is $\underline{\mathbf{1 9 7}}$.
Calculation of 2008-09 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

| Grades | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Number Tested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level 1 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  |  |
| 3-8 | 0\% |  | 3\% |  | 67\% |  | 29\% |  | 344 |
|  | PI | $=$ | 3 | + | 67 | $+$ | 29 | = | 100 |
|  |  |  |  | + | 67 | + | 29 | $=$ | 97 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PI | $=$ | 197 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. We tested 344 students and every single grade level surpassed the AMO mark set by NYSED. Our school wide Performance Index (PI) was 197.

## Additional Evidence

Students have surpassed the AMO all four years, and as important, have shown an increase each year. The percentage of students scoring in Level 1 has decreased from $4.1 \%$ in 2006 to $0 \%$ in 2009. The percentage of students performing at Level 2 has also decreased from $20.8 \%$ in 2006 to $3 \%$ in 2009.

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 |  |  |
| 2005-06 | 3-7 | 265 | 4\% | 21\% | 59\% | 17\% | 171 | 86 |
| 2006-07 | 3-8 | 340 | 2\% | 19\% | 67\% | 12\% | 177 | 86 |
| 2007-08 | 3-8 | 348 | 0\% | 3\% | 70\% | 26\% | 196 | 102 |
| 2008-09 | 3-8 | 344 | 0\% | 3\% | 67\% | 29\% | 197 | 102 |

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

Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School's overall cohort group performed at a $96 \%$ proficiency rate on the 2009 math exam, compared to the local district's $78 \%$ of students performing at levels 3 and 4 on the same test.

> 2008-09 State Mathematics Exams
> Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RCACS Students In At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | 97\% | 35 | 91\% | 210 |
| 4 | 94\% | 50 | 90\% | 218 |
| 5 | 98\% | 56 | 94\% | 207 |
| 6 | 98\% | 50 | 58\% | 170 |
| 7 | 100\% | 39 | 60\% | 176 |
| 8 | 91\% | 58 | 69\% | 168 |
| All | 96\% | 288 | 78\% | 1149 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. Overall, our cohort students outperformed the local district by a greater than $18 \%$ margin on the math test.
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## Additional Evidence

Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School's overall cohort group has outperformed the local district since 2006. The margins have been $17 \%$ (2006), $15 \%$ (2007), $23 \%$ (2008) and $18 \%$ (2009).

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

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year And <br> All District Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  | 2008-09 |  |
|  | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 3 | 90\% | 83\% | 95\% | 86\% | 100\% | 89\% | 97\% | 91\% |
| 4 | 95\% | 77\% | 74\% | 89\% | 100\% | 88\% | 94\% | 90\% |
| 5 | 73\% | 65\% | 90\% | 82\% | 96\% | 89\% | 98\% | 94\% |
| 6 | 58\% | 52\% | 89\% | 75\% | 100\% | 67\% | 98\% | 58\% |
| 7 | 44\% | 12\% | 55\% | 22\% | 98\% | 53\% | 100\% | 60\% |
| 8 |  |  | 45\% | 37\% | 88\% | 54\% | 91\% | 69\% |
| All | 75\% | 58\% | 79\% | 64\% | 98\% | 74\% | 96\% | 78\% |

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 2008-09 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2007-08 results, the most recent ones available.

## Results

The overall Effect Size is 1.44 , exceeding the 0.3 requirement of this measure.
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## 2007-08 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 |  | 52 | 100.00 | 86.82 | 13.18 | 1.39 |
| 4 |  | 74 | 97.30 | 79.36 | 17.94 | 1.47 |
| 5 |  | 64 | 96.90 | 78.21 | 18.69 | 1.35 |
| 6 |  | 50 | 98.00 | 71.67 | 26.33 | 1.63 |
| 7 |  | 68 | 97.10 | 69.83 | 27.27 | 1.54 |
| 8 |  | 40 | 85.00 | 58.98 | 26.02 | 1.19 |
| All | 58.47 | 348 | 96.28 | 74.96 | 21.32 | 1.44 |

## School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a large degree

## Evaluation

In 2007-08 RCACS achieved this measure by having an Effect Size of 1.44. We performed higher than expected to a large degree compared to similar schools across the state. All grade levels performed better than predicted by at least $13 \%$, with an overall margin of $21.32 \%$.

## Goal 2: Growth Measure

Each year, 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.

## 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 proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2008-09 and also have a state exam score in 2007-08. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2007-08 and 75 percent proficient in 2008-09. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2007-08, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. 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

All cohort groups achieved greater than $75 \%$ proficiency on the Math 2008 and 2009 tests. The overall cohort of students who took the 2008 and 2009 Math Tests achieved $96 \%$ proficiency.

## Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2007-08 to 2008-09

| Grade | Cohort | Percent at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  | Target |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Size | $2007-08$ | Target | $2008-09$ | Achieved |
| 4 | 48 | $100 \%$ | 100 | $94 \%$ | No |
| 5 | 61 | $100 \%$ | 100 | $98 \%$ | No |
| 6 | 53 | $96 \%$ | Increase | $98 \%$ | Yes |
| 7 | 41 | $98 \%$ | Increase | $100 \%$ | Yes |
| 8 | 61 | $98 \%$ | Increase | $90 \%$ | No |
| All | 264 | $98 \%$ | Increase | $96 \%$ | No |

## Evaluation

We partially met this outcome measure. This year, 264 of our $4^{\text {th }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students also took the $3^{\text {rd }}$ through7 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ grade test in 2007-08. Last year, 260 of those 264 students were proficient, or $98 \%$. This year their performance slightly decreased as a whole to $96 \%$ proficient on the NYS Math test, or 253/264. Because our students performed so well on the 2007-08 math exams, it was difficult to improve on those numbers. We are very proud of our 2009 results, as the overall proficiency rate is $96 \%$. Each grade level scored far greater than $75 \%$ proficiency rate on the 2009 NYS Math test.
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## Summary of the Mathematics Goal

We met every single measure under our school's Math goal.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in <br> at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on <br> the New York State examination. | Achieved |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on <br> the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective <br> (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled <br> in at least their second year and performing at or above Level <br> 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in <br> the same tested grades in the local school district. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of <br> performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size. | Achieved |
| Growth | Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the <br> gap between the ercent at or above Level 3 on the previous <br> year's state exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the <br> current year's State exam. | Achieved 75\% - <br> All Cohort Groups did <br> not improve, but all <br> groups are greater than <br> 90\% proficient |
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## SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science
All students at Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

## Background

The Instructional Principal and Assistant Principals oversee the staff regarding the Science Program. All staff members have a Pacing Guide and the Middle School works on a carefully planned syllabus. Monthly assessments are turned into administration for appraisal, gone over during grade level and data team meetings.

## 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 $4^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade in spring 2009. 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

## Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State Science Exams By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | Population | Percent at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  | Number Tested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 3/4 |  |
| 4 | All Students | 0 | 0 | 6\% | 94\% | 100\% | 52 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 0 | 6\% | 94\% | 100\% | 52 |
| 8 | All Students | 0 | 14\% | 68\% | 18\% | 86\% | 66 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 14\% | 66\% | 21\% | 87\% | 58 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. $100 \%$ of all $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students scored at Level 3 or higher. $87 \%$ of eighth grade students in at least their second year scored at Level 3 or higher.

## ROOSEVELT CHILDREN'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

## Additional Evidence

Our NYS Science results have been exceptional for all of the years of this charter period. We are convinced that our solid core reading program has been of great benefit to our Science program, and thus the results on the State Assessment.

## Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004-05 |  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  | 2008-09 |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 | 100\% | 75 | 100\% | 50 | 95\% |  | 98\% | 61 | 100\% | 52 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | 80\% |  | 97\% | 34 | 87\% | 58 |

## 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

There are no officially released district results for 2008-09. This comparison cannot be performed at this time.

## 2008-09 State Science Exams Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RCACS Students In At <br> Least 2 | All Roosevelt Union Free <br> School District Students |  |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
|  | $100 \%$ | 52 |  |  |
| 8 | $87 \%$ | 58 |  |  |

## Evaluation

NA

## Summary

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in <br> at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on <br> the New York State examination. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled <br> in at least their second year and performing at or above Level <br> 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in <br> the same tested grades in the local school district. | District Scores <br> Unavailable |

## ROOSEVELT CHILDREN'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

## SOCIAL STUDIES

## Goal 4: Social Studies

All students at Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of social, geographical, civic and world studies.

## Background

This school year a new Social Studies curriculum was adopted. The staff had input in the choosing of the program. The Assistant Principals work with the staff to develop an assessment calendar, pacing calendar, and choosing the Power Standards for Social Studies at their grade level. The assessments are turned into administration for input, discussed at Grade Level Meetings and Data Team Meetings.

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 $5^{\text {th }}$ grade in November 2008 and 8th grade in June 2009. 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

Of grade 5 students, the overall percent of students in at least their second year performing at Levels $3 \& 4$ was $100 \%$. Grade 8 cohort students performed at a proficiency rate of $81 \%$ on the NYS social studies exam.

Charter School Performance on 2007-08 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 | 0 | 26\% | 74\% | 100\% | 68 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 0 | 25\% | 75\% | 100\% | 59 |
| 8 | All Students | 0 | 20\% | 75\% | 5\% | 80\% | 65 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0 | 19\% | 76\% | 5\% | 81\% | 58 |

## Evaluation

We met this outcome measure. $100 \%$ of our fifth grade cohort passed the $5^{\text {th }}$ grade social studies exam. $81 \%$ of $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year scored at Level 3 or higher on the NYS social studies test.

## Additional Evidence

RCACS cohort students have been proficient in social studies since 2006.

> Social Studies Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2005-06$ |  | $2006-07$ |  | $2007-08$ |  | $2008-09$ |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 5 | $100 \%$ | 60 | $100 \%$ | 48 | $90.8 \%$ | 55 | $100 \%$ | 59 |
| 8 |  |  | $95 \%$ | 24 | $82 \%$ | 35 | $81 \%$ | 58 |

## 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

We have no 2008-09 local district Social Studies comparative information.

> 2008-09 State Social Studies Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RCACS Students In At <br> Least 2 | All Roosevelt Union Free <br> Ychool District Students |  |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
|  | $100 \%$ | 59 |  |  |
| 8 | $81 \%$ | 58 |  |  |

## Evaluation

NA

## Summary

Based on the information available, we have met our social studies goals. Our grade 5 students performed at $100 \%$ on the test in November 2008. Our grade 8 cohort students performed at $81 \%$ proficiency on the social studies test.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at <br> least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New <br> York State examination. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at <br> least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the <br> State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested <br> grades in the local school district. | District Scores <br> Unavailable |

NCLB

## 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

NCLB Status by Year

| Year | Status |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2003-04$ | Good Standing |
| $2004-05$ | Good Standing |
| $2005-06$ | Good Standing |
| $2006-07$ | Good Standing |
| $2007-08$ | Good Standing |
| $2008-09$ | Good Standing |

## Section II.

Charter School Student Attrition Rates
2008-09

| Student Attrition Rates |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7} \mathbf{- 2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6 - 2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 2 0 0 6}$ |
| Number of students leaving <br> for lack of transportation | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students leaving <br> for geographic reasons (e.g., <br> out of state/district <br> relocation) | 2 |  |  | 10 |
| Number of students leaving <br> for more restrictive special <br> education setting | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| Number of students leaving <br> due to parental choice (e.g., <br> school transfer closer to <br> residence, local elementary <br> school, parent convenience) | 2 | 17 | 10 | 0 |
| Number leaving for other <br> reasons (undetermined) | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 |
| Total number of students <br> leaving. | 4 | 23 | 35 | 23 |
| Highest Number Enrolled <br> (July 1 - June 30) | 502 | 499 | 500 | 250 |
| Total Percent Attrition | Less than 1\% | $\mathbf{4 . 6 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | 2 |

## Charter School Teacher Attrition Rates <br> 2008-09

|  | $\mathbf{2 0 0 8 - 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 7 - 2 0 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 6 - 2 0 0 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 0 5 - 2 0 0 6}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Classroom <br> Teachers | 23 | 23 | 18 | 18 |
| Number of Special Area <br> Teachers | 9 | 5 | 7 | 0 |
| Total Number of Teachers | 32 | 28 | 25 | 18 |
| Total Number of Teachers <br> Leaving | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| Total Percent Attrition | $\mathbf{3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{7 \%}$ | $\mathbf{8 \%}$ | $\mathbf{5 . 5 \%}$ |

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE, SECONDARY AND CONTINUING EDUCATION PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAMS

CHARTER SCHOOL ANNUAL REPORT OF FISCAL PERFORMANCE

Charter School Code: ROR THE SCHOOL YEAR ENDED 6/30/09

| Charter School Code: |
| :---: |
| 280208860024 |

ROOM 462, EDUCATION BUILDING ANNEX
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

| Charter School Name: Contact Person: | Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Philip Leconte |  |  | Phone: |  |  |  |
| REVENUES |  |  |  | EXPENDITURES |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | SALARIES | OTHER |  | TOTAL |
| A. STATE SOURCES | \$ | 247,690 | F. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION | \$ 697,900 | \$ 1,344,232 | \$ | 2,042,132 |
| B. FEDERAL SOURCES |  | 462,501 | G. InSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION | 290,982 | - |  | 290,982 |
| C. PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS |  |  | H. ALL OTHER INSTRUCTION | 1,564,977 | 429,394 |  | 1,994,371 |
| 1. BASIC OPERATING REVENUES |  | 8,323,367 | I. PUPIL SERVICES | 81,526 | - |  | 81,526 |
| 2. STATE AID-PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES |  | - | J. PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES | 38,793 | - |  | 38,793 |
| 3. FED. AID-PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES |  | - | K. TRANSPORTATION | - | - |  | - |
| 4. OTHER REV FROM PUB SCH DISTRICTS |  | - | L. COMMUNITY SERVICE | - | - |  | - |
| D. ALL OTHER REVENUES |  | 163,397 | M. OPERATION \& MAINTENANCE | 270,704 | 124,172 |  | 394,877 |
| E. TOTAL REVENUES FROM ALL SOURCES | \$ | 9,196,954 |  | N. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS |  |  | 682,031 |
|  |  |  |  | O. DEBT SERVICE |  |  | 92,293 |
|  |  |  |  | P. SCHOOL LUNCH |  |  | 220,322 |
| S. ENROLLMENT | 497 |  |  | Q. CAPITAL EXPENSE |  |  | 482,000 |
| T. EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL |  | 12,715 |  | R. GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES |  | \$ | 6,319,328 |
|  |  | (R/S) |  |  |  |  |  |

## COMPLETED FORM SHOULD BE RETURNED <br> NO LATER THAN AUGUST 3, 2009 TO: PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAMS

State Education Department
Room 462 - Education Building Annex
Albany, New York 12234

* Please also send the Charter School Institute a copy

Signature: $\qquad$ Date: $\qquad$
Chief School Officer

Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School - 2008-09
Statement of Modifications to the School's Educational Program and Governance Structure
Roosevelt Children's Academy Charter School did not make any substantial and material changes to our school's educational program or governance structure.

ROOSEVELT CHILDREN'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

| Teacher's Name | Room \# | Teaching Assignment (Grades/Subjects) | Type of Certification | Certification Issue Date | Certification <br> Expiration Date | Years Teaching Experience Prior to This Year | Years Teaching Experience at This School Prior to This Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Highly } \\ \text { Qualified } \\ \text { (Yes or N/A) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abrams, Marilyn |  |  | K \& Common Branch Subjects-Perm | 9/1/1963 |  |  |  |  |
| Allen Kellene |  |  | Math 7-12 Initial | 2/1/2009 | 1/31/2014 |  |  |  |
| Antos, Jessica |  |  | Pre K \& K 1-6 Initial | 2/1/2002 | 1/31/2009 |  |  |  |
| Athanasatos, Dennis |  |  | Math 7-12 Prof | 1/1/2008 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Social Studies Prof | 9/1/1972 |  |  |  |  |
| Bacani,Katherine |  |  | Early Childhood Birth-2 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/31/2012 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Students w/Disabilities 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Baldwin, Atiya |  |  | Early Childhood Birth-2 Initial | 9/1/2009 | 8/31/2014 |  |  |  |
| Bascelli,Rosemary |  |  | Pre K \& K 1-6 Perm | 9/1/2003 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Early childhood Pre K-3 Perm EC Annotation | 9/1/2003 |  |  |  |  |
| Benavides, Patricia |  |  | Early Childhood 1-6 Initial | 2/1/2008 | 8/31/2013 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Childhood Education Birth-2 Initial | 9/1/2008 | 1/31/2013 |  |  |  |
| Block, Brittany |  |  | Physical Education | 9/1/2008 | 8/31/2013 |  |  |  |
| Campbell, Gwendolyn |  |  | Childhood Education Initial | 12/14/2006 |  |  |  |  |
| Campbell, Lakesha |  |  | Nursery, Kindergarten 1-6 Perm | Not Ready for Review | 3/31/2008 | View Evaluation History |  |  |
| Alfred Cesar |  |  | Visual Arts Initial | 9/1/2008 | 8/31/2013 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Art-Perm | 10/3/2008 | 8/13/2012 |  |  |  |
| Delgatto, Danielle |  |  | Students w/Disabilities 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/13/2013 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/13/2012 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Early Childhood Education Birth-2 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/13/2012 |  |  |  |
| Diedrick, Leeann |  |  | School Social Worker-Perm | 9/1/2007 |  |  |  |  |
| Donnelly, Nicole |  |  | School Social Worker-Provisional | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Galley, Ruth |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 2/1/2008 | 1/31/2013 |  |  |  |
| Geller, Rose |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 2/1/2005 | 1/31/2010 |  |  |  |
| Gordon, Jillian |  |  | Early Childhood Education Birth-2 Initial | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Kennedy, Melissa |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2005 | 8/31/2012 |  |  |  |
| Kurz, Timothy |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Lipner, Michelle |  |  | School Counselor Provisional | 9/1/2007 | 8/31/2012 |  |  |  |
| Livingston, Brian |  |  | Social Studies 7-12 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/31/2012 |  |  |  |
| Melella, Antoinette |  |  | Math 7-12 Initial | 9/1/2008 | 8/31/2013 |  |  |  |
| Nobles, Danielle |  |  | Students w/Disabilities 1-6 Initial | 2/1/2007 | 1/31/2012 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 2/1/2007 | 1/31/2012 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Students w/Disabilities Birth-2 Initial | 2/1/2007 | 1/31/2012 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Early Childhood Educatioņ3irth-2 Initial | 2/1/2007 | 1/31/2012 |  |  |  |

ROOSEVELT CHILDREN'S ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL

| Teacher's Name | Room \# | Teaching Assignment (Grades/Subjects) | Type of Certification | Certification Issue Date | Certification Expiration Date | Years Teaching Experience Prior to This Year | Years Teaching Experience at This School Prior to This Year | Highly Qualified (Yes or N/A) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nugent, Sean |  |  | Physical Education Initial | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Persad, Reshma |  |  | School Administrator Supervisor Provisional | 2/1/2007 | 1/31/2013 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Literacy 5-12 Initial | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Pisani, Donna |  |  | Nursery, Kindergarten 1-6 Perm | 2/1/1994 |  |  |  |  |
| Pischel, Kristofer |  |  | Students w/ Disabilities 1-6 Prof | 2/1/2009 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2005 | 8/31/2010 |  |  |  |
| Ranieri, Daniela |  |  | Pre K \& Kindergarten 1-6 Perm | 9/1/2006 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Italian 7-12 Initial | 7/9/2004 |  |  |  |  |
| Schieferstien, Michael |  |  | Music Initial | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Schiraldi, Denise |  |  | Nursery, Kindergarten 1-6 Perm | 9/1/2001 |  |  |  |  |
| Schnupp, Charla |  |  | English Language Arts 7-12 Initial | 9/1/2004 | 8/31/2009 |  |  |  |
| Sebastien, McGline |  |  | No Data Found |  |  |  |  |  |
| Smalls Vinson |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | Withdrawn |  |  |  |  |
| Sorcelli, Nicole |  |  | Pre K \& Kindergarten 1-6 Perm | 2/1/2005 |  |  |  |  |
| Thomas, Anu |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 2/1/2008 | 1/31/2013 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Childhood Education Internship | 9/1/2007 | 8/31/2009 |  |  |  |
| Thompson, Tina |  |  | Pre K\& Kindergarten 1-6 Provisional | 2/1/2003 | 2/1/2003 |  |  |  |
| Wareing, Michelle |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2007 | 8/31/2012 |  |  |  |
| Wareing, Patricia |  |  | Childhood Education 1-6 Initial | 9/1/2006 | 8/31/2011 |  |  |  |
| Wexler, Lauren |  |  | Pre K \& Kindergarten 1-6 Perm | 9/1/2003 |  |  |  |  |
| Williams, Mignon |  |  | Generalist Middle Childhood 5-9 Initial | Ready for Review | 4/17/2009 | View Evaluation History |  |  |
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FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR ENDED 6／30／09
REPORT OF FISCAL PERFORMANCE
CHARTER SCHOOL ANNUAL

## Section V

## NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

## Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee Annual Report 2008-09


2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? $\qquad$ Yes $X^{\mathrm{No}}$
3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write none. Please note that if you answered yes to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status,
salary, etc.

| Date(s) | Nature of Financial <br> Interest/Transaction | Steps taken to avoid <br> a conflict of interest, <br> (e.g., did not vote, <br> did not participate in <br> discussion) | Name of person <br> holding interest or <br> engaging in <br> transaction and <br> relationship to <br> yourself |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | temporaricy <br> serued as <br> attorney to <br> Board to <br> negotiate <br> Contrad | Denise <br> Washucigton |  |

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School and in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write none.

| Organization <br> Conducting <br> Business with <br> the School <br> none | Nature of <br> Business <br> Conducted | Approximate <br> Value of the <br> Business <br> Conducted | Name of Trustee/ <br> Immediate Family/Member <br> of Household Holding an <br> Interest in the Organization <br> Conducting Business with <br> the School and the Nature of <br> the Interest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |



## Section V

## NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

## Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee Annual Report 2008-09


2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? $\qquad$ Yes

3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write none. Please note that if you answered yes to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

| Date(s) | Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction | Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion) | Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $<12 \ll c$ | Comeso Mant |  <br> C'cij <br>  | $\operatorname{se} 11=$ |

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School and in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write none.



## Section V

## NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

## Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee Annual Report 2008-09

Charter Entity $\qquad$

Home Address $\qquad$
Business Address

Daytime Phone $\qquad$

E-Mail Address


1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer. parent representative): $\qquad$ (e.g., chair, treasurer. parent neanbex Aeadencelammittee.
2. Is the trustee an employed of the School? $\qquad$ Yes $>$ No
3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.

Identify each interest/ransaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write none. Please note that if you answered yes to Question 2, you need nol disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.

| Date(s) | Nature of Financial <br> Interest/Transaction | Steps taken to avoid <br> a conflict of interest, <br> (e.g., did not vote, <br> did not participate in <br> discussion) | Name of person <br> holding intercst or <br> engaging in <br> transaction and <br> relationship to <br> yourself |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |

Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School and in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write none.

| Organization <br> Conducting <br> Business with <br> the School | Nature of <br> Business <br> Conducted | Approximate <br> Value of the <br> Business <br> Conducted | Name of Trustee/ <br> Immediate Famity/Member <br> of Household Holding an <br> Interest in the Organization <br> Conducting Business with <br> the School and the Nature of <br> the Interest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |



Section V
NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee Annual Report 2008-09


1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative): Bosun member. Cluirpersm of edacotiond
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? $\qquad$ Yes No
3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write none. Please note that if you answered yes to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.


Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School and in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write none.

| Organization <br> Conducting <br> Business with <br> the School | Nature of <br> Business <br> Conducted | Approximate <br> Value of the <br> Business <br> Conducted | Name of Trustee/ <br> Immediate Family/Member <br> of Household Holding an <br> Interest in the Organization <br> Conducting Business with <br> the School and the Nature of <br> the Interest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



Section V
NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee Annual Report 2008-09


Name of Charter school RočatikELT CHILSRENJ's ACADEMy
Charter Entity $\square$
Business Address


1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative): $\qquad$
2. Is the trustee an employee of the School? $\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No
3. If you checked Yes, please provide a description of the position you hold and your responsibilities, your salary and your start date. $\qquad$

Identify each interest/transaction (and provide the requested information) that you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house have held or engaged in with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six month period prior to such service. If there has been no such financial interest or transaction, write none. Please note that if you answered yes to Question 2, you need not disclose again your employment status, salary, etc.


Identify each individual, business, corporation, union association, firm, partnership, committee proprietorship, franchise holding company, joint stock company, business or real estate trust, non-profit organization, or other organization or group of people doing business with the School and in which such entity, during the time of your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or other relationship. If you are a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with the School that is doing business with the School through a management or services agreement, you need not list every transaction between such organization and the School that is pursuant to such agreement. Instead, please identify only the name of the organization, your position in the organization as well as the relationship between such organization and the school. If there was no financial interest, write none.

| Organization Conducting Business with the School | Nature of Business Conducted | Approximate <br> Value of the Business Conducted | Name of Trustee ${ }^{\prime}$ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { LECOTNE }+ \\ & \text { ASSCintes } \end{aligned}$ | Previde= Financial Manngement ANDOLERSnH of Accounting $D=P A C T M \angle N T$ | $\$ 40 / 1+2$ | PhiliPLEConk |



Our signatures below attest that/all of the information contained herein is truthful and accurate, and that this charter school is in compliance with all aspects of its charter, and with all pertinent Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and rules. We understand that if any information in any part of this report is found to have been deliberately misrepresented, that will constitute grounds for the revocation of our charter.




Print Name, President, Board of Trustees


Signature and Date


LOO R. MCGHANEY NOTARY PUBLIC, State of New York No. 01MC4862170 Qualified in Nassau County Commission Expires Oct. 11 U C


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Beginning in 2005-06 the state administered tests in grades 3-8 and a single AMO was set for the aggregate PI of all tested students in those grades.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam

