

**Merrick Academy-Queens
Public Charter School**

**2010-11 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 16, 2011

By Carolyn Thomas, Program Manager

207-01 Jamaica Avenue
Queens Village, NY 11428
718-479-3753

Carolyn Thomas prepared this 2010-11 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Gerald Karikari, Esq	Chair
Traci Powell	Trustee
Milagros Garcia	Trustee
Valerie Williams	Trustee
Greg Hanton	Trustee
Tonya Johnson	Trustee

INTRODUCTION

The Merrick Academy – Queens Public Charter School was approved by the State University of New York Board of Trustees in June of 2000. Situated in District 29 in Queens Village, New York City, the school opened in September 2000 with an enrollment of 121 in grades K - 2 and concluded school year 2010-11 with an enrollment of 491 students in grades K-6.

Mission Statement:

The mission of Merrick Academy is to become one of the finest public schools in America. The Academy is built on the philosophy that all children can learn and the Academy ensures that all students meet or exceed New York State performance standards.

The focus of the Academy is on the core skills of reading, language and mathematics. The Academy is organized to provide an extended day, a high degree of individualized instruction and an innovative research-based academic curriculum.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
2005-06	74	76	49	75	76	75	73	498
2006-07	76	78	75	52	76	83	56	496
2007-08	78	76	74	77	54	80	56	495
2008-09	78	80	81	76	78	50	56	499
2009-10	75	77	81	76	77	71	39	496
2010-11	73	76	76	77	74	68	47	491

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

All students enrolled in the Merrick Academy Charter School will become proficient in reading and writing of the English language.

Background

The school's English Language Arts curriculum is conducted using the Balanced Literacy model. The program is supplemented with interesting reading materials, independent reading, graphic organizers, literacy centers, and writing periods. Reading and writing are driven by the Core Knowledge thematic units. For the 2010-2011 school year the school increased the student support services staff and provided differentiated professional development for teachers. The school also implemented a co-teacher model in grades K-5; with the classroom teacher being responsible for the instruction of ELA, math, writing, character education and the co-teacher responsible for the instruction of social studies and science for their assigned grade.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75% of all tested students who were continuously enrolled in at least their second year¹ at the school 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 6th 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	657
4	654
5	654
6	654
7	652
8	652

¹ A student will be considered "continuously enrolled in at least ... second year" if he enrolled on or before the first Wednesday of October of the school year prior to that of the test through the first date of the assessment, without interruption.

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	77	0	0	0	77
4	74	0	0	0	75
5	68	0	0	1	68
6	47	0	0	0	47
All	266	0	0	1	267

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 6th grade, using the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score. Overall, 74.7% of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved or exceeded a Time Adjusted Level 3 performance level.

**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	63.6%	77
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>68.8%</u>	64
4	All Students	83.6%	74
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>82.4%</u>	68
5	All Students	72.7%	68
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>74.6%</u>	59
6	All Students	71.7%	47
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>71.7%</u>	47
All	All Students	72.9%	266
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>74.7%</u>	238

Evaluation

Overall, the school did not meet this measure by 0.3 percentage points. As the table above shows, in 2010-11 students in at least their second year in grade 3 did not meet the measure by 6.2%; whereas students in grades 5 and 6 did not meet the measure by 0.4% and 3.3% respectively. Students in

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.

grade 4, enrolled in at least their second year, met or exceeded this measure by 7.4% with 82.4% of the students meeting or exceeding the measure.

Additional Evidence

Overall the school did not meet this measure in school year 2007-08 by 5.2 percentage points. However, the school met and exceeded the measure during 2008-09. Overall, 87.9% of students in grades 3-6 enrolled in at least their second year scored at or above Level 3 in 2008-09. In 2009-10 the overall performance declined by 8.6 percentage points; however, the school still met or exceed the measure by 4.3%. The table below reflects that the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year further declined by 4.6% and we missed the measure by only 0.3%.

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	75.0%	64	91.2%	68	76.8%	69	68.8%	64
4	61.5%	39	84.3%	70	82.4%	68	82.4%	68
5	77.8%	54	87.5%	48	82.1%	67	74.6%	59
6	60.0%	45	88.7%	53	73.7%	38	71.7%	46
All	69.8%	202	87.9%	239	79.3%	242	74.7%	237

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate³ Performance Index (PI) on the State ELA exam will meet or exceed that year's Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) school accountability system.

Method

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

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

³ Aggregate, meaning for all students in the school, not disaggregated by grade or any other factor.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percentage of all tested students who were continuously enrolled in at least their second year at the school and who performed at or above Level 3 on the State ELA Assessment 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 reflects that overall students in at least their second year at the Merrick Academy outperformed the students in the local school district by 3.9 percentage points on the State ELA assessment. Of Merrick's tested students in at least their second year, 49.4% scored at level 3 and 4, whereas only 45.5% of the local school district students scored at level 3 and 4.

**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	54.7%	64	48.1%	2623
4	50.0%	68	50.6%	2678
5	44.1%	59	45.2%	2,662
6	47.8%	47	37.7%	2,495
All	<u>49.4%</u>	237	<u>45.5%</u>	10,458

Evaluation

Merrick Academy has met the measure in 2010-11 by having a higher percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 in comparison to the local school district. In 2010-11, Merrick Academy had 49.4% of all students (in at least their second year) at Level 3 or 4 while the District had only 45.5% of students at Level 3 or 4. The School exceeded the local school district by 3.9 percentage points. Merrick Academy's percentage also exceeded that of the District in 2010-11 for grades 3 and 6 only for students in at least their second year as compared to all the students tested in the respective grades in the local school district. The school outperformed the district by 6.6% in grade 3 and by 10.1% in grade 6. However, in grades 4 and 5 the local school district outperformed Merrick Academy by

⁴ "District" is defined as Community School District 29 within the New York City School District.

0.6% and 1.1% respectfully. Overall, the school met the measure of students in at least their second year outperforming the district by 3.9%.

Additional Evidence

In 2007-08 through 2010-11, on a school-wide basis, Merrick Academy students enrolled in at least their second year performed at a level that was higher than the surrounding schools within the local district. While our overall level of proficiency numbers dropped considerably from 2008-09 to 2010-11, as shown in the table below, we believe this result is attributed to the change in the cutoff score for proficiency, as the district experienced a comparable decline.

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	75.0%	61.8%	91.2%	69.2%	65.2%	45.9%	54.7%	48.1%
4	61.5%	61.3%	84.3%	68.8%	51.5%	40.3%	50.0%	50.6%
5	77.8%	71.6%	87.5%	75.5%	53.7%	40.8%	44.1%	45.2%
6	60.0%	53.7%	88.7%	73.3%	39.5%	35.4%	47.8%	37.7%
All	69.8%	62.2%	87.9%	71.7%	54.1%	40.7%	49.4%	45.5%

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its expected level of performance on the State ELA exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to 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.

⁵ In its Accountability Plan K-8 Template (March 2006), CSI describes this as follows: "This complex and fair statistical analysis utilizes demographic and state assessment data, which gives schools an opportunity to see where they stand compared to demographically similar schools across the state. The analysis is conducted by CSI staff and presented to the school for incorporation into the annual Accountability Plan Progress Report."

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

In 2009-10 the school did not achieve this measure as we performed only slightly higher than expected with an effect size of 0.16.

2009-10 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Free Lunch Eligible Students	Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		76	67.1	52.7	14.4	1.16
4		77	49.4	53.7	-4.2999999999999998	-0.33
5		71	52.1	49.8	2.3	0.17
6		39	38.5	49.5	-11.0	-0.82
7						
8						
All	47.6	263	53.6	51.8	1.9	0.16

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Slightly higher than expected

Evaluation

Overall the school did not meet the measure of this goal in 2009-10 of performing higher than expected to a small degree of at least 0.30. Grade 3 was the only cohort to achieve the measure by performing higher than expected to a large degree. Our overall comparative performance was positive but only slightly higher than expected with an effect size of 0.16.

Additional Evidence

Merrick progressed from performing at about the same as expected in 2007-08 to comparatively performing higher than expected to a large degree in 2008-09. Although our comparative performance declined in 2009-10 we still performed slightly higher than expected with an effect size of .16.

The data for 2010-11 are not yet available for comparison purposes.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3-6	40%	262	54.2%	66.5%	-1.07
2007-08	3-6	39.39%	266	70.7%	72.05%	-0.13
2008-09	3-6	36.7%	261	88.1%	80.1%	-0.85
2009-10	3-6	47.6%	263	53.6%	51.8%	0.16
2010-11	3-6	***	***	***	***	***

Goal 1: Value Added to Student Learning

Each year, grade-level cohorts of the school's students will reduce by one-half the gap between their baseline performance⁶ and the CSI-required objective⁷ on the State ELA Assessment. If a cohort's baseline performance was above the objective, the cohort will increase its performance on the next administration.

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

No cohort achieved their target in the 2010-11 school year. Overall, the school-wide target was also not met for this measure.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Target Achieved
		2009-10	Target	2010-11	
4	69	66.7%	>=71.0%	49.3%	NO
5	66	47.0%	>=61.0%	43.9%	NO
6	46	52.2%	>=63.6%	47.8%	NO
All	181	55.8%	>=65.4%	47.0%	NO

Evaluation

Merrick Academy missed the school-wide target by 18.4 percentage points. Similarly, all of the grade cohorts missed their target, with the most significant decrease in performance being grade 4 with a gap of 21.7%. Additionally, grade 5 missed its target by 17.1% and grade 6 by 15.8%.

⁶ "Baseline performance" on the State ELA assessment is defined as the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on the previous year's administration.

⁷ The "CSI-required objective" is defined as 75 percent of students scoring at or above Level 3.

Additional Evidence

In 2008-09 all three cohorts met their target. However in 2009-10 the fourth and sixth grades missed the target measure by 1.4 point and 2.6 points respectfully. The fifth grade surpassed the cohort growth measure by 4.2 percentage points and none of the cohorts in grades 4-6 meet their target for school 2010-11. These results are quite possibly due to the change in the level 3 cut score. As part of instructional action plan, we will continue to closely monitor interventions for students and teachers who require additional support to meet our achievement benchmarks. Please see the action plan for additional performance improvement strategies.

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	4-6	1	3
2008-09	4-6	3	3
2009-10	4-6	1	3
2010-11	4-6	0	3

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

The school achieved only the comparative ELA measure where the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above level 3 on the State exam was greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district. Merrick Academy outperformed the local district schools by 3.9 percentage points. The school missed the absolute measure of 75% of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score by 0.3%. The school did not come close to meeting the growth measure and missed the comparative Effect Size goal by .14%. Overall, the Merrick Academy achieved one out of the four measures of this Accountability Plan goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	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

Merrick will continue to implement its instructional action plan which focuses on rigorous data analysis to inform instruction, differentiated instruction and professional development, and parent workshops.

The school will implement a data team comprised of teachers and administration to focus their efforts on improved student outcomes by developing and aligning strategies to ensure a coherent and focused approach to improving student achievement. The school will continue to employ intense data analysis to identify and support areas that are in need of improvement. The outcomes being targeted are academic intervention with students grouped according to skill ability, ongoing differentiated professional development and coaching of teachers in ELA. Additionally, we will continue to provide rigorous instruction in ELA in the areas of reading comprehension, vocabulary, and writing using the balanced literacy model. There will be increased student writing and teacher-student conferencing at each grade level, K-6. This will continue to be implemented across the curriculum using Accountable talk, oral presentations, technology infusion, and fine arts. The goal will be set using grade rubrics which incorporate the state level standards and the Common Core Standards for proficiency. Further, teachers and administrators will continue to plan strategically through monthly planning meetings, weekly grade team meetings, and weekly Pupil Personnel Committee meetings. Also, we will implement inter-classroom visitations and teacher study groups school-wide as professional development for teachers to observe best practices in action. As a final point, parent workshops to provide reading comprehension, writing strategies, and strategies to assist with homework will be incorporated into the school's parent calendar.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

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

Background

The school's mathematics curriculum is conducted using a balanced math approach which includes student-centered concept development through the use of manipulative and math games; number sense activities; problem solving experiences; standardized as well as performance-based assessments; and opportunities for students to communicate their thinking and justify their answers. The program is supplemented with interesting reading materials pertaining to mathematics.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75% of all tested students who were continuously enrolled in at least their second year¹ at the school will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics Assessment.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 6th grade in May 2011. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10 and 2010-11, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score at or above the state's Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores¹, presented in the table below.

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

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁸			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	77	0	0	0	77
4	74	0	0	0	74
5	68	0	0	0	68
6	47	0	0	0	47
All	266	0	0	0	266

Results

The following table presents the State Mathematics test results for all students and for those enrolled in at least their second year in 3rd through 6th grade, using the Time Adjusted Level 3 Cut Score. Overall, 89.2% of students enrolled in at least their second year achieved or exceeded a Time Adjusted Level 3.

**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	98.7%	77
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>98.4%</u>	64
4	All Students	86.5%	74
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>85.5%</u>	69
5	All Students	91.2%	68
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>90.2%</u>	61
6	All Students	80.9%	47
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>80.9%</u>	47
All	All Students	90.2%	266
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	<u>89.2%</u>	241

Evaluation

Overall, the school exceeded this measure by 14.2 percentage points with students in grades 3-6 in at least their second year meeting or exceeding the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score. As the table above shows, in 2010-11 students in at least their second year in grade 3 far exceeded the measure by 23.4%. Likewise, students in at least their second year at Merrick Academy in grades 4, 5, and 6 also met or exceeded this measure by 10.5%, 15.2% and 5.9% respectively.

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

The chart below reports the results of the NYS Mathematics Assessment for Merrick Academy students, providing evidence of how the School is maintaining a high level of performance. In school year 2009-10, 93.4% of our students in at least their second year scored at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score. By comparison, in school year 2010-11 we experienced a decline in the percentage of students who score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score with 89.2% achieving this measure. In 2009-10 and 2010-11 all grades scored at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and at or above Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score in 2009-10 and 2010-11							
	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	98.4%	62	98.5%	68	97.1%	69	98.4%	64
4	76.9%	39	95.7%	70	88.2%	68	85.5%	69
5	74.1%	54	97.9%	48	92.4%	66	90.2%	61
6	93.3%	45	100%	53	97.4%	38	80.9%	47
All					93.4%	241	89.2%	241

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate³ Performance Index (PI) on the State Math exam will meet or exceed that year's Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) school 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 percentage of all tested students who were continuously enrolled in at least their second year¹ at the school and who performed at or above Level 3 on the State Mathematics Assessment 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 chart below reflects that overall students in at least their second year at the Merrick Academy outperformed the students in the local school district by 6.7 percentage points on the State Mathematics assessment. Of Merrick's tested students in at least their second year, 58.1% scored at level 3 and 4, whereas only 51.4% of the local school district students scored at level 3 and 4.

**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	55.2%	64	49.4%	2658
4	69.0%	69	56.6%	2713
5	55.9%	61	54.5%	2699
6	48.9%	47	44.8%	2534
All	58.1%	241	<u>51.4%</u>	10,604

Evaluation

Merrick Academy has met the measure in 2010-11 by having a higher percentage of students scoring at Levels 3 and 4 in comparison to local school district. In 2010-11, Merrick Academy had 58.1% of all students (in at least their second year) at Level 3 or 4 while the District had only 51.4% of students at Level 3 or 4. The School exceeded the local school district by 6.7 percentage points. Merrick Academy's students also exceeded that of the District in 2010-11 for all grades for students in at least their second year at Merrick Academy as compared to all the students tested in the respective grades in the local school district.

Additional Evidence

In 2008-09 and 2009-10, Merrick Academy exceeded the performance level of the local district schools district in all grades by a significant amount as shown below. While our overall proficiency numbers dropped considerably, from 97.9% to 58.1%, between 2008-09 and 2010-11, as shown in

the table below, we believe this result is attributed to the change in the cutoff score for proficiency, as the district experienced a comparable decline.

**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	98.4%	86.6%	98.5%	90.6%	75.4%	47.1%	55.2%	49.4%
4	76.9%	77.1%	95.7%	82.5%	72.1%	48.1%	69.0%	56.6%
5	74.1%	76.9%	97.9%	82.4%	65.2%	50.3%	55.9%	54.5%
6	93.3%	72.8%	100%	75.5%	65.8%	41.8%	48.9%	44.8%
All	86.5%	78.3%	97.9%	82.8%	70.1%	46.9%	58.1%	51.4%

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its expected level of performance on the State Math exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to 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

In school 2009-10 Merrick Academy achieved this measure in that we performed higher than expected to a medium degree with an effect size of 0.61.

2009-10 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Free Lunch Eligible Students	Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		76	73.6	0	16.6	1.10
4		77	68.8	61.1	7.7	0.49
5		70	65.7	62.1	3.6	0.23
6		39	66.6	57.6	9.0	0.53
7						
8						
All	47.6	262	69.0	59.6	9.4	0.61

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Higher than expected to a medium degree

Evaluation

Overall the school met the measure of this goal in 2009-10 by performing higher than expected to a medium degree of 0.61 effect size. Grade 5 was the only cohort to not meet this measure. They performed slightly higher than expected with an effect size of 0.23. However, grades 3, 4, and 6 exceeded the goal by performing higher than expected from a small degree to a large degree.

Additional Evidence

The overall performance in 2009-10 is higher than expected by a medium degree. This is, however, a decline from 2008-09 with a performance of higher than expected to a large degree. This decline can most likely be attributed to the change for the level 3 cut score of 650 to the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores. The data for 2010-11 is not yet available.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2006-07	3-6	40.1%	262	64.9%	77.6%	-1.05
2007-08	3-6	39.39%	266	85.3%	84.41%	0.16
2008-09	3-6	36.7%	261	98.1%	89.1%	1.16
2009-10	3-6	47.6%	262	69.0%	59.6%	0.61
2010-11	3-6	***	***	***	***	***

Goal 2: Value Added to Student Learning

Each year, grade-level cohorts of the school's students will reduce by one-half the gap between their baseline performance⁹ and the CSI-required objective¹⁰ on the State Mathematics Assessment. If a cohort's baseline performance was above the objective, the cohort will increase its performance on the next administration.

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

No cohort achieved their target in the 2010-11 school year. Overall, the school-wide target was also not met for this measure.

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	70	72.9%	$\geq 74.0\%$	68.6%	NO
5	68	66.2%	$\geq 70.6\%$	55.9%	NO
6	46	65.2%	$\geq 70.1\%$	50.0%	NO
All	184	68.5%	$\geq 71.8\%$	59.2%	NO

Evaluation

Merrick Academy missed the school-wide target by 12.6 percentage points. Similarly, all of the grade cohorts missed their target, with the most significant decrease in performance being grade 6 with a gap of 20.1%. Additionally, grade 5 missed its target by 14.7% and grade 4 by 5.4%.

Additional Evidence

The chart below provides evidence that all cohorts have inconsistently met the established target. In 2009-10 none of the three cohorts met the target quite possibly due to the change in the level 3 cut score. As part of instructional action plan, we will continue to closely monitor interventions for students and teachers who require additional support to meet our achievement benchmarks. Please see the action plan for additional performance improvement strategies.

⁹ "Baseline performance" on the State Mathematics assessment is defined as the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 3 on the previous year's administration.

¹⁰ The "CSI-required objective" is defined as 75 percent of students scoring at or above Level 3.

**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	4-6	2	3
2008-09	4-6	2	3
2009-10	4-6	0	3
2010-11	4-6	0	3

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

The school achieved the absolute and both comparative Mathematics measures. 89.2% of our students score at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the state assessment. Additionally, 58.1% of our students enrolled in at least their 2nd year at the school scored at or above the Level 3 cut score, outperforming the local school district by 6.7%. We exceeded our predicted level performance on the assessment higher than expected to a medium degree (.61 Effect Size). We, however, did not meet our growth measure in that we missed our target by 12.6%. Overall, Merrick Academy achieved three out of the four measures of this Accountability Plan goal.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above at or above the Time Adjusted Level 3 cut score on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	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

Merrick will continue to implement its instructional action plan which focuses on rigorous data analysis to inform instruction, differentiated instruction and professional development, and parent workshops.

The school will implement a data team comprised of teachers and administration to focus their efforts on improved student outcomes by developing and aligning strategies to ensure a coherent and focused approach to improving student achievement. The school will continue to employ intense data analysis to identify and support areas that are in need of improvement. The outcomes being targeted are academic intervention with students grouped according to skill ability, ongoing differentiated professional development and coaching of teachers in math instruction. Additionally, there will be rigorous instruction in mathematics, including manipulative for hands-on experiences

for students and math games at each grade level, K-6. This will continue to be implemented across the curriculum using Accountable talk, writing in mathematics, technology, researched based instructional strategies and fine arts. The goal will be set using a rubric which incorporates the state level standards and Common Core Standards for proficiency. Further, teachers and administration will continue to plan strategically through monthly planning meetings, weekly grade team meetings, and weekly Pupil Personnel Committee meetings. Also, we will implement inter-classroom visitations school wide as professional development for teachers to observe best practices in action. As a final point, parent workshops to provide math comprehension strategies and assist with homework will be incorporated into the school's parent calendar.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

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

Background

Merrick Academy utilizes a proprietary, standard-based curriculum based on the Core Knowledge Sequence to teach science. It was developed and is continually updated and refined by the Core Knowledge Foundation, an independent organization that leverages the research of teachers, administrators and academic scholars around the country. Science instruction is conducted at least twice a week in ninety-minute blocks. Inquiry-based instruction is done using the scientific method. Students in grades 4 – 6 utilize the science lab once a week and teachers receive differentiated professional development according to need. Students in grades K – 6 are administered a unit test upon completion of the Earth, Physical, and Life Science units. Students in grade 4 complete the New York State Science Assessment.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75% of all tested students who were continuously enrolled in at least their second year¹ at the school will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science Assessment.

Method

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

Results

In 2010-11, 85.3% of students at Merrick Academy Charter School (in at least their 2nd 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	2.7%	11.0%	43.8%	42.5%	86.3%	73
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	2.9%	11.8%	42.6%	42.6%	85.3%	68

Evaluation

The school achieved this measure with 85.3% of students enrolled in at least their second year scoring at or above Level 3.

Additional Evidence

When comparing the results of 2009-10 to 2010-11 we noted a 4.4% drop in the number of students at Levels 3 & 4. Even though we have noted a steady decline in the percentage of students scoring at or above level 3 and 4, the overall achievement remains high. The action plan will detail how Merrick Academy intends to reverse the trend.

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	82.1%	39	91.4%	70	89.7%	68	85.3%	68
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	86.3%	73

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percentage of all tested students who were continuously enrolled in at least their second year¹ at the school and who performed at or above Level 3 on the State Science Assessment 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.

Results

The results of District 29's performance on the State Science exam are not yet available; therefore, we are unable to compare the performance of our fourth graders in their second year to the district's students.

**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	85.3%	68	N/A	N/A
8	-	-	-	-

Evaluation

To be determined.

Additional Evidence

Local district data for 2010-11 is not yet 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	82.1%	71%	91.4%	77%	89.7%	79.0%	85.3%	***
All	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Summary

Merrick Academy achieved the absolute measure with 85.3% of the students enrolled in at least their second year scoring at or above Level 3 on the State science assessment. The comparative measure is to be determined as we do not yet have the District 29 Science Assessment results for comparison,.

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.	TBD - District data not yet available

Action Plan

Merrick will continue to implement its instructional action plan which focuses on rigorous data analysis to inform instruction, differentiated instruction and professional development, and parent workshops.

Science will continue to be taught using the scientific method. This will include science instruction being inquiry based and experimental, allowing students to research topics using the New York State standards as goals. Furthermore, teachers and administration will continue to plan strategically through the engagement of: peer review (Critical Friends Group), monthly meetings, weekly grade team meetings, and weekly Pupil Personnel Committee meetings.

The school will implement a data team comprised of teachers and administration to focus their efforts on improved student outcomes by developing and aligning strategies to ensure a coherent and focused approach to improving student achievement. The school will continue to employ intense data analysis to identify and support areas that are in need of improvement. The outcomes being targeted are academic intervention with students grouped according to skill ability, ongoing differentiated professional development and coaching of teachers in math. Additionally, there will be rigorous inquiry based instruction in science, with continued weekly utilization of the science lab by students in grades 3-6. The goal will be set using a rubric which incorporates the state level standards and Common Core Standards for proficiency. Also, we will implement inter-classroom visitations school wide as professional development for teachers to observe best practices in action. As a final point, parent workshops to provide strategies for incorporating science into everyday life will be incorporated into the school's parent calendar.

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB

The school will demonstrate academic success by making adequate yearly progress as required by NCLB

Goal 5: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school will be designated in “Good Standing” under the Federal Title I component of the state’s “school accountability system.”

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

Merrick Academy has been in good standing for the entire prior charter term through the 2010-11 school year.

Evaluation

Given that Merrick has been in good standing for the past five years, we expect that that our AYP status for 2011-12 will be positive as well.

Additional Evidence

Merrick Academy has been in good standing every school year through 2010-11.

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