

**The State Education Department**  
The University of the State of New York

**Office of Instructional Support and Development**  
Public School Choice Programs  
462 EBA  
Albany, New York 12234  
518-474-1762

***Charter School Annual Report***  
***2008 - 2009***

**Charter School Information and Cover Page**

Name of Charter School  Kings Collegiate Charter School

Address  1084 Lenox Road, Brooklyn, NY 11212

Telephone  718-342-6047  Fax  718-342-6727

BEDS #  331800860908

District/CSD of Location  18

Charter Entity  State University of New York

Head of School (Contact Person)  Lauren Harris and Laura Lee McGovern   
(print name)

E-mail address of contact person  [REDACTED]

President, Board of Trustees  John Kim   
(print name)

E-mail address and Phone Number of Board President  [REDACTED]



**Other Student Assessment Data**  
2008-09

Name of Charter School:           Kings Collegiate Charter School          

Name of Test:           CTB/McGraw-Hill TerraNova CAT 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 14-16C, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition 15G           Subject:           Reading          

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade*	Score (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE)	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining**	Other ***
5 (spring)	6/2/09	80	0	0	0	80	Mean NCE 53.9	61% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
5 (fall)	9/4/08	80	0	0	0	80	Mean NCE 46.5	43% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
6 (spring)	6/2/09	55	0	0	0	55	Mean NCE 58.5	78% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
5 (spring)	6/3/08	75	0	0	0	75	Mean NCE 54.2	61% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A

\* This number should equal the number of students enrolled on the day of the test, minus the number absent and the number exempted by either their IEP or their ELL status.

\*\*If the assessment provides qualitative levels of achievement, e.g., "with honors," indicate the applicable levels and the percent of students who took the test in each grade who attained each level. If not applicable, enter "NA."

\*\*\* For any other evaluative data that describe the performance of your students on the assessments given. If not applicable, enter "NA."

**Other Student Assessment Data**  
2008-09

Name of Charter School:           Kings Collegiate Charter School          

Name of Test:           CTB/McGraw-Hill TerraNova CAT 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 14-16C, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition 15G           Subject:           Language Arts          

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade*	Score (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE)	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining**	Other ***
5 (spring)	6/2/09	80	0	0	0	80	Mean NCE 51.0	59% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
5 (fall)	9/4/08	80	0	0	0	80	Mean NCE 47.2	45% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
6 (spring)	6/2/09	55	0	0	0	55	Mean NCE 63.4	91% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
5 (spring)	6/3/08	75	0	0	0	75	Mean NCE 53.6	60% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A

\* This number should equal the number of students enrolled on the day of the test, minus the number absent and the number exempted by either their IEP or their ELL status.

\*\*If the assessment provides qualitative levels of achievement, e.g., "with honors," indicate the applicable levels and the percent of students who took the test in each grade who attained each level. If not applicable, enter "NA."

\*\*\* For any other evaluative data that describe the performance of your students on the assessments given. If not applicable, enter "NA."

**Other Student Assessment Data**  
2008-09

Name of Charter School: \_\_\_\_\_ Kings Collegiate Charter School

Name of Test: \_\_\_\_\_ CTB/McGraw-Hill TerraNova CAT 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 14-16C, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition 15G \_\_\_\_\_ Subject: \_\_\_\_\_ Mathematics

Grade	Date of Test (DOT)	# Enrolled in Grade on DOT	# Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	# Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade*	Score (Indicate Type of Score, e.g., NCE)	Qualitative Level and Percent Attaining**	Other ***
5 (spring)	6/2/09	80	0	0	0	80	Mean NCE 52.6	61% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
5 (fall)	9/4/08	80	0	0	0	80	Mean NCE 50.0	54% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
6 (spring)	6/2/09	55	0	0	0	55	Mean NCE 73.6	100% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A
5 (spring)	6/3/08	75	0	0	0	75	Mean NCE 61.3	76% = students at or above 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	N/A

\* This number should equal the number of students enrolled on the day of the test, minus the number absent and the number exempted by either their IEP or their ELL status.

\*\*If the assessment provides qualitative levels of achievement, e.g., "with honors," indicate the applicable levels and the percent of students who took the test in each grade who attained each level. If not applicable, enter "NA."

\*\*\* For any other evaluative data that describe the performance of your students on the assessments given. If not applicable, enter "NA."

**Progress Toward Goal Attainment**

Using the table provided below, state each goal as listed in your approved charter, and provide a narrative that describes the type and amount of progress made toward attaining that goal. Provide specific examples, and indicate the measures that were used to determine such progress. These measures must also be the same as those listed in your approved charter. If the goal has not been met, describe why you think it was not met, and the efforts that you will undertake in the following year to attain it.

Charter schools authorized by the Trustees of the State University of New York may attach a copy of their Accountability Plan and a report of the progress made towards meeting the goals and objectives described in the Plan.

**Progress Toward Goals  
2008-09**

**Charter School Name:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**School Year:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>Goal/Objective: Desired Level of Attainment</b>	<b>Actual Result: Observed  Level of Attainment</b>	<b>Measure Used To Indicate Attainment of The Goal/Objective</b>	<b>Was the Goal/ Objective Met?  (Y/N)</b>	<b>Explanation if Not Met</b>
--------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

PLEASE SEE ATTACHED  
ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT

## **Kings Collegiate Charter School**

### **ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN FOR THE CHARTER PERIOD 2007-08 THROUGH 2010-11**

#### **ACADEMIC GOALS**

##### **GOAL I: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS**

**Goal:** Students will be proficient readers and writers of the English language.

##### **Absolute Measures**

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

##### **Comparative Measures**

- 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 students in the same tested grades in the local school district.
- 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 Measures**

- Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State 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, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

##### **GOAL II: MATHEMATICS**

**Goal:** Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.

##### **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 exam.

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

#### **Comparative Measures**

- 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 students in the same tested grades in the local school district.
- 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.

#### **Value Added Measures**

- Each year, all grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

### **GOAL III: SCIENCE**

**Goal:** Students will demonstrate proficiency in the understanding and application of scientific principles.

#### **Absolute Measures**

- 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 exam.

#### **Comparative Measures**

- 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 a State science exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

### **GOAL IV: SOCIAL STUDIES**

**Goal:** Students will demonstrate an understanding of key geographical, economic, and governmental concepts, as well as major historical ideas and developments in the United States, New York and the world.

#### **Absolute Measures**



- 
- 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 exam.

**Comparative Measures**

- 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 students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

**GOAL V: NCLB**

**Goal:** The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

**Absolute Measure**

- Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

**KINGS COLLEGIATE  
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2008-09**

**ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN  
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

August 3, 2009

By Laura Lee McGovern and Lauren Harris

Kings Collegiate Charter School  
1084 Lenox Road  
Brooklyn, NY 11217  
Tel: 718-342-6047  
Fax: 718-342-6727  
<http://www.kingscollegiate.org>

\_\_\_\_\_ Laura Lee McGovern \_\_\_\_\_ prepared this 2008-09 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Allyson Alimansky	Trustee
C.J. Cash	Trustee
Kiesha Earle	Trustee
John Greenstein	Treasurer
Bob Howitt	Trustee
John Kim	Acting Board Chair
Brett Peiser	Clerk
Reemah Sen	Trustee
Laura Lee McGovern, <i>ex officio</i>	
Lauren Harris, <i>ex officio</i>	

**INTRODUCTION**

*MISSION and GRADES SERVED*

The mission of Kings Collegiate Charter School (KCCS) is to prepare each student for college. Kings Collegiate Charter School opened on August 22, 2007. The school opened with 5<sup>th</sup> grade and will grow to grades 5-12 over time. During the 2008-2009 school year, the school served 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> graders.

*STUDENT POPULATION*

With an initial enrollment as of BEDS Day 2008 of 137 students, Kings Collegiate Charter School had extremely low attrition and ended the 2008-2009 school year with 135 students in grade 5 and 6.

Gender	48% Boys	52% Girls
Free & Reduced Lunch	70%	
Special Needs	14%	
Race	100% African-American	
English Language Learners	0%	
Mode of Transportation	34% School Bus 26% Car	15% Subway/City Bus 25% Walk
Geography	99% Brooklyn	1% Queens

*Students selected via public lottery*

**School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year**

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2005-06														
2006-07														
2007-08						81								81
2008-09						82	55							137

\*enrollment as of BEDS Day

Our incoming 5<sup>th</sup> grade students in 2008-09 enrolled at Kings Collegiate Charter School from 33 different New York City schools. Based on results from the TerraNova exam, our incoming group of students began the year performing below the national average in Reading and Language Arts and at the national average in Math, and the students in our lowest-skilled class were substantially below the national average in all areas.

Measurement Tool Fall 2008	Incoming Student Performance 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade (n = 80)	Incoming Student Performance 5A class (n=25)
TerraNova Reading <i>Mean NCE</i>	46.5	31.9
TerraNova Language Arts <i>Mean NCE</i>	47.2	35.4
TerraNova Math <i>Mean NCE</i>	50.0	33.7

Our newly incoming 5<sup>th</sup> grade students also took the McLeod Assessment of Reading Comprehension and their skill level on average was just below the 5<sup>th</sup> grade level (4.9 grade-level equivalent). Students from our lowest-skilled class who were tested (n=21) were more than a grade levels behind in comprehension (3.7 grade-level equivalent).

### STRATEGY

Kings Collegiate Charter School's educational program rests on three pillars:

1. We believe that creativity flourishes within structured academic environments.  
*Good work cannot occur unless there is a safe and orderly environment in and out of the classroom.*
2. We have very high academic and behavioral expectations.  
*High expectations demand significant amounts of extra support before, during, and after school and on Saturdays.*
3. We know that without great teachers, nothing else matters.  
*Teachers must have the time and professional tools and resources to do their jobs effectively.*

At Kings Collegiate, we do not believe that there is a panacea that makes a school work. Nor do we pretend that what we do is "rocket science" or necessarily innovative. KCCS teachers work hard and use common sense because elevating student achievement and transforming lives requires constant attention to hundreds of different elements – not one, magical 100% solution but rather one hundred, individual 1% solutions.

### DESIGN

Kings Collegiate Charter School's school design includes seven core components.

**Focus on Literacy.** Many of our students beginning in grade 5 are reading substantially below grade level. If a school does not address this dramatic and central issue immediately, students will be at a huge disadvantage in all subjects in high school and college. The ultimate academic success of KCCS students, therefore, is tied to mastering this fundamental skill. In 2008-09, KCCS provided explicit instruction in literacy skills and inculcated the reading habit through:

- Two hours of daily literacy instruction;
- 20 minutes of silent reading or read aloud to start each school day;
- Requiring students to read reading level-appropriate books during the summer;

- Requiring graded, written work in every class, including math; and
- Requiring students to carry a silent reading book at all times to serve as the entrance ticket to school in the morning, make better use of transition time in the hallways, and ensure that there is never a lost moment during the day since “you never know when you’ll have a chance to read.”

**Target Curriculum Focused on Basic Skills.** KCCS does not use an off-the-shelf curriculum. Rather, KCCS develops curriculum directly from the New York State Learning Standards that ensures students master a core set of basic academic skills before they can master higher-level, abstract material.

KCCS teachers pay particularly close attention to the topics, sequence, and performance standards outlined in the New York State standards. This ensures that students are mastering the same material as their peers throughout New York State. At the same time, we trust teachers to adapt the subject topics and performance standards according to their professional expertise. KCCS teachers create a comprehensive curriculum for their subject, saved on the school’s shared drive, with a year-long scope and sequence, individual unit plans, daily lesson plans, and assessment materials. Not only does this provide the school with a record of individual course instruction but this also serves as a valuable curricular planning resource for returning and future teachers.

**Assess Early and Often to Drive the Instructional Program.** The most effective schools use assessment to diagnose student needs, measure instructional impact, and build a culture of continuous reflection and improvement. In addition to the TerraNova Assessments and New York State Social Studies, Mathematics, and English Language Arts exams, KCCS administered four internally-aligned Interim Assessments and one Final Exam in Math, English Language Arts, Science and History. These tests assessed ongoing student mastery of Math, Reading/Writing, Science and History skills and standards throughout the year and provided immediate data on individual student and class growth. KCCS teachers, with the support of the Co-Director for Curriculum and Instruction, used this data to identify standards mastered and standards in need of re-teaching so that lesson plans could be continuously adjusted. KCCS also utilized the information to target content- and skills-driven tutoring and small-group instruction afterschool and on Saturdays. In 2009-10, Kings Collegiate will expand the interim assessment program into grade 7.

**Make More Time.** In order to provide students with a comprehensive, college preparatory education, Kings Collegiate has a longer-than-usual school day and longer-than-usual school year. During the 2008-09 school year, Kings Collegiate was open 184 instructional days for students (203 days for teachers). For most students, the regular school day began at 7:45 AM and ended at 4:30 PM. For those receiving tutoring and homework help, the day ended at 5:30 PM. Finally, as a result of their academic need, 40% of KCCS students (n=55) also attended school from 9:00 AM to 12:00 PM on Saturdays at some point during the school year.

With hour-long periods four days a week and 65-minute periods on Wednesdays when classes are taught on alternating weeks to allow for significant staff meeting and professional development time – fifth and sixth grade students at Kings Collegiate received weekly:

- 9 periods of Mathematics (Math Procedures and Math Problem Solving)
- 9 periods of English Language Arts (Reading and Writing)
- 4-5 periods of Social Studies
- 4-5 periods of Science

- 1 period of Advisory/Character Education
- 4 periods of Enrichment

Kings Collegiate students extended their learning beyond the school day completing, on average, one-and-a-half to two hours of homework every night.

**Emphasis on College.** For too many at-risk students, college only exists in the abstract. For Kings Collegiate students, freshman year of college will be a natural extension of their educational experience at KCCS. In the school's whole-school Wednesday Community Meetings, the goals for the day consistently revolved around the question, "How do we get to college?" To which KCCS students answered together, "Be nice! Work hard! Get smart!" We introduced a Staff Spotlight this year, in which teachers and administrative members focused on an element of their college experience during a short presentation, and took questions from students about what college life was like.

Kings Collegiate students began talking about college on the first day of school as their advisories are named after the alma maters of their teachers. Through informal conversations in advisory and in classes, students learned about the college application process, financial aid, dorm-life, selecting a major, and other important aspects of college survival. Students also won T-shirts from their namesake advisories. Our 5<sup>th</sup> grade students visited Harvard College and our 6<sup>th</sup> grade students visited Howard University during their end of year school trips. Several of our male students also participated in the "Doctor for a Day" program held on the campus of Columbia University.

During the regular school day, from 3:25 to 4:20 PM four days per week, KCCS offers a variety of rotating electives, including:

- Art
- Yoga
- Newspaper
- Soccer
- Basketball
- Healthy Living
- Tennis
- Drama
- Afro-Caribbean Dance
- Dance Styles
- Martial Arts
- Kickboxing

From 4:30 to 5:30 PM, KCCS offers subject-specific tutoring and requires students struggling to regularly complete homework assignments on-time and at high quality to spend an additional hour in Homework Center working on that night's homework assignments.

KCCS's school culture is based on its five core THINK values of "Tenacity," "High Expectations," "Integrity," "No Excuses," and "Kindness." Collegiate students are expected to consistently demonstrate these characteristics wherever they find themselves and are rewarded with merits when they model these characteristics well or go above and beyond. Students earning merits receive the opportunity to represent the school on merit trips and trade their merits at Merit Auctions for tangible rewards. Every month, by participating in merit-earned trips either with a group of the top merit

earners or one-on-one/two-on-one with staff members, merit winners develop the more abstract skills necessary for true college preparation (trying new activities, demonstrating leadership and professionalism, and participating in community service). During the 2008-09 school year, Kings Collegiate students

- Carved and took home pumpkins for Halloween
- Went to a Brooklyn Cyclones, New York Mets, and a New York Red Bulls Major League Soccer game
- Visited the Harlem Studio Museum, Madame Tussaud's Wax Museum, the New York Museum of Natural History and the Brooklyn Museum of Art
- Went to the movies or dinner with a staff member and ate Ethiopian or Japanese food for the first time
- Played basketball against staff members and flew kites in Prospect Park
- Visited the New York Aquarium, the Brooklyn Botanic Garden and the Prospect Park Zoo
- Walked across the Brooklyn Bridge and visited Rockefeller Center to see the Christmas tree
- Took a personal tour of an artist's gallery and stopped by a café with the artist
- Attended The Big Apple Classic (a basketball game between four historically black colleges and universities) at Madison Square Garden
- Visited a bookstore and the Farmer's Market in Manhattan

**Provide Structure and Order.** Students need a safe and orderly environment to be productive. In 2008-09, KCCS created a calm, composed, and disciplined environment to maximize the amount of time on-task. Strategies included:

- strictly enforced school dress code;
- merit system that defined clear expectations of and immediate responses to positive behavior;
- demerit and detention system that defined clear expectations of and immediate responses to negative or inappropriate behavior;
- rubric system that provided immediate feedback to classes at the end of each class each day; and
- common Blackboard Configuration (BBC) consisting of a Do Now, Aim, Agenda, and Homework.

**Insist on Family Involvement.** KCCS's educational program is structured so that families must be involved in their child's academic pursuits. In 2008-09, KCCS families:

- picked up their child's report card in person at the school three times, leading to 100% participation for three sets of formal Family-Teacher Conferences;
- met with teachers and staff on dozens of occasions to formally and informally discuss their child's academic and behavioral performance;
- maintained an open line of communication with their child's teachers through in-person meetings, phone calls, and e-mails;
- were called at home or at work each day if their child earned a detention;
- attended Family Involvement Committee meetings throughout the year to better understand the curricular program, learn about summer camp opportunities, and talk about how to communicate with their pre-teen;
- were asked to offer input on the school on annual surveys, grading the school on how it was doing, and eagerly provided their input via a focus group as part of our SUNY second-year visit, and;



- were offered the opportunity to watch their children perform in their chosen Enrichment activity at two public performances during the course of the year, with the Winter Celebration being followed by a potluck dinner.

Our families also took the lead in planning the first-ever Kings Collegiate Community Day: an end-of-year potluck celebration where students, staff and families socialized, played games, and ate delicious food on the last day of school.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### **Goal 1: English Language Arts**

**Students will be proficient readers and writers of the English language.**

#### **Background**

Reading instruction at Kings Collegiate is based around shared, whole-class novels. The curriculum develops reading comprehension skills and strategies and vocabulary. Whole-class novels are selected for each grade that are appropriately leveled for the majority of students in that grade. The whole-class novels should be accessible for students with the appropriate scaffolding.

In Writing classes at Kings Collegiate, students learn the essential skills of grammar and writing. Writing class explicitly supports the work that students are doing in Reading class, as students learn to write strong responses to literature in short answer and essay formats and use weekly vocabulary words from Reading class in their daily writing assignments.

Kings Collegiate Charter School uses data from the following assessments to ensure student proficiency in English Language Arts:

- Criterion-referenced New York State exams in English Language Arts
- Norm-referenced TerraNova Assessments in Reading and Language Arts;
- Internally developed Interim Assessments in English Language Arts
- Internally developed Final Examination in English Language Arts.

Each fall for new students, and each spring for returning students, Kings Collegiate Charter School administers in grades 5 through 8 exams in Reading, Language Arts and Mathematics using the TerraNova Assessment (the CTB/McGraw-Hill TerraNova 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition Basic Multiple Assessments). All students are then subsequently tested each spring to a) demonstrate their progress over the course of one academic year, and b) compare student performance relative to students nationwide. The TerraNova was selected since its format and the types of questions it contains more closely parallel the New York State exams than other similar, norm-referenced exams. This spring, we administered the CTB/McGraw-Hill TerraNova 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Multiple Assessments for our 5<sup>th</sup> graders because the 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition was phased out by the company.

Kings Collegiate Charter School administered four internally developed and aligned Interim Assessments and a Final Exam in English Language Arts (Reading and Writing) during the 2008-09 school year. These assessments were created to reflect the school's scope and sequence in Reading and Writing, and to mirror the style and scope of the New York State English Language Arts exams. Similar to the state exam, the ELA Interim Assessments were administered in two parts: 3-4 reading passages accompanied by multiple choice questions and a listening comprehension section with multiple choice and open response questions or an extended response/essay section. The assessments also included at least two editing passages that assessed student mastery of grammar, capitalization, and punctuation skills.

After the tests were administered, KCCS teachers graded each exam and KCCS administrative staff entered individual performance data into a shared template for detailed test analysis. With the individual student, whole class, and whole grade data, KCCS teachers analyzed the data and

developed strategic plans to re-teach specific standards to individuals, small groups, and classes. KCCS also utilized the information to target content- and skills-driven tutoring and reteaching after school and on Saturdays.

Prior to the 2008-09 school year, we made the following key changes:

- In order to improve Reading growth for our most struggling 5<sup>th</sup> grade readers, KCCS decided to group our lowest-skilled academic class into three smaller groups for daily instruction in Reading class. One group was taught by our 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading Teacher, one was taught by our Special Education Coordinator/Teacher and one was taught by the Co-Director for Curriculum and Instruction. These small group classes allowed our most struggling readers to receive more individualized instruction in reading comprehension and in decoding, fluency, and vocabulary work (through Words Their Way). Throughout the year, while students in these smaller sections learned the same reading skills and strategies as their classmates, they read a different set of class novels that were more accessible to them, given their lower independent reading levels.
- The teaching of vocabulary was formalized. Vocabulary is taught through word study during reading class and reinforced, in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade, in writing class. Vocabulary words are selected from the text on a weekly basis. Students define each vocabulary word, identify its part of speech and word charge, and use the vocabulary word in a sentence. Students should maintain a record of their vocabulary words over the course of the year by creating a flashcard for each word and keeping the vocabulary cards on a ring or in another organized format. Students in our lowest-skilled Reading class participated in daily word study instead of Read-Aloud, which provided them with more time in their 60-minute Reading class to focus on reading skills and strategies and their class novel.
- We also decided to utilize Village Academies Leveled Reading Assessments, developed by Harlem Village Academies, to determine our students' independent reading level and track their growth over time. We gave the assessments approximately every quarter and used the results to make sure students were given independent reading books from the school library at the appropriate reading level as well as to provide another data point for our Reading teachers.

**Goal 1: 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 English language arts examination.

**Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English Language Arts assessment to students in 5<sup>th</sup> through 6<sup>th</sup> 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 Tested	Not Tested <sup>1</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
5	81				81
6	55				55
All	136				136

**Results**

The overall percent of students in at least their second year performing at Levels 3 & 4 on the 2008-09 State English Language Arts Exam was 90%.

**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	
5	All Students	1%	25%	64%	10%	74%	81
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0%	36%	64%	0%	64%	11
6	All Students	0%	4%	80%	16%	96%	55
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0%	4%	80%	16%	96%	51
All	All Students	1%	16%	71%	13%	<b>84%</b>	136
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0%	10%	77%	13%	<b>90%</b>	62

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

**Evaluation**

This accountability measure was met and exceeded by 15 percentage points: 90% of our students performed at Level 3 or 4 on the 2008-2009 State English Language Arts Exam. Our 6<sup>th</sup> graders did extremely well, with 96% scoring Advanced or Proficient. We are very pleased with this performance, as it shows that students who are with us for two years are truly learning the skills and content needed in English Language Arts and helps validate that our whole class-novel approach to teaching Reading content is delivering strong results.

Our 5<sup>th</sup> graders as a whole performed well, with 74% performing at Level 3 or 4. We believe this shows that the vast majority have built a strong foundation of skills in the few months that they have been at our school and are well-positioned towards exceeding this measure for next year.

In terms of room for improvement, we had 11 students who repeated the 5<sup>th</sup> grade at our school, and so are also counted towards this measure. 64% of these students performed at Level 3 or 4, which is under our goal. While it is worth noting that 55% of our repeating 5<sup>th</sup> graders (6 out of 11) have IEPs, it will be important for us as we go into next year to think about how we can better support returning 5<sup>th</sup> graders so that their second year in the grade leads to greater academic improvement and achievement.

**Additional Evidence**

Since this is our second year of operation, this is our first year in which this measure applies. We look forward to examining year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period next year, as it will highlight whether we are continuing to maintain a high level of performance.

The table below examines whether performance changes the longer students are enrolled in the school. As an early marker of a successful school, student performance should increase with prolonged participation in the academic program. While the 64% of repeating 5<sup>th</sup> grade students scoring Advanced or Proficient is lower than we would like, and the small number of Year 1 6<sup>th</sup> graders makes any conclusions based on that data less relevant, we feel that the overall increase in the percentage of students scoring Advanced or Proficient from Year 1 to Year 2 (from 77% to 90%) shows us the right kind of progress.

**2008-09 English Language Arts Performance  
by Grade Level and Years Attending the School**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	76%	70	64%	11				
6	100%	4	96%	51				
All	77%	74	90%	62				

**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 144. 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 data table below shows that our aggregate PI score was 183, reflecting our performance in grades 5-6 on the 2008-09 State English Language Arts exam.

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

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
5 - 6	1	16	71	13	136

$$\begin{array}{rccccccccc}
 \text{PI} & = & 16 & + & 71 & + & 13 & = & 99 \\
 & & & & + & 71 & + & 13 & = & 84 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{183}
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

We succeeded this year in achieving this measure. Our aggregate PI score of 183 exceeds this year's AMO of 144.

**Additional Evidence**

We are very pleased to see that this year's PI of 183 is far higher than last year's PI of 141. The huge reduction in the percent of students scoring at Level 2 (from 41 to 16, a decrease of 25 percentage points) is fantastic. We are also, however, very happy to see the increase in the percentage of students performing at Level 4 (from 1% to 10%).

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

Year	Grades <sup>2</sup>	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2007-08	5	78	1	41	56	1	141	133
2008-09	5-6	136	1	16	71	13	183	144

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**

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

**Method**

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

**Results**

The aggregate school performance for KCCS in grades 5-6 was 90% of students in at least their 2<sup>nd</sup> year performing at Levels 3 and 4, compared to 70% of students at Levels 3 and 4 in District 18.

**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 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	64%	11	73%	1717
6	96%	51	67%	1316
All	<b>90%</b>	62	<b>70%</b>	3033

**Evaluation**

KCCS met this accountability measure, exceeding the aggregate district performance by 20 percentage points. Our 6<sup>th</sup> grade performance was outstanding, exceeding the aggregate district performance by an even larger margin of 29 percentage points. We fell short by comparison with the district in terms of looking at our repeating 5<sup>th</sup> graders compared to all 5<sup>th</sup> graders in the district, though again the percentage of our students in this specific population with IEPs (55%) greatly exceeds the district percentage. Nonetheless, however, we will look to improve this in the future.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

**Additional Evidence**

As this is the first year that we have utilized this measure, we do not have comparative data to the local district from previous years. We look forward to continuing to track our performance relative to the local district in the future.

As an optional comparison measure, we also decided to compare our performance to three local schools. We are co-located with Middle School of Art and Philosophy K588, a school with 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> graders in 2008-09. We also chose to compare ourselves with P.S. 219, a K-5 school, because it is located only a couple of blocks from the school and many of our students come to us from that school. Finally, we chose to compare our performance to General Chappie Elementary and Middle Schools, since they are also near to our school.

The chart below shows that our 6<sup>th</sup> graders' performance far exceeds that of the two other schools with 6<sup>th</sup> grade. Our Year 2 5<sup>th</sup> graders come close to the performance of all 5<sup>th</sup> graders at the other two schools, but could still be improved.

**2008-09 English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools							
	Charter School		K588 (Middle School of Art and Philosophy)		K219 (P.S. 219)		K631/K634 (General Chappie ES and MS)	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	64%	11			69%	121	65%	66
6	96%	51	62%	69			49%	79
All	90%	62	62%	69	69%	121	57%	145

**Goal 1: Comparative Measure**  
 Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

**Method**

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school's actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. 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 data table shows that we underperformed the predicted level of performance given the percentage of our students eligible for free lunch last year by 13 percentage points and therefore had a negative effect size.

**2007-08 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3						
4						
5		78	57.7%	70.7%	-13.0%	-1.00
6						
7						
8						
All	60.5%	78	57.7%	70.7%	-13.0%	-1.00

**School's Overall Comparative Performance:**  
*KCCS underperformed the predicted level of performance in 2007-08.*

**Evaluation**

We did not meet this measure based on our 2007-08 English Language Arts results, and had a negative effect size. We are confident that we will improve on this measure in 2008-2009.

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**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. Students who repeated the

grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2006-07 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**

Both of our cohorts achieved their target. Our 5<sup>th</sup> graders exceeded the target by 6 percentage points, and our 6<sup>th</sup> graders exceeded the target by 23 percentage points. Overall, we exceeded our target as a whole school by 13 percentage points.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
5	71	63%	69%	75%	YES
6	55	71%	73%	96%	YES
All	126	67%	71%	84%	YES

**Evaluation**

We met this measure, with all cohorts achieving their target, including the school-wide cohort. We are very pleased with the high level of growth each cohort displayed.

**Additional Evidence**

Whereas last year, our 5<sup>th</sup> grade cohort did not meet their growth target, both of our cohorts met their growth target this year.

**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	5	0	1
2008-09	5-6	2	2

The table below provides the opportunity to examine year-to-year changes in the same students' performance levels. It shows how many students in a particular performance level in 2007-08 remained at the same level, moved to a higher level, or moved to a lower level in 2008-09. It shows the number of students, not percentages. Students in the upper right quadrant are those who moved from below proficiency in 2007-08 to proficiency in 2008-09.

The data shows that we moved 27 students from below proficiency in 2007-08 to proficiency in 2008-09. Many more students moved up in performance level than down from 2007-08 to 2008-09.

**Change in English Language Arts Performance Levels  
from 2007-08 to 2008-09 – All Students**

		Number of Students at Each Performance Level				
		2008-09				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Number
2007-08	Level 1	0	3	0	0	3
	Level 2	1	11	26	1	39
	Level 3	0	5	64	13	82
	Level 4	0	0	1	1	2
	Total Number	1	19	91	15	126

We administered the CTB McGraw-Hill TerraNova Multiple Assessments 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition in September for incoming 5<sup>th</sup> graders and in June for all students. We used the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition for 5<sup>th</sup> Graders in June 2009 because the company phased out the 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. The TerraNova is a norm-referenced test. The tables below represent cohort growth on the Reading and the Language Arts sections of the test. Our target was positive growth in the average NCE for each cohort. We succeeded in all cohorts, except for 6<sup>th</sup> grade Reading. We are not certain why average TerraNova scores declined in that cohort, especially in light of their growth in ELA State Exam scores, but plan to do additional investigation to make sure that the lack of growth is not emblematic of a problem.

**Cohort Growth on TerraNova Multiple Assessments Test from June 2008 to June 2009 (Gr 6)  
and September 2008 to June 2009 (Gr 5) - Reading**

Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
5	78	46	+ growth	54	YES
6	54	59	+ growth	58	NO
All	132	52	+ growth	56	YES

**Cohort Growth on TerraNova Multiple Assessments Test from June 2008 to June 2009 (Gr 6)  
and September 2008 to June 2009 (Gr 5) – Language Arts**

Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
5	78	47	+ growth	51	YES
6	54	60	+ growth	63	YES
All	132	52	+ growth	56	YES

The table below presents another way of looking at our students' performance. When our 2008-09 5<sup>th</sup> grade students first entered KCCS, less than half of our students were performing above the national average (50th percentile) on the Reading and Language Arts sections of the exam. After only nine months at KCCS, the percentage of students scoring above this national average improved to 63% in Reading and 59% of our students performing above the national average in Language Arts.

<b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade/Class of 2016 – % at or above national average (50<sup>th</sup> percentile)</b>			
<b>TERRANOVA</b>	<b>September 2008 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Pre-Test 78 students</b>	<b>June 2009 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Post-Test 78 Students</b>	<b>1-YEAR CHANGE</b>
<b>Reading</b>	<b>42.3%</b>	<b>62.8%</b>	<b>+ 20.5 %</b>
<b>Language Arts</b>	<b>44.9%</b>	<b>59.0%</b>	<b>+ 14.1 %</b>

When our 2008-09 6<sup>th</sup> grade students first entered KCCS, just over half of our students were performing above the national average (50th percentile) on the Reading section of the exam and 63% were performing above the national average on the Language Arts sections of the exam. After two school years at KCCS, the percentage of students scoring above this national average improved to nearly 80% in Reading performing above the national average, and over 90% of our students performing above the national average in Language Arts.

<b>6<sup>th</sup> Grade/Class of 2015 – % at or above national average (50<sup>th</sup> percentile)</b>				
<b>TERRANOVA</b>	<b>September 2007 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Pre-Test 54 students</b>	<b>June 2008 5<sup>th</sup> Grade Post-Test 54 students</b>	<b>June 2009 6<sup>th</sup> Grade Post-Test 54 students</b>	<b>2-YEAR CHANGE</b>
<b>Reading</b>	<b>51.9%</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>+ 25.9 %</b>
<b>Language Arts</b>	<b>63.0%</b>	<b>77.8%</b>	<b>90.7%</b>	<b>+ 27.7 %</b>

**Summary of the English Language Arts Goal**

All of our measures were achieved this year, except for the comparative measure of Effect Size, which was based on 2007-08 data. We are confident that the Effect Size measure will be met when 2008-09 data is applied. We feel that this year’s 2008-09 data shows that we are well underway towards attaining this Accountability Plan goal and we look forward to next year’s results to further reinforce that we are indeed on the right path.

<b>Type</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size.	Did Not Achieve (in 2007-08)

Growth	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 exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	Achieved
--------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

**Action Plan**

In 2009-2010, KCCS plans to continue to implement many of the successful strategies this year:

- Continuing to encourage and provide daily common planning time for more collaboration between our Writing and Reading teachers to ensure that students are consistently writing about what they are reading;
- Breaking our lowest-skilled fifth and sixth grade reading classes into two sections for daily, small-group instruction;
- Selecting leveled texts for whole-class reading instruction that are more independently accessible for our lowest-skilled readers: both our lowest 5<sup>th</sup> grade and lowest 6<sup>th</sup> grade sections will have a set of class novels that are closer to their independent reading level;
- Continuing to use historical fiction novels in 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grade History classes to support history content and further enhance literacy instruction in our middle school;
- Implementing a common writing rubric and set of editing marks to ensure that all students are being held to the same high expectations for writing across the school, especially since we will now have multiple grades; and

Changes will include:

- Moving from three class sections to four class sections within the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades, in order to allow for even smaller class sizes and more targeted instruction.
- On Wednesdays, we will have one ELA block dedicated to short texts and specific reading strategies, and one ELA block dedicated to non-fiction texts. This will help ensure that our students are regularly exposed to short, unfamiliar, fiction and non-fiction passages, similar to those that they will see on standardized assessments. This is important given that reading instructional time is dedicated to whole-class novels.
- Leveraging the power of our network of three other sister Collegiate schools, by instituting a Collegiate-wide writing prompt at least twice during the 2009-10 school year, that will enable us to compare student writing performance across our schools and inform the sharing of best practices for writing instruction.
- Move from a school-wide library of independent reading books to Reading classroom-based libraries that can be managed by our Reading teachers. This will help strengthen our teachers' understanding of what students are reading independently, allow them to better monitor how much students are reading independently, and enable them to make more immediate adjustments to independent reading levels as needed.

We are also planning to do whatever we can to address the needs of the population of students who will be repeating the 5<sup>th</sup> grade or 6<sup>th</sup> grade. During our three weeks of staff orientation and professional development time before the start of school, we plan to have our Reading and Writing teachers, our Special Education Teachers, and our School Social Worker discuss and create action plans for supporting our repeating 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> graders.

## MATHEMATICS

### **Goal 2: Mathematics**

**Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematical computation and problem solving.**

### **Background**

We believe our students should be able to compute numbers quickly and accurately, apply appropriate math procedures in single- and multi-step problems, and speak and write fluently and clearly about math problem solving and procedures, using accurate mathematical vocabulary. For this reason, our students take two hours of math per day, one hour of Math Procedures, which is typically more focused on developing procedural fluency, and one hour of Math Problem Solving, which is typically more focused on the application of skills and problem solving. Basically, we double the time dedicated to math instruction each day to ensure that students can compute and problem solve.

Kings Collegiate Charter School uses data from the following assessments to ensure student proficiency in Mathematics:

- Criterion-referenced New York State exams in Mathematics
- Norm-referenced TerraNova Assessments in Mathematics
- Internally developed Interim Assessments in Mathematics
- Internally developed Final Examination in Mathematics

Each fall for new students, and each spring for returning students, Kings Collegiate Charter School administers in grades 5 through 8 exams in Reading, Language Arts and Mathematics using the TerraNova Assessment (the CTB/McGraw-Hill TerraNova 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition Basic Multiple Assessments). All students are then subsequently tested each spring to a) demonstrate their progress over the course of one academic year, and b) compare student performance relative to students nationwide. The TerraNova was selected since its format and the types of questions it contains more closely parallel the New York State exams than other similar, norm-referenced exams. This spring, we administered the CTB/McGraw-Hill TerraNova 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition Multiple Assessments for our 5<sup>th</sup> graders because the 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition was phased out by the company.

Kings Collegiate Charter School administered 4 internally developed and aligned Interim Assessments and a Final Exam in Math during the 2008-09 school year. These assessments were created to reflect the school's scope and sequence in Math, and to mirror the style and scope of the New York State Math exams. Similar to the state exam, the Math Interim Assessments were administered in two parts; a 25-35 question multiple-choice section and a 6-12 question open-response section. The assessments focused primarily on the most recently covered standards, with a smaller focus on cumulative skills and standards covered in previous units.

After the tests were administered, KCCS teachers graded each exam and entered individual performance data into a shared template for detailed test analysis. With the individual student, whole class, and whole grade data, KCCS teachers analyzed the data and developed strategic plans to re-teach specific standards to individuals, small groups, and classes. KCCS also utilized the information to target content- and skills-driven tutoring after school and on Saturdays.

**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 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades 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 Tested	Not Tested <sup>3</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
5	81				81
6	55				55
All	136				136

**Results**

As the data table below highlights, 100 percent of our students in at least their second year at Kings performed at Levels 3 and 4.

**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	
5	All Students	0%	2%	58%	40%	98%	81
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0%	0%	73%	27%	<b>100%</b>	11
6	All Students	0%	0%	18%	82%	100%	55
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0%	0%	20%	80%	<b>100%</b>	51
All	All Students	0%	1%	42%	57%	99%	136
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	0%	0%	29%	71%	<b>100%</b>	62

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

**Evaluation**

This measure was met and exceeded by a full 25 percent. We are really proud that all of our students who were enrolled in their second year at Kings, both the repeating 5<sup>th</sup> graders and our 6<sup>th</sup> graders, scored at a Level 3 or 4. Almost all of our students, in fact, even in their first year, performed at Level 3 or 4. We believe that these really positive results help validate our approach towards math instruction.

**Additional Evidence**

Since this is our second year of operation, this is our first year in which this measure applies. We look forward to examining year-to-year trends during the current Accountability Period next year, as it will highlight whether we are continuing to maintain a high level of performance.

The table below examines whether performance changes the longer students are enrolled in the school. As an early marker of a successful school, student performance should increase with prolonged participation in the academic program. Our high level of performance in mathematics for both students in their first year at Kings and students in their second year is very encouraging.

**2008-09 Mathematics Performance  
by Grade Level and Years Attending the School**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 According to Number of Years Enrolled							
	One		Two		Three		Four or More	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	97%	70	100%	11				
6	100%	4	100%	51				
All	97%	74	100%	62				

**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 119. 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**

Our aggregate PI score for 2008-2009 in Mathematics is 199.

**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	
5 – 6	0	1	57	42	136

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= 1 + 57 + 42 = 100 \\
 &+ 57 + 42 = 99 \\
 \text{PI} &= 199
 \end{aligned}$$

**Evaluation**

We met this measure, with an almost perfect PI score of 199 that well exceeded the AMO of 119.

**Additional Evidence**

This year’s PI exceeds last year’s PI, continuing to provide a very positive indication of the efficacy of our instructional program in mathematics. The percentage of our students performing at Level 2 is smaller in 2008-09 than in 2007-08.

**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		
2007-08	5	75	0%	9%	57%	33%	191	102
2008-09	5-6	136	0%	1%	57%	42%	199	119

**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**

Our aggregate school performance in Mathematics this year -- 100% of students in at least their second year performing at Level 3 and 4 -- exceeded the average of all students in our local district within grades 5 and 6 by 22 percentage points.

**2008-09 State Mathematics Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	100%	11	85%	1737
6	100%	51	69%	1304
All	<b>100%</b>	62	<b>78%</b>	3041

**Evaluation**

We met this measure, exceeding the aggregate district performance by 22 percentage points. Our 5<sup>th</sup> graders' performance exceeded the district by 15 percentage points and our 6<sup>th</sup> grade exceeded the district performance by 31 percentage points.

**Additional Evidence**

As this is the first year that we have utilized this measure, we do not have comparative data to the local district from previous years. We look forward to continuing to track our performance relative to the local district in the future.

As an optional comparison measure, we also decided to compare our performance to three local schools. We are co-located with Middle School of Art and Philosophy K588, a school with 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> graders in 2008-09. We also chose to compare ourselves with P.S. 219, a K-5 school, because it is located only a couple of blocks from the school and many of our students come to us from that school. Finally, we chose to compare our performance to General Chappie Elementary and Middle Schools, since they are also near to our school.

The chart below shows that our 5<sup>th</sup> graders' and our 6<sup>th</sup> graders' performance far exceeds that of the other local comparison schools, which is very encouraging.

**08-09 Mathematics Performance of  
Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year and All Students in Comparison Schools							
	Charter School		K588 (Middle School of Art and Philosophy)		K219 (P.S. 219)		K631/K634 (General Chappie ES and MS)	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	100%	11	85%	1737	85%	1737	69%	1304
6	100%	51	69%	1304	69%	1304	69%	1304
All	<b>100%</b>	62	<b>78%</b>	3041	<b>78%</b>	3041	<b>78%</b>	3041

5	100%	11			81%	122	70%	66
6	100%	51	54%	71			42%	78
All	100%	62	54%	71	69%	121	55%	144

**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**

Our aggregate Effect Size was 0.86 based on the 2007-08 state exam results.

**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						
4						
5		75	90.6	77.7	12.9	.86
6						
7						
8						
All	60.5%	75	90.6	77.7	12.9	.86

**School's Overall Comparative Performance:**

*KCCS exceeded the predicted level of performance in 2007-08.*

**Evaluation**

This measure was met: our aggregate Effect Size was 0.86, which exceeds the bar of 0.3.

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**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. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. 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**

Our 5<sup>th</sup> grade cohort achieved their target by having positive growth. 100% of our 6<sup>th</sup> grade cohort scored at Level 3 and 4 in 2007-08 and they stayed at 100% in 2008-09.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
5	71	77%	+ growth	97%	YES
6	55	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
All	126	87%	+ growth	98%	YES

**Evaluation**

This measure was achieved: all cohorts met their targets. The 5<sup>th</sup> grade cohort increased their percentage achieving Level 3 and 4 by 20 percentage points. The 6<sup>th</sup> grade cohort maintained its performance with 100% scoring Level 3 and Level 4. The school overall increased the percent scoring at Level 3 and 4 by 11 percentage points.

**Additional Evidence**

Our 5<sup>th</sup> grade cohort met their growth target last year and both our 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts met their growth target this year.

**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	5	1	1
2008-09	5-6	2	2

The table below provides the opportunity to examine year-to-year changes in the same students' performance levels. It shows how many students in a particular performance level in 2007-08 remained at the same level, moved to a higher level, or moved to a lower level in 2008-09. It shows the number of students, not percentages. Students in the upper right quadrant are those who moved from below proficiency in 2007-08 to proficiency in 2008-09.

The data shows that we moved 14 students from below proficiency in 2007-08 to proficiency in 2008-09. Many more students moved up in performance level than down from 2007-08 to 2008-09, most notably 40 students moved from Level 3 to Level 4.

**Change in Mathematics Performance Levels  
from 2007-08 to 2008-09 – All Students**

		Number of Students at Each Performance Level				
		2008-09				
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total Number
0	Level 1	0	2	0	0	0
	Level 2	0	0	14	0	14
	Level 3	0	0	34	40	74
	Level 4	0	0	4	32	35
	Total Number	0	2	52	72	126

We administered the CTB McGraw-Hill TerraNova Multiple Assessments 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition in September for incoming 5<sup>th</sup> graders and in June for all students. We used the 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition for 5<sup>th</sup> Graders in June 2009 because the company phased out the 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. The TerraNova is a norm-referenced test. The tables below represent cohort growth on the Mathematics sections of the test. Our target was positive growth in the average NCE for each cohort. We achieved this in both our 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade cohorts.

**Cohort Growth on TerraNova Multiple Assessments Test from Spring 2008 to Spring 2009 (Gr 6) and Fall 2008 to Spring 2009 (Gr 5) - MATHEMATICS**

Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
5	78	50	+ growth	53	YES
6	54	68	+ growth	73	YES
All	132	57	+ growth	61	YES

The table below presents another way of looking at our students' performance. When our 2008-09 5<sup>th</sup> grade students first entered KCCS, just over half of our students were performing above

the national average (50th percentile) on the Mathematics section of the exam. After only nine months at KCCS, the percentage of students scoring above this national average improved to over 60% in Mathematics.

<b>5<sup>th</sup> Grade/Class of 2016 – % at or above national average (50<sup>th</sup> percentile)</b>			
<b>TERRANOVA</b>	<b>September 2008</b> 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Pre-Test 78 students	<b>June 2009</b> 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Post-Test 78 Students	<b>1-YEAR CHANGE</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>53.8%</b>	<b>61.5%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>

When our 2008-09 6<sup>th</sup> grade students first entered KCCS, just under three-fourths of our students were performing above the national average (50th percentile) on the Mathematics section of the exam. After two school years at KCCS, the percentage of students scoring above this national average improved to 100% in Mathematics performing above the national average.

<b>6<sup>th</sup> Grade/Class of 2015 – % at or above national average (50<sup>th</sup> percentile)</b>				
<b>TERRANOVA</b>	<b>September 2007</b> 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Pre-Test 54 students	<b>June 2008</b> 5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Post-Test 54 students	<b>June 2009</b> 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Post-Test 54 students	<b>2-YEAR CHANGE</b>
<b>Mathematics</b>	<b>74.1%</b>	<b>92.6%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>25.9%</b>

**Summary of the Mathematics Goal**

All of our measures were achieved this year, including the comparative measure of Effect Size, which was based on 2007-08 data. We are confident that the Effect Size measure will definitely be met when 2008-09 data is applied. We feel that this year’s 2008-09 data shows that we are well underway towards attaining this Accountability Plan goal and we look forward to next year’s results to further reinforce that we are indeed on the right path.

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

Growth	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 exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	Achieved
--------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------

**Action Plan**

To maintain our rate of progress along this goal, we intend to do the following things:

- Continue double periods of Math daily;
- Celebrate student achievement in Math through special events with students and families
- Support students with special needs through targeted intervention, specifically through small-group instruction during and out of class;
- Continue to target struggling students through afterschool tutoring and targeted Math instruction as part of Saturday School;
- Offer math enrichment through participation in Math competitions;
- Reinforce math skills in daily science classes; and

We also believe that the move we are planning this school year from three class sections to four class sections in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade will help increase student achievement in mathematics even further, by reducing class size for our most struggling students.

## SCIENCE

### **Goal 3: Science**

Students will demonstrate proficiency in the understanding and application of scientific principles.

#### **Background**

The Science curriculum at KCCS has been designed to provide a solid foundation for students in the essential understandings of Middle Grades Science as outlined in the New York State standards. Our fifth and sixth grade science curriculum is designed to equip students for more in-depth studies of Biology, Chemistry, and Physics in high school. During the 2008-2009 school year, KCCS students in the fifth grade completed units of study on the Scientific Method and Measurement, Motion and Forces, Chemicals and Reactions, Matter and Energy, and Living Things; while students in the sixth grade completed units of study on the Scientific Method and Measurement, Ecology, Electricity, Astronomy, and Landforms. Students participated in hands-on science activities or demonstrations on a weekly basis, usually adapted from FOSS Science kits that align with our science content. Science instruction consistently reinforced both math and reading comprehension skills, and our science teachers frequently worked closely with both our math and English Language Arts teachers to ensure that common approaches and language were used to reinforce cross-curricular content. For example, during the Scientific Method and Measurement unit, students worked with units of measurement, tools of measurement, and conversions between units of measure, reinforcing important skills from the math curriculum. In terms of supporting literacy, planning time was dedicated to determining how to best expose students to nonfiction texts during science class each week and how to encourage them to access and use scientific texts for their own learning and study. This exposure to nonfiction provided an important opportunity for students to practice and continue to develop their reading comprehension and vocabulary skills.

### **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**

Schools administered the New York State Testing Program Science Assessment to students in 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade in spring 2009. Each student's raw score is then 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**

As we opened with 5<sup>th</sup> graders only during the 2007-2008 school year, we will not have data for this measure until our students reach the 8<sup>th</sup> grade in 2010-2011.



**Evaluation**

N/A

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**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**

As we opened with 5<sup>th</sup> graders only during the 2007-2008 school year, we will not have data for this measure until our students reach the 8<sup>th</sup> grade in 2010-2011.

**Evaluation**

N/A

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**Summary**

We will not have data for these measures until our students reach the 8<sup>th</sup> grade in 2010-2011. In the meantime, however, we are measuring their growth through our own internally developed and aligned Interim Assessments, which show that our students are making progress in science. As standards were retested throughout the 2008-09 school year and new material was added, we looked for questions answered correctly to stay consistent or increase as students developed stronger science skills and content knowledge. We believe that our science instruction is teaching our students the content and skills they need to be successful.

		SCI				
		IA1	IA2	IA3	IA4	Final Exam
5th GRADE	n 80	80%	74%	72%	70%	74%
6th GRADE	55	78%	82%	83%	80%	90%

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.	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.	N/A

### Action Plan

To maintain our rate of progress along this goal, we intend to do the following things:

- Continue to use the science curriculum to provide students with the essential understandings and skills that will prepare them for more in-depth study of Chemistry, Biology, and Physics during high school;
- Provide professional development and common planning time dedicated to collaboration between science, math, and literacy teachers to ensure that the KCCS science curriculum continues to reinforce essential math and reading comprehension skills;
- Guarantee that students continue to participate in as many hands-on Science lessons and activities during Science classes as is appropriate and possible;
- Encourage students to participate in Science enrichment activities after school, such as Science Adventures, a club run by our science teachers that offers regular, hands-on science activities after school; and
- Ensure our new 7<sup>th</sup> grade Science teacher works in close collaboration with our returning 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade Science teachers to ensure consistency from grade to grade and class to class.

We also believe that the move we are planning this school year from three class sections to four class sections in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade will help increase student achievement in science even further, by reducing class size for our most struggling students.

## SOCIAL STUDIES

### **Goal 4: Social Studies**

Students will demonstrate an understanding of key geographical, economic, and governmental concepts, as well as major historical ideas and developments in the United States, New York and the world.

### **Background**

The History curriculum at Kings Collegiate teaches specific history content through traditional direct instruction and through a series of whole-class historical fiction novels. We develop internal standards for our units of study, building from those outlined in the New York State Social Studies Core Curriculum. We then select three to four historical fiction novels that align with the standards that we outline for each grade level. Through the historical fiction, we continue to develop students' literacy skills (comprehension and vocabulary) while teaching historical content through a specific storyline.

The fifth grade History curriculum at KCCS consists of two parts. History instruction from August through November develops essential social studies skills and content. This portion of the scope and sequence focuses largely on preparing students for the New York State Exam in November, developing understandings of geography, history, and social studies; building skills for reading and interpreting graphs and timelines; and preparing students to respond to Document-Based Questions. History instruction from November through the end of the year is based on three historical fiction novels. Fifth grade students read The Sign of the Beaver (Native American culture and early European settlement), The Witch of Blackbird Pond (early European settlement and Puritan culture), and My Brother Sam is Dead (American colonies and Revolutionary War). Each day's history lesson is focused on a content-based objective, and each day's readings and assignments reinforce both the history content and literacy skills of vocabulary and reading comprehension.

The sixth grade curriculum focuses on Ancient World History, beginning with a review of essential social studies skills and moving into the study of the Ancient River Valley Civilizations of Mesopotamia, Egypt, India, China, Greece, and Rome. The sixth grade curriculum includes the historical fiction novels A Place in the Sun (Ancient Egypt), Roman Mysteries #1: Thieves of Ostia (Ancient Rome), and The Iliad (Ancient Greece).

### **Goal 4: Absolute Measure**

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

### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program Social Studies Assessment to students in 5<sup>th</sup> grade in November 2008. 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**

64% out of the 11 5<sup>th</sup> grade students enrolled in at least their second year at Kings Collegiate scored at Level 3 or Level 4 on the State Social Studies exam. We will not have any 8<sup>th</sup> grade students at our school until the 2010-2011 school year.

**Charter School Performance on 2008-09 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	15%	7%	57%	21%	78%	81
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	18%	18%	55%	9%	<b>64%</b>	11
8	All Students						
	Students in At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year						

**Evaluation**

The measure was not met this year. Though we fell short by 9%, we feel it is important to point out the very small sample size of 11 repeating 5<sup>th</sup> graders and the unique nature of the population that qualifies for this measure. Because students enter our school as 5<sup>th</sup> graders, the vast majority of our students will not count towards this measure until they are 8<sup>th</sup> graders. Therefore, this year and next year, the only population that qualifies for this measure is our students who have been held back for academic performance and are repeating the 5<sup>th</sup> grade again. As mentioned earlier in the report, out of the 11 repeating 5<sup>th</sup> graders we had this year, 6 have IEPs. While we are committed to moving all of our students towards advanced and proficient, we believe that the nature of this population (both their higher special needs percentage as well as the fact that they are, by definition, our lowest-skilled students academically) makes it difficult to interpret the implications of this data for our overall educational program. We feel that the 78% of our total 5<sup>th</sup> grade population scoring at level 3 and 4 this year is a much stronger indication that our instructional program for Social Studies is on target.

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**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**

Unfortunately, 2008-09 state and district level Social Studies data have not yet been made available and current comparisons are not possible at this time.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	64%	11	Not available	Not available
8				

**Evaluation**

N/A

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**Summary**

While we did not achieve the measure of 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination, we are encouraged by the fact that 78 percent of all of our 5<sup>th</sup> grade students (including those enrolled in their first year) did perform at or above Level 3.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State examination.	Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	TBD

**Action Plan**

In 2009-2010, KCCS plans to continue to implement many of the successful strategies this year:

- Continue to use historical fiction novels to support students' mastery of history content and social studies skills and their development of strong reading comprehension skills;
- Provide professional development and common planning time dedicated to collaboration between history and literacy teachers to ensure that the KCCS history curriculum continues to reinforce essential reading comprehension skills;

Changes will include:

- More explicit and targeted instruction on reading and responding to Document-Based Questions, similar to those on the New York State Assessment;
- Small-group instruction, provided by our Special Education teacher, during History class for our lowest-skilled fifth grade students;
- Ensure our new 5<sup>th</sup> grade History teacher works in close collaboration with our returning 6<sup>th</sup> grade and 7<sup>th</sup> grade History teachers to ensure consistency from grade to grade and class to class.

We also believe that the move we are planning this school year from three class sections to four class sections in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade and 6<sup>th</sup> grade will help increase student achievement in history even further, by reducing class size for our most struggling students.

**Goal 5: NCLB**  
The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.

**Goal 5: Absolute Measure**  
Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

**Method**

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

**Results**

While our school's 2008-2009 Accountability Status is not available yet, for the 2007-2008 school year, Kings Collegiate Charter School was found to be in Good Standing.

**Evaluation**

N/A

**Additional Evidence**

N/A

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2005-06	N/A
2006-07	N/A
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	TBD



**Charter School Student Attrition Rates  
2008-09**

	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07	2005-06
Number of students leaving for lack of transportation	0	0		
Number of students leaving for geographic reasons (e.g., out of state/district relocation)	3	3		
Number of students leaving for more restrictive special education setting	0	0		
Number of students leaving due to parental choice (e.g., school transfer closer to residence, local elementary school, parent convenience)	9	6		
Number leaving for other reasons (undetermined)	0	0		
Total number of students leaving.	12	9		
Highest Number Enrolled (July 1 – June 30)	147	81		
<b>Total Percent Attrition</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>11%</b>		

NOTE: For 2008-09, only 4 students left after 9/8/08, which is when Kings begins our school-year attendance calculation



**Charter School Teacher Attrition Rates  
2008-09**

	<b>2008-09</b>	<b>2007-08</b>	<b>2006-07</b>	<b>2005-06</b>
Number of Classroom Teachers	12	6		
Number of Special Area Teachers	1	1		
Total Number of Teachers	13	7		
Total Number of Teachers Leaving	2	2		
<b>Total Percent Attrition</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>28.6%</b>		

THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK  
 THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT  
 OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY, MIDDLE,  
 SECONDARY AND CONTINUING EDUCATION  
 PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAMS  
 ROOM 462, EDUCATION BUILDING ANNEX  
 ALBANY, NEW YORK 12234

CHARTER SCHOOL ANNUAL  
 REPORT OF FISCAL PERFORMANCE  
 FOR THE SCHOOL YEAR ENDED 6/30/09

Charter School Code:  
 331800860908

Charter School Name:	Kings Collegiate Charter School
Contact Person:	Laura Lee McGovern
Phone:	718-342-6047

REVENUES

A. STATE SOURCES	\$ -
B. FEDERAL SOURCES	300,539
C. PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS	
1. BASIC OPERATING REVENUES	1,695,602
2. STATE AID-PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES	137,063
3. FED. AID-PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES	12,233
4. OTHER REV FROM PUB SCH DISTRICTS	31,010
D. ALL OTHER REVENUES	112,117
E. TOTAL REVENUES FROM ALL SOURCES	\$ 2,288,564

S. ENROLLMENT	136
T. EXPENDITURES PER PUPIL	15,732

(R/S)


EXPENDITURES

SALARIES	\$ 331,168	OTHER	\$ 302,335	TOTAL	\$ 633,503
F. GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	774,768		-		774,768
G. INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION	27,760		212,133		239,893
H. ALL OTHER INSTRUCTION	38,162		1,000		39,162
I. PUPIL SERVICES	64,382		3,000		67,382
J. PUPILS WITH DISABILITIES	-		4,752		4,752
K. TRANSPORTATION	-		550		550
L. COMMUNITY SERVICE	-		100,508		100,508
M. OPERATION & MAINTENANCE	-		-		252,573
N. EMPLOYEE BENEFITS					-
O. DEBT SERVICE					12,000
P. SCHOOL LUNCH					14,506
Q. CAPITAL EXPENSE					
R. GRAND TOTAL EXPENDITURES					\$ 2,139,597

COMPLETED FORM SHOULD BE RETURNED  
 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:   
 Chief School Officer


Date: 8/03/09


NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT


Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee  
2008-2009


Name (print): Allyson Alimansky

Name of Charter School: Kings Collegiate

Home Address: 

Business Address: 

Daytime Phone: 

E-Mail Address: 

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative, etc): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the Trustee an employee of the School?  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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. 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.

<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction</b>	<b>Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)</b>	<b>Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself</b>
None			

5. 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 Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
None			

ally aling  
Signature

9/6/08  
Date


NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT


Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee  
2008-2009


Name (print): C. J. Cash

Name of Charter School: Kings Collegiate Charter School

Home Address: 

Business Address: 

Daytime Phone: 

E-Mail Address: 

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative, etc): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the Trustee an employee of the School?  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.


\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. 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
None			

5. 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 Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
None			

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Signature

12/2/08  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Date




NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee  
2008-2009

Name (print):           KIESHA EARLE          

Name of Charter School:           KINGS COLLEGIATE          

Home Address: 

Business Address:

Daytime Phone:

E-Mail Address: 

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative, etc):           MEMBER          

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the Trustee an employee of the School?       Yes     X     No  

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


          N/A            
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. 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.

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

5. 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 Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
N/A			

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature*

12/22/08  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*


NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee  
2008-2009

Name (print): John Greenstein

Name of Charter School: Kings Collegiate

Home Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Business Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Daytime Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_



1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative, etc):  
Treasurer

2. Is the Trustee an employee of the School?  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.


\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. 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.

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

5. 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 Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature*

9/2/08  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*


NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee  
2008-2009

Name (print): Bob Howitt

Name of Charter School: King's Collegiate Charter School

Home Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Business Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Daytime Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_



1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative, etc):  
Trustee

2. Is the Trustee an employee of the School?  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.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_


4. 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
	Trustee of non-profit Uncommon Schools	Recuse from voting	no financial interest



5. 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 Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
	(See prior)		

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature*


  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*


NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT


Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee  
2008-2009


Name (print): JOHN K. KIM

Name of Charter School: KINGS COLLEGIATE

Home Address: 

Business Address: 

Daytime Phone: 

E-Mail Address: 

1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative, etc): X-CHAIR, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the Trustee an employee of the School?  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.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_


4. 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.

<b>Date(s)</b>	<b>Nature of Financial Interest/Transaction</b>	<b>Steps taken to avoid a conflict of interest, (e.g., did not vote, did not participate in discussion)</b>	<b>Name of person holding interest or engaging in transaction and relationship to yourself</b>
	NONE		

5. 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 Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
	NONE		

Signature



Date

9/9/08


NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

Disclosure of Financial Interest by a Charter School Trustee  
2008-2009

Name (print): Brett Peiser

Name of Charter School: Kings College Charter School

Home Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Business Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
Daytime Phone: \_\_\_\_\_  
E-Mail Address: \_\_\_\_\_



1. List all positions held on board (e.g., chair, treasurer, parent representative, etc): Trustee / Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. Is the Trustee an employee of the School?  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.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_


\_\_\_\_\_

4. 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
	Employee of Uncommon Schools, school's non-profit member organization/partner	Recuse from voting on matters related to Uncommon	Self - no financial interest in school

5. 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 Value of the Business Conducted	Name of Trustee/ Immediate Family/Member of Household Holding an Interest in the Organization Conducting Business with the School and the Nature of the Interest
	(see prior)		

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature*

9/10/08  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

*Statement of Assurances*

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.

Laura Lee McGovern  
Print Name, Head of Charter School

Laura Lee McGovern 7/30/09  
Signature and Date

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30 day of July, 2009.

[Signature]  
Notary Public

RANDY BATES  
NEW YORK  
01BA6176526  
QUEENS  
10/29/2011

JOHN KIM  
Print Name, President, Board of Trustees

[Signature]  
Signature and Date

RANDY BATES  
NEW YORK  
01BA6176526  
QUEENS  
10/29/2011

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 30<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2009.

[Signature]  
Notary Public

DIANE M JACKMAN  
Notary Public - State of New York  
NO. 01JA6170574  
Qualified in New York County  
My Commission Expires Jul 9, 2011





**COLLEGIATE CHARTER SCHOOL**  
Academic Year 2008-2009

**August**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

**September**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

**October**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

**November**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30						

**December**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

**January**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

**February**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

**March**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30	31				

**April**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30		

**May**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

**June**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30				

**July**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
			1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8	9	10	11
12	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	25
26	27	28	29	30	31	

Note: Shaded boxes indicate no school due to vacation, holiday, or PD day. Boxes with diagonal lines indicate a 1/2 day. Dismissal on 1/2 days will be at 11:45 AM. Lunch will not be served on 1/2 days. Regular dismissal is at 4:30 PM except for Wednesdays when regular dismissal will be at 2:00 PM.

- |                |                                   |                |                                        |             |                                   |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| August 25      | Gr. 5 First Day of School         | December 2-3   | Interim Assessments #2                 | March 16-17 | Interim Assessments #4 (no Math)  |
| August 26      | Gr. 6 First Day of School         | December 5     | Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis            | March 20    | Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis       |
| September 1    | Labor Day: No School              | December 10    | End of Second Quarter                  | March 25    | End of Third Quarter              |
| September 4-5  | TerraNova Exams                   | December 18    | Family Tchc. Confs. #2: 1/2 Day        | April 2     | Family-Tchc. Confs. #3: 1/2 Day   |
| September 30   | Rosh Hashanah: No School          | December 24-31 | Winter Recess: No School               | April 9-17  | Spring Recess: No School          |
| October 1      | Rosh Hashanah: No School          | January 1-2    | New Year's Day Holiday: No School      | May 11-12   | Interim Assessments #5            |
| October 9      | Yom Kippur: No School             | January 13-14  | New York State English Exam: Grade 5   | May 15      | Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis       |
| October 13     | Columbus Day: No School           | January 19     | Martin Luther King, Jr. Day: No School | May 25      | Memorial Day: No School           |
| October 14-15  | Interim Assessments #1            | January 20-22  | New York State English Exam: Grade 6   | June 2-5    | TerraNova Exams                   |
| October 17     | Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis       | January 26-27  | Interim Assessments #3 (no ELA)        | June 15-16  | Interim Assessments #6 (Final Ex) |
| October 22     | End of First Quarter              | January 30     | Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis            | June 26     | Last Day of School                |
| October 30     | Family-Tchr. Confs. #1: 1/2 Day   | February 16-20 | February Recess: No School             | July 2      | Report Card #4 Mailed             |
| November 11    | Veterans' Day: No School          | March 3-4      | New York State Math Exam: Grade 5      |             |                                   |
| November 12-13 | NYS Social Studies Exam: Grade 5  | March 9-11     | New York State Math Exam: Grade 6      |             |                                   |
| November 26    | Pre-Thanksgiving Holiday: 1/2 Day |                |                                        |             |                                   |
| November 27-28 | Thanksgiving Holiday              |                |                                        |             |                                   |

= Interim Assessment Exams

= TerraNova or State Exams



**COLLEGIATE CHARTER SCHOOL**  
*Academic Year 2009-2010 DRAFT*

**August**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

**September**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

**October**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

**November**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28
29	30					

**December**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31		

**January**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
					1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20	21	22	23
24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31						

**February**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28						

**March**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

**April**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

**May**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
						1
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	31					

**June**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
		1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30			

**July**

Su	M	Tu	W	Th	F	Sa
				1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	31

Note: Shaded boxes indicate no school due to vacation, holiday, or PD day. Boxes with diagonal lines indicate a 1/2 day. Dismissal on 1/2 days will be at 11:45 AM. Lunch will not be served on 1/2 days. Regular dismissal is at 4:30 PM except for Wednesdays when dismissal will be at 1:30 PM.

- August 31                    Gr. 5 First Day of School
- September 1              Gr. 6-7 First Day of School
- September 7              Labor Day: No School
- September 10-11        TerraNova Exams
- October 12                Columbus Day: No School
- October 19-20            Interim Assessments #1
- October 23                Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis
- November 4                End of First Quarter
- November 11              Veterans' Day: No School
- November 12              Report Card Conference #1: 1/2 Day
- November 18-19        NYS Social Studies Exam: Grade 5
- November 25              Pre-Thanksgiving Day Holiday: 1/2 Day
- November 26-27        Thanksgiving Holiday
- December 23-31        Winter Recess: No School
- January 1                  New Year's Day Holiday: No School
- January 11-12            Interim Assessments #2
- January 15                Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis
- January 18                Martin Luther King, Jr. Day: No School

- February 4                Report Card Conference #2: 1/2 Day
- February 15-19        February Recess: No School
- March 8-9                Interim Assessments #3
- March 12                Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis
- Mar 29-Apr 6            Spring Recess: No School
- April 14                  End of Third Quarter
- April 22                  Report Card Conference #3: 1/2 Day
- April 26-27            Interim Assessments #4
- April 30                  Prof. Dev. Day: IA Analysis
- May TBD                New York State English Exam: Grade 5
- May TBD                New York State English Exam: Grade 6-7
- May TBD                New York State Math Exam: Grade 5
- May TBD                New York State Math Exam: Grades 6-7
- May 31                  Memorial Day: No School
- June 1-4                TerraNova Exams
- June 21-22            Interim Assessments #5 (Final Exams)
- June 25                  Last Day of School: 1/2 Day
- June 29                  Staff Check Out/Last Day for Staff

August 3, 2009

Charter Schools Institute  
State University of New York  
41 State Street, Suite 700  
Albany, New York 12207

To the best of our knowledge, we did not make any material changes to our educational program and organizational structure during the 2008-2009 school year.

Best,



Laura Lee McGovern  
Co-Director

