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## INTRODUCTION

Marcia Glattstein, Principal, and Dr. Arthur Pritchard, consultant prepared this 2014-15 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

| Trustee's Name | Voting Board Position |
| :---: | :---: |
| Gail Golden | President |
| Carl C. Icahn | Member |
| Julie Goodyear | Secretary |
| Seymour Fliegel | Member |
| Robert Sancho | Member |
| Edward J. Shanahan | Member |
| Karen Mandelbaum | Member |
| Joan Rivera | Parent |

Marcia Glattstein has served as the Principal since July 2014.

## INTRODUCTION

The mission of the Icahn Charter School 3 is to use the Core Knowledge curriculum developed by E . D. Hirsch to provide students with a rigorous academic program offered in an extended day/year setting. Students will graduate armed with the skills and knowledge to participate successfully in the most rigorous academic environments, and will have a sense of personal and community responsibility. Icahn Charter School 3 opened in September 2008 and served grades kindergarten2. In September 2009 grade 3 was added, and in September 2010 grade 4 was added. Based on 2012-13 School Report Card data, our school is composed of $62 \%$ African American, $36 \%$ Latino, $2 \%$ and Asian/Pacific, with a free and reduced lunch rate of $77 \%$.

Our instructional program is data driven and combines Core Knowledge with ongoing assessments. Children who have demonstrated a deficiency in ELA or Mathematics as evident by the results of an assessment test are placed in our Targeted Assistance Program. Our Targeted Assistance Program consists of in school remediation, and after school tutoring. We have an extended school day of 7.5 hours and an extended school year ranging from 190 to 192 days of instruction.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School <br> Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2011-12$ | 37 | 38 | 37 | 29 | 36 | 34 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 211 |
| $2012-13$ | 39 | 40 | 39 | 34 | 32 | 31 | 33 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 248 |
| $2013-14$ | 39 | 40 | 35 | 34 | 35 | 34 | 28 | 32 | - | - | - | - | - | 277 |
| $2014-15$ | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 38 | 38 | 29 | 23 | 29 | - | - | - | - | 317 |
| $2015-16$ | 37 | 40 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 37 | 34 | 24 | 21 | - | - | - | - | 310 |

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

## Goal 1: English Language Arts

## Students will become proficient readers of the English Language

## BACKGROUND

Our ELA curriculum follows the Core Knowledge sequence and is comprised of McGraw-Hill readers, workbooks, a strong emphasis on writing, extensive classroom libraries and monthly assessments. Our ELA specialist provides small group instruction for 45 minutes a day 5-days a week to those children who have demonstrated a deficiency in any area of reading. Teachers and ELA specials meet to provide remediation lessons for the targeted students. The process of ongoing assessments ensure that the program will closely monitor the student's progress and promote the student out of the Targeted Assistance where appropriate, as well as accept new students as required by their practice tests and teacher recommendation. Teachers are provided with professional development at the beginning of the school year followed by monthly on-going professional development sessions.

## Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

## METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts ("ELA") assessment to students in 3 through 8 grades in April 2016. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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 not enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year).

## 2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam <br> Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Tested }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Total } \\ \text { Enrolled }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 0 | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused |$)$

[^0]| 8 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |

## RESULTS

Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school achieved a score of 44.5 on the 2015-16c NYS ELA assessment. While the measure was not made, the impact of the removal of students with less than two years at the school resulted in a slight gain in the percent proficiency.

Performance on 2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grades | All Students |  | Enrolled in at least their <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
|  | 64 | 39 | 65 | 37 |
| 4 | 59 | 39 | 62 | 37 |
| 5 | 30 | 37 | 29 | 35 |
| 6 | 38 | 34 | 38 | 34 |
| 7 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 24 |
| 8 | 48 | 21 | 48 | 21 |
| All | 44 | 194 | 44.5 | 188 |

## EVALUATION

The measure was not made.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

While the measure was not made, Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school demonstrated a significant increase on overall proficiency when scores are compared with previous years. The average score increased by 16.2\% from 2014-15 to 2015-16.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2013-14$ |  | Achieving Proficiency |  |  |


| All | 26.33 | 155 | 28.30 | 183 | 44.5 | 188 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") 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 enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 English language arts AMO of 104. The PLI 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 PLI is 200 . $^{2}$

## RESULTS

Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved a Performance Level Index rating of 134.89, which was 30.89 higher than the 2015-16 Language Arts AMO of 104.

English Language Arts 2015-16 Performance Level Index

| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |  |
| 194 | 9.33 | 47 | 32.66 | 11.33 |  |  |
|  | PI | 47 | + 32.66 | + 11.33 | = | 90.9 |
|  |  |  | 32.66 | + 11.33 | = | 43.9 |
|  |  |  |  | PLI | = | 134.89 |

## EVALUATION

The measure was made and the difference between Icahn3's score and the AMO increased by a score of 25 over 2014-15.

## Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency 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.

[^1]
## METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district. ${ }^{3}$

## RESULTS

In scoring 44.5\% Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school outscored their District peers by 15.17 points.

2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students <br> In At Least 2nd Year | All District Students |  |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | 65 | 37 | 32 | 3232 |
| 4 | 62 | 37 | 32 | 3129 |
| 5 | 29 | 35 | 24 | 3203 |
| 6 | 38 | 34 | 23 | 2858 |
| 7 | 25 | 24 | 29 | 2907 |
| 8 | 48 | 21 | 33 | 3015 |
| All | $\underline{\mathbf{4 4 . 5}}$ | 188 | $\underline{\mathbf{2 8 . 8 3}}$ | 18,344 |

## EVALUATION

The measure was met.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school have consistently outscored their District peers. The difference between Icahn 3 and District scores has widened each year with 2015-16 demonstrating the greatest difference with $15.17 \%$.

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

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or <br> Above Proficiency Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2013-14$ |  | $2014-15$ |  | $2015-16$ |  |
|  | Charter <br> School | Local <br> District | Charter <br> School | Local <br> District | Charter <br> School | Local <br> District |
| 3 | 26.5 | 23 | 39.4 | 21.8 | 65 | 32 |
| 4 | 21.2 | 23 | 28.12 | 22.5 | 62 | 32 |
| 5 | 19.35 | 19 | 14.28 | 20.3 | 29 | 24 |

[^2]| 6 | 25.9 | 18 | 44.44 | 19.7 | 38 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 38.7 | 16 | 9.09 | 19.0 | 25 | 29 |
| 8 | - | - | 34.5 | 24.0 | 48 | 33 |
| All | $\mathbf{2 6 . 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 3 0}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2 1 . 2 1}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{4 4 . 5}}$ | $\mathbf{2 8 . 8 3}$ |

## Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

## METHOD

The SUNY Charter Schools Institute ("Institute") conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains $\underline{2014-15}$ results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## RESULTS

In 2014-15 Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved an overall Effect Size of . 55 in ELA Comparative Performance, .25 greater than the state target of .3 , and doing so achieved a rating of "Higher than expected to a meaningful degree".

## 2014-15 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Percent of Students at Levels 3\&4 |  | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Actual | Predicted |  |  |
| 3 | 75 | 40 | 40 | 24.2 | 15.8 | 1.1 |
| 4 | 85 | 38 | 26 | 19.7 | 6.3 | . 46 |
| 5 | 89.5 | 38 | 13 | 15.2 | -2.2 | -0.18 |
| 6 | 77.4 | 29 | 41 | 20.6 | 20.4 | 1.36 |
| 7 | 87.5 | 23 | 9 | 14.0 | -5.0 | -0.44 |
| 8 | 82.8 | 29 | 34 | 21.2 | 12.8 | . 82 |
| All | 82.7 | 197 | 27.7 | 19.4 | 8.3 | . 55 |

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

## EVALUATION

The measure was met.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In 2014-15 Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students significantly increased Effect Size over 2013-14 and were not able to reach the school effort in 2012-13,

## English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

| School Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2012-13 | 3,4,5,6 | 83.4 | 130 | 26.9 | 18.9 | . 65 |
| 2013-14 | 3,4,5,6,7 | 81.2 | 163 | 25.0 | 20.5 | . 32 |
| 2014-15 | 3,4,5,6,7,8 | 82.7 | 197 | 27.7 | 19.4 | . 55 |

## Goal 1: Growth Measure ${ }^{4}$

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades $4-8$ will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

## 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 in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2014-15 and also have a state exam score from 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 score are ranked by their 2014-15 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains $\underline{2014-15}$ results, the most recent Growth Model data available. ${ }^{5}$

[^3]
## RESULTS

In 2014-15, Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved a Mean Growth Percentile score of 45.3, 4.7 points below the Statewide Median.

## 2014-15 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | Statewide <br> Median |
| 4 | 46.8 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 40.4 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 54.2 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 44.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 41.1 | 50.0 |
| All | 45.3 | 50.0 |

## EVALUATION

The measure was not made.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The Mean Growth Percentile at Icahn 3 dropped in comparison with the 2013-14 performance by 5.1 points, and was 1.5 higher than the 2012-13 effort.

## English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2012-13$ | $2013-14$ | $2014-15$ | Statewide <br> Median |
| 4 | 44.1 | 33.4 | 46.8 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 37.6 | 40.5 | 40.4 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 49.3 | 60.1 | 54.2 | 50.0 |
| 7 | - | 70.8 | 44.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | - | - | 41.1 | 50.0 |
| All | 43.8 | $\underline{\mathbf{5 0 . 4}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{4 5 . 3}}$ | 50.0 |

## Goal 1: Optional Measure

Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: CSD 11, PS 83, PS 103, PS 106, and PS/MS 194

## METHOD

ICAHN 3 tested-students are compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the result of each grade in which ICAHN 3 had tested students and the result of grades 3 through 8 in the surrounding schools.

## RESULTS

ICAHN 3 students in grades 3 through 8 outscored their peers in District 11 and in surrounding schools. Compared with K-5 schools PS 103 and 106, ICAHN 3 in grades 3 through 5 students outscored their peers by $26.67 \%$ and 13.33 \% respectively. Compared with K-8 schools PS 83 and PS/MS 194, ICAHN 3 students outscored their peers by $7.5 \%$ and $4.33 \%$ respectively

## EVALUATION

The measure was met.

| 2015-16 NYS ELA - Comparison of All Student Performance on the Math assessment - Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 <br> - ICAHN 3 with District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 103, PS/IS 194 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | District | School |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11 | PS 83 | PS 103 | PS 106 | PS/IS 194 | ICAHN 3 CS |
| 3 | 32 | 36 | 29 | 39 | 32 | 64 |
| 4 | 32 | 41 | 22 | 43 | 39 | 59 |
| 5 | 24 | 32 | 22 | 31 | 40 | 30/51 |
| 6 | 23 | 35 | - | - | 46 | 38 |
| 7 | 29 | 40 | - | -- | 40 | 25 |
| 8 | 33 | 35 | - | - | 41 | 48 |
| Total | $\underline{28.83}$ | 36.50 | $\underline{24.33}$ | 37.67 | 39.67 | 44.00 |

## SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Absolute - Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school averaged 44.50\% proficiency on the 2015-16 ELA tests.

Absolute - The Performance Index value achieved by ICAHN 3 students was 134.89, which was 30.89 points higher than the state AMO of 104.

Comparative - ICAHN 3 students outscored their peers in District 11 by 15.17\% (44.00\% to 28.83).

Comparative - ICAHN 3 students achieved an Effect Size value of . 55 on the 2014-15 Comparative Performance Analysis. The school was designated as "Higher than expected to a meaningful degree".

Growth - At 45.3, ICAHN 3 students in grades 4 through 8 demonstrated a collective Mean Growth Percentile in ELA, which was below the statewide median of $50 \%$.

Optional - ICAHN 3 students outscored their peers in the following schools: PS 103, and PS 106. They were outscored by their peers at PS 83 and PS/IS 194.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least <br> their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English <br> language arts exam for grades 3-8. | Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the <br> state English language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable <br> 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 <br> their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English <br> language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested <br> grades in the local school district. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the <br> state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above <br> (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a <br> regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students <br> among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2013-14 school district <br> results.) | Achieved |
| Growth | Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted <br> growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades <br> 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile. | Did Not Achieve |
| Optional | Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 on the State ELA <br> exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and <br> similar schools: CSD 11, PS 83, PS 103, PS 106, and PS/MS 194 | Achieved |

## ACTION PLAN

ICAHN 3 completed its sixth testing year, with 2014-15 the second year of the common core-based exam. ICAHN 3 students outscored their peers in District \#11 and the schools identified by ICAHN 3 for comparison. In the coming year we plan to analyze the impact of our instruction on at risk students, and those scoring in the high Level 2 to low Level 3 range to identify possible changes we can introduce to support their increased academic achievement. Given the impact of the common core learning standards, we shall also review and adjust as needed student reading, writing, and listening skills.

## MATHEMATICS

## Goal 2: Mathematics <br> Students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts.

## BACKGROUND

Our Mathematics curriculum follows the Core Knowledge sequence and is comprised of McGraw-Hill Mathematics Connect, workbooks, and a strong emphasis on hands on learning and monthly assessments. Our Mathematics specialist provides small group instruction for 45 minutes a day 5 days a week to those children who have demonstrated a deficiency in any area of Mathematics. The results of practice tests are reviewed with the Principal, teachers, mathematics specialist, and Mathematics consultant in order to provide remediation lessons for the targeted students. Our process of ongoing assessments ensures that the program will closely monitor the child's progress and promote the students out of targeted assistance where appropriate, as well as accept new students as required by practice tests and teacher recommendation. The Mathematics program is supervised by the Principal and with additional support from a Mathematics Consultant from the NYC Mathematics Project at Lehman College. The Mathematics Consultant is responsible for demonstration lessons and participates in developing teaching strategies. The mathematics consultant also provides professional development during common planning periods.

## Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

## METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3 through 8 grades in April 2016. Each student's raw score has been converted to a gradespecific scaled score and a performance level.

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 not enrolled in at least their second year.


[^4]| 3 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| 5 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 37 |
| 6 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| 7 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 8 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| All | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 194 |

## RESULTS

In the 2015-16 NYS Math assessment, Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school averaged a proficiency score of $51 \%$ proficiency.

Performance on 2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grades | All Students |  | Enrolled in at least their <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | 72 | 39 | 73 | 37 |
| 4 | 54 | 39 | 57 | 37 |
| 5 | 35 | 37 | 34 | 35 |
| 6 | 68 | 34 | 68 | 34 |
| 7 | 42 | 24 | 42 | 24 |
| 8 | 33 | 21 | 33 | 21 |
| All | $\mathbf{5 0 . 6 6}$ | 194 | $\mathbf{5 1}$ | 188 |

## EVALUATION

The measure was not met.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

As compared with previous years, $51 \%$ achieved in 2015-16 is the highest level achieved in the past three years, and 10 points higher than 2014-15.

## Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2013-14$ |  |  | $2014-15$ |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |  |
| 3 | 61.8 | 34 | 60.5 | 38 | 73 | 37 |  |


| 4 | 45.45 | 33 | 40.6 | 32 | 57 | 37 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 32.25 | 31 | 17.14 | 35 | 34 | 35 |
| 6 | 51.85 | 27 | 48.14 | 27 | 68 | 34 |
| 7 | 54.83 | 31 | 31,81 | 22 | 42 | 24 |
| 8 | - | - | 48.3 | 29 | 33 | 21 |
| All | $\underline{49.23}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 0 8}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 3}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{5 1}}$ | 188 |

## Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") 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 enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 101. The PLI 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 PLI is $200 .{ }^{7}$

## RESULTS

In 2015-16, Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved a Performance Level Index score of 133.33 in Mathematics, which was 32.32 points above the State AMO of 101.

## Mathematics 2015-16 Performance Level Index (PLI)

| Number in <br> Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |  |  |
|  | 16.67 | 32.67 | 28.50 | 21.83 |  |  |  |

## EVALUATION

The measure was met, and the difference between the Icahn 3 value of 133.33 and the State AMO increased by 10 over 2014-15.

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

[^5]
## MATHEMATICS

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

## METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested 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. ${ }^{8}$

## RESULTS

In 2015-16 Icahn 3 students enrolled for at least two years outscored their District peers in tested grades by $49.4 \%$ with their achievement of $51 \%$.

> 2015-16 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students In At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | 73 | 37 | 30 | 3277 |
| 4 | 57 | 37 | 31 | 3166 |
| 5 | 34 | 35 | 27 | 3222 |
| 6 | 68 | 34 | 26 | 2902 |
| 7 | 42 | 24 | 22 | 2934 |
| 8 | 33 | 21 | 19 | 2834 |
| All | 51 | 188 | 25.83 | 18,335 |

## EVALUATION

The measure was met.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grades students in at least their second year at the school, have consistently outscored their District peers in tested grades over the past three years.

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

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at <br> Proficiency Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2013-14$ |  |  | $2014-15$ |  | $2015-16$ |  |
|  | Charter | Local | Charter | Local | Charter | Local |  |

[^6]|  | School | District | School | District | School | District |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | 61.8 | 29 | 60.5 | 27.8 | 73 | 30 |
| 4 | 45.45 | 32 | 40.6 | 27.9 | 57 | 31 |
| 5 | 32.25 | 26 | 17.14 | 31.4 | 34 | 27 |
| 6 | 51.85 | 27 | 48.14 | 26.2 | 68 | 26 |
| 7 | 54.83 | 17 | 31,81 | 23.6 | 42 | 22 |
| 8 | - | - | 48.3 | 15.3 | 33 | 19 |
| All | $\underline{\mathbf{4 9 . 2 3}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2 6 . 2}}$ | $\mathbf{4 1 . 0 8}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2 5 . 3 6}}$ | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{5 1}}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{2 5 . 8 3}}$ |

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

## METHOD

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 , or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## RESULTS

In 2014-15 Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved an Effect Size value .88 on the NYS Math assessment, thereby earning the school's comparative performance designation as "Higher than expected to a large degree.

2014-15 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Percent of Students at Levels 3\&4 |  | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Actual | Predicted |  |  |
| 3 | 75.0 | 40 | 63 | 34.2 | 28.8 | 1.55 |
| 4 | 85.0 | 38 | 37 | 28.3 | 8,7 | 0.46 |
| 5 | 89.5 | 38 | 18 | 24.3 | -6.3 | -0.36 |
| 6 | 77.4 | 29 | 45 | 27.0 | 18.0 | 0.93 |
| 7 | 87.5 | 23 | 35 | 16.9 | 18.1 | 1.11 |
| 8 | 82.8 | 29 | 48 | 14.2 | 33.8 | 1.93 |


| All | 82.7 | 197 | 41.2 | 25.1 | 16.1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


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

## EVALUATION

The measure was made.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

2014-15 was the first year the Effect Size could be determined for grades 3 through 8, and may have accounted for a lower Effect Size than the two previous years.

## Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent <br> Eligible for <br> Free Lunch/ <br> Economically <br> Disadvantaged | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2012-13$ | $3,4,5,6$ | 83.4 | 130 | 40.0 | 22.0 | 1.09 |
| $2013-14$ | $3,4,5,6,7$ | 81.2 | 163 | 49.1 | 27.6 | 1.13 |
| $2014-15$ | $3,4,5,6,8$ | 82.7 | 197 | 41.2 | 25.1 | 0.55 |

## Goal 2: Growth Measure ${ }^{9}$

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades $4-8$ will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

## 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 in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2014-15 and also have a state exam score in 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 scores are ranked by their 2014-15 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available. ${ }^{10}$

[^7]
## MATHEMATICS

## RESULTS

In 2014-15, Icahn 3 3rd through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved a Mean Growth Percentile value of 40.5, 9.5 points below the Statewide Median.

## 2014-15 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | Statewide <br> Median |
| 4 | 35.1 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 26.4 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 60.0 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 36.2 | 50.0 |
| All | $\underline{\mathbf{4 0 . 4}}$ | 50.0 |

## EVALUATION

The measure was not met. .

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

2014-15 was the first year all tested grades were represented in the Mean Growth Percentile data and may account for the drop over previous years.

## Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | $2014-15$ | Statewide <br> Median |
| 4 | 43.9 | 31.1 | 35.1 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 38.7 | 44.5 | 26.4 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 80.1 | 73.3 | 60.0 | 50.0 |
| 7 | - | 62.8 | 50.0 | 50.0 |
| 8 | - | - | 36.2 | 50.0 |
| All | $\underline{\mathbf{5 4 . 4}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{5 1 . 8}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{4 0 . 4}}$ | 50.0 |

[^8]
## Goal 2: Optional Measure

Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 in the State Math exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and similar schools: CSD 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/MS 194

## METHOD.

Icahn 3 tested-students compared to all tested students in the surrounding similar schools. Comparisons are between the results of each grade in which Icahn 3 had tested students and the results of grades $3,4,5,6,7$ and 8 in the surrounding schools.

## RESULTS

ICAHN 3 students in grades 3 through 8 outscored their peers in District 11 and in surrounding schools. Compared with K-5 schools PS 103 and 106, ICAHN 3 in grades 3 through 5 students outscored their peers by $29.33 \%$ and $15.99 \%$ respectively. Compared with K-8 schools PS 83 and PS/MS 194, ICAHN 2 students outscored their peers by $10.33 \%$ and $10.67 \%$ respectively.

## EVALUATION

The Measure was met.

| 2015-16 NYS Math - Comparison of All Student Performance on the Math assessment - Students reaching or surpassing Level 3 - ICAHN 3 with District 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 103, PS/IS 194 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | District | School |  |  |  |  |
|  | 11 | PS 83 | PS 103 | PS 106 | PS/IS 194 | ICAHN 3 CS |
| 3 | 30 | 39 | 29 | 39 | 32 | 72 |
| 4 | 31 | 38 | 22 | 43 | 39 | 54 |
| 5 | 27 | 36 | 22 | 31 | 40 | 35/53.66 |
| 6 | 26 | 44 | - | - | 46 | 68 |
| 7 | 22 | 47 | - | - | 40 | 42 |
| 8 | 19 | 38 | - | - | 41 | 33 |
| Total | $\underline{25.83}$ | $\underline{40.33}$ | $\underline{24.33}$ | $\underline{37.67}$ | 39.66 | 50.66 |

## SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Absolute - Overall, ICAHN $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students enrolled for at least two years scored 51\% proficient. They did not reach the first absolute measure of $75 \%$, scoring $24 \%$ below the target. However their achievement was significantly greater than their 2014-15 effort.

Absolute - The Performance Index value achieved by ICAHN 3 students was 133.33, which was 32.32 points higher than the state AMO of 104.

Comparative - ICAHN 3 students outscored their peers in District 11 by $15.44 \%$ ( $51 \%$ to $25.83 \%$ ).

Comparative - Icahn $33^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved a collective comparative performance Effect Size of .55, . 25 higher than the required .3.

Growth - The overall Mathematics Mean growth percentile achieved at ICAHN 3 was 40.4\%, 9.6\% below the Statewide Median.

Optional - ICAHN 3 students in grades 3 through 8 outscored their peers in District 11 and in three surrounding schools. Compared with K-5 schools PS 103 and 106, ICAHN 33 through 5 students outscored their peers by $20.87 \%$ and $1.40 \%$ respectively. Compared with K-8 schools PS 83 ICAHN 3 students outscored their peers by $7.79 \%$ and $6.63 \%$ and were lower than PS/MS 194 by 2.75

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least <br> their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State <br> mathematics exam for grades 3-8. | Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the <br> state mathematics exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective <br> (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least <br> their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics <br> exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the <br> local school district. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the <br> state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing <br> higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis <br> controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public <br> schools in New York State. (Using 2013-14 school district results.) | Achieved |
| Growth | Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted <br> growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will <br> be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile. | Did Not Achieve |
| Optional | Each year, the percent of students at or above Level 3 in the State Math <br> exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of the following and <br> similar schools: CSD 11, PS 103, PS 83, PS 106, and PS/MS 194 | Achieved |

## ACTION PLAN

ICAHN 3 will continue utilizing the NYC Math Project as well as ongoing assessment and remediation as
needed. In addition, we will continue to align our curriculum and provide current texts as the NYS Education Department modifies its mathematic strands. Given the impact of the common core learning standards, we shall also review and adjust as needed student reading, writing, and listening skills as they relate to mathematics.

## SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

## Students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.

## BACKGROUND

The ICAHN 3 Charter School science curriculum is aligned with the NYS standards and utilizes McGrawHill/National Geographic text.

## Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State science examination.

## METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in $4^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade in spring 2016. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

## RESULTS

In 2015-16, Icahn $34^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school averaged $92.9 \%$ proficiency on the NYS Science exam. $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students scored 1005 , while $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students scored 85.8\%.

Charter School Performance on 2015-16 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students <br> In At Least 2 |  |  |  |
|  | Percent <br> Year | All District Students |  |  |
|  | 100 | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
| 8 | 85.8 | 21 |  |  |
| All | 92.9 | 59 |  |  |

## EVALUATION

The measure was made.

## SCIENCE

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Icahn $34^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students enrolled for at least two years at the school have consistently demonstrated proficiency in tested grades. In 2015-16 the average score of 92.9\% was an increase of $11.55 \%$ over 2014-15.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013-14 |  | 2014-15 |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 | 82.8 | 33 | 90.3 | 31 | 100 | 38 |
| 8 | - | - | 72.4 | 29 | 85.8 | 21 |
| All | 82.8 | 33 | 81.35 | 60 | 92.9 | 59 |

## Goal 3: Comparative Measure was

Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.

## METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

## RESULTS

2015-16 data for the District are not available.
2015-16 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students In At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
| 4 | 100 | 38 | Data Not Available |  |
| 8 | 85.8 | 21 |  |  |
| All | 92.9 | 59 |  |  |

## EVALUATION

The measure could not be determined.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## Science Performance of Charter School and Local District <br> by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their <br> Second Year Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2013-14$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $2014-15$ |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Charter <br> School | Local <br> District | Charter <br> School | Local <br> District | Charter <br> School | Local <br> District |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 82.8 | 70 | 90.3 | 68 | 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | - | 36 | 72.4 | 40 | 85.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All | 82.8 | 53 | 81.35 | 54 | 92.9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Absolute - Icahn $34^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school, averaged $92.9 \%$ proficiency. $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students achieved $100 \%$, while their peers in $8^{\text {th }}$ grade demonstrate 85.9\%.

Comparative - While 2015-16 data were not available for District 9, 2014-15 data support the conclusion that Icahn $34^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade students in at least their second year at the school outscored their District 9 peers.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at <br> least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New <br> York State examination. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at <br> least their second year and performing at proficiency on the <br> state exam will be greater than that of all students in the <br> same tested grades in the local school district. | N/A |

## ACTION PLAN

Efforts at ICAHN 3 will continue to ensure that our students are provided with available resources such as the TA program, afterschool and the Saturday Academy Program and their instruction is aligned with the NYS standards.

## NCLB

## Goal 4: NCLB

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

## Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

## METHOD

Because 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 state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind ("NCLB") accountability system.

## RESULTS

Icahn 3 Charter School's NCLB status this year was "Good Standing"

## EVALUATION

The measure was made.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Icahn 3 has maintained "Good Standing" status through each year of its existence.

## NCLB Status by Year

| Year | Status |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2013-14$ | Good Standing |
| $2014-15$ | Good Standing |
| $2015-16$ | Good Standing |

## APPENDIX A: HIGH SCHOOL GOALS AND MEASURES

Icahn 3 is a K-8 school, there are not high school goals, measures or performance data.

## APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

The following section contains a Parent Satisfaction optional goal, as well as examples of possible optional measures.

## Goal S: Parent Satisfaction

Parents will demonstrate strong support and commitment to the school.

## Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school's program based on a parent satisfaction survey.

## METHOD

A parent survey is provided to all parents/guardians of students who attend Icahn Charter School 3. The survey contains fifteen (15) questions on the school's performance with options to select from A to D, with $A$ equaling poor and $D$ equaling excellent. After the collection of the surveys, all questions are tallied with notification of how many surveys were not returned to the school. Below is a copy of the survey provided to the parents/guardians.

## RESULTS

In 2015-16, 64\% of parents demonstrated satisfaction with the school's programs based on the parent satisfaction survey.

## 2015-16 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

| Number of <br> Responses | Number of <br> Families | Response Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 134 | 210 | $64 \%$ |

## 2015-16 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

| Item | Percent of <br> Respondents <br> Satisfied |
| :--- | :---: |
| I feel respected by my child's teachers. (98) | $98 \%$ |
| Staff at this school work hard to build trusting relationships with <br> parents/guardians like me. (95) | $95 \%$ |
| School staff regularly communicate with parents/guardians about <br> how parents can help students learn. (93) | $93 \%$ |


| Parents/guardians are greeted warmly when they call or visit the <br> school. (93) | $93 \%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Teachers work closely with families to meet students' needs. (93) | $93 \%$ |

## EVALUATION

The measure was not met.

## Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

## METHOD

Tracking of ICAHN 3 students is maintained by the Principal, using attendance records, and interactions with parents.

## RESULTS

The retention rate at Icahn 3 for the reporting year was $90.7 \%$

| 2015-16 Student Retention Rate |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Students <br> Who Graduated in <br> $2013-14$ | Number of Students <br> Who Returned in <br> $2014-15$ | Retention Rate <br> 2014-15 Re-enrollment $\div$ <br> $(2013-14$ Enrollment - Graduates $)$ |
|  | 29 | 285 | $90.7 \%$ |

## EVALUATION

The measure was made.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

| Year | Retention Rate |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2013-14$ | $92.6 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ | $93.2 \%$ |
| $2015-16$ | $90.7 \%$ |

## Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 90 percent.

## METHOD

Tracking of ICAHN 3 students is maintained by the Principal, using attendance records, and interactions with parents.

## RESULTS

In 2015-16 Icahn 3 achieved an overall attendance percent of 95.73\%. All grades except 8 exceeded the $95 \%$ target.

## NCLB

## 2015-16 Attendance

| Grade | Average Daily <br> Attendance Rate |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $95.68 \%$ |
| 2 | $96.43 \%$ |
| 3 | $95.91 \%$ |
| 4 | $96.01 \%$ |
| 5 | $95.21 \%$ |
| 6 | $95.73 \%$ |
| 7 | $96.54 \%$ |
| 8 | $94.87 \%$ |
| Overall | $95.73 \%$ |

## EVALUATION

The measure was made in 2014-15 and 2015-16.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

| Year | Average Daily <br> Attendance Rate |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2013-14$ | $94.70 \%$ |
| $2014-15$ | $95.20 \%$ |
| $2015-16$ | $95.73 \%$ |


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

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.
    ${ }^{5}$ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ 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.

[^5]:    ${ }^{7}$ In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

[^7]:    ${ }^{9}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

[^8]:    ${ }^{10}$ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

