Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2007-08 School Year

Reader's Guide<br>SUNY Authorized Charter Schools

As set forth in the Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees, the single most important factor that the Charter Schools Institute and the State University Board of Trustees consider in making renewal determinations is the school's record in generating successful student achievement outcomes. In order to determine whether a school has met that high standard, each charter school that the State University Board of Trustees authorizes is required to enter into an accountability agreement, known as an Accountability Plan, which ultimately becomes part of its charter.

## The Charter Schools Institute closely monitors each school's progress toward achieving the goals outlined in its Accountability Plan.

In addition, as part of its annual reporting requirements, each SUNY authorized charter school must submit an Accountability Plan Progress Report which, from its vantage point, addresses each of the goals and outcome measures contained in its Accountability Plan. The information presented in these Progress Reports constitutes important evidence that a school is keeping its promises to its students, parents and community, and is critical to making its case for renewal at the end of its charter period. The most important parts of Progress Reports are student achievement results on state exams and other assessments. However, not all schools will have tested grade levels for a particular state exam. Each year, the state administers English language arts and mathematics tests to 3rd through 8th grade, science tests to the 4th and 8th grades, and social studies tests to the 5th and 8th grades.

Important Note: The Accountability Plan Progress Report is authored by the charter school. In reporting school progress toward meeting the outcome measures set forth in the Accountability Plan, schools are encouraged to build a case for the effectiveness of their program, and to lay the groundwork for writing a Renewal Application and ultimately for charter renewal. The school's evaluation of its own progress does not necessarily reflect the conclusions of the Institute. Further, the Institute does not affirm the completeness or accuracy of the report's data and may not endorse the school's characterization of the progress it has made toward achieving its Accountability Plan goals. Throughout the life of the school's charter, the Institute will visit each school, generating Institute School Visit Reports, and at the end of each charter period, a Renewal Report (select the <back> button in your browser to return to the school profile to see any/all available reports). These reports include detailed summaries of the Institute's observations of the school, as well as its evaluation of student performance and progress toward meeting the academic subject goals in its Accountability Plan.
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## INTRODUCTION

The mission of Village Academy is to prepare students of fine character to graduate from college and make a positive contribution to society. In order to accomplish this mission, we have established clear, measurable goals which are outlined in this document. The school leadership and faculty continually strive to maintain our community's focus on achieving these goals.

Harlem Village Academy opened in the fall of 2003 to its first class of fifth graders. The school currently serves approximately 240 students grades fifth through ninth.

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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2003-04$ |  |  |  |  |  | 73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 73 |
| $2004-05$ |  |  |  |  |  | 52 | 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| $2005-06$ |  |  |  |  |  | 62 | 42 | 46 |  |  |  |  |  | 150 |
| $2006-07$ |  |  |  |  |  | 68 | 52 | 43 | 43 |  |  |  |  | 206 |
| $2007-08$ |  |  |  |  |  | 76 | 46 | 46 | 31 | 36 |  |  |  | 235 |

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

## Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will meet or exceed state performance standards for mastery of skills and content knowledge in the area of English language arts. Students will also demonstrate proficiency in advanced skills in the area of English language arts necessary for admission into and success in college.

## Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, $75 \%$ of tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will score proficient (i.e. at level three or above) on the New York State English language arts (ELA) assessment.

## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in fifth through eighth grade in January 2008. Each student's raw score has been converted to a gradespecific 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.

> 2007-08 State English Language Arts Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total <br> Tested | Not Tested $^{1}$ |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ELL | Absent | Enrolled |  |$|$|  | 73 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 31 |
| All | 190 | 0 | 0 | 192 |

## Results

The table below shows the results of the 2008 State English language arts exam. Overall, $69.5 \%$ of students in at least their second year at the school scored proficient.

[^0]
## Harlem Village Academy Performance on 2007-08 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 | 0.0\% | 34.7\% | 65.3\% | 0.0\% | 65.3\% | 72 |
|  | Students in At Least 2nd Year | 0.0\% | 36.4\% | 63.6\% | 0.0\% | 63.6\% | 11 |
| 6 | All Students | 0.0\% | 37.2\% | 62.8\% | 0.0\% | 62.8\% | 43 |
|  | Students in At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0.0\% | 37.2\% | 62.8\% | 0.0\% | 62.8\% | 43 |
| 7 | All Students | 0.0\% | 14.0\% | 86.0\% | 0.0\% | 86.0\% | 43 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0.0\% | 14.0\% | 86.0\% | 0.0\% | 86.0\% | 43 |
| 8 | All Students | 0.0\% | 41.9\% | 51.6\% | 6.5\% | 58.1\% | 31 |
|  | Students in At Least 2nd Year | 0.0\% | 41.9\% | 51.6\% | 6.5\% | 58.1\% | 31 |
| All | All Students | 0.0\% | 31.7\% | 67.2\% | 1.1\% | 68.3\% | 189 |
|  | Students in At Least 2nd Year | 0.0\% | 30.5\% | 68.0\% | 1.6\% | 69.5\% | 128 |

## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded the measure in $7^{\text {th }}$ grade, but not in $5^{\text {th }}$, $6^{\text {th }}$ or $8^{\text {th }}$. The seventh grade class exceeded the target score by 11 percentage points. $19 \%$ of the $8^{\text {th }}$ grade class scored a 649 , one point from proficient.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the percentage of students in at least their second year scoring proficient on the New York State ELA exam. The school's percentage of students scoring proficient has increased each year.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2003-04$ |  | $2004-05$ |  | $2005-06$ |  | $2006-07$ |  | 2007-08 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $63.6 \%$ | 11 |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | $61.4 \%$ | 44 | $66.7 \%$ | 36 | $62.8 \%$ | 43 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | $57.9 \%$ | 38 | $53.1 \%$ | 32 | $86.0 \%$ | 43 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $56.4 \%$ | 39 | $58.1 \%$ | 31 |
| All |  |  |  |  | $58.1 \%$ | 86 | $58.4 \%$ | 113 | $69.5 \%$ | 128 |

## 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 2007-08 is 133. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

## Results

The table below shows the calculation of the school's Performance Index.

## Calculation of 2007-08 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

| Grades | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |
| $5^{\text {th }-8^{\text {th }}}$ | $0 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $1 \%$ |  |

## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin. The Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for ELA in the 2007-2008 school year was 133. Harlem Village Academy's Performance Index was 168.

## Additional Evidence

The school's Performance index increased 14 points in the 2007-2008 school year. The percentage of students scoring at level 1 and 2 decreased from $45 \%$ in the 2006-2007 school year to $32 \%$ in the 2007-2008 school year. Every student scored at least at level 2 in the current year.

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

| Year | Grades $^{2}$ | Number <br> Tested | Percent of Students at Each Performance |  |  |  | PI | AMO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |  |
| $2005-06$ | $5-7$ | 151 | $1 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $2 \%$ | 155 | 122 |
| $2006-07$ | $5-8$ | 196 | $2 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 154 | 122 |
| $2007-08$ | $5-8$ | 189 | $0 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $1 \%$ | 168 | 133 |

## Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

## Method

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. 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 table below shows the results of the 2007-2008 ELA exam for Harlem Village Academy and Community School District 5.

## 2007-08 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 <br> In At Least 2nd Year | All District Students |  |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 5 | $63.6 \%$ | 11 | $55.3 \%$ | 1062 |
| 6 | $62.8 \%$ | 43 | $47.9 \%$ | 1273 |
| 7 | $86.0 \%$ | 43 | $51.6 \%$ | 1185 |
| 8 | $58.1 \%$ | 31 | $29.5 \%$ | 1220 |
| All | $\mathbf{6 9 . 5 \%}$ | 128 | $\mathbf{4 5 . 7 \%}$ | 4740 |

[^1]2007-2008 NYS ELA
Harlem Village Academy and Community School Dist. 5


## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin at every grade level. 69.5\% of the school's students who have been enrolled for two or more years scored proficient, 24 percentage points than the local community school district. The school's seventh graders who have been enrolled for two or more years were significantly more likely to score proficient than the local school district. $86.0 \%$ scored proficient compared to District 5's score of $51.6 \%$.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of Harlem Village Academy and Community School District 5 on the New York State ELA exams from 2005-2006 to 2007-2008. Harlem Village Academy has had a higher percentage of students scoring proficient than the local community school district in each tested grade since the first administration of the ELA test.

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

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2003-04 |  | 2004-05 |  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  |
|  | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63.6\% | 55.3\% |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 61.4\% | 34.9\% | 66.7\% | 38.4\% | 62.8\% | 47.9\% |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 57.9\% | 26.2\% | 53.1\% | 34.4\% | 86.0\% | 51.6\% |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 56.4\% | 26.2\% | 58.1\% | 29.5\% |
| All |  |  |  |  | 58.1\% | 30.3\% | 58.4\% | 32.6\% | 69.5\% | 45.7\% |

## 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 2007-08 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2006-07 results, the most recent ones available.

## Results

The table below shows the Comparative Performance Analysis for the 2006-2007 school year.
2006-07 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 |  |  |
| 5 |  | 64 | 54.7 | 62.2 | -7.5 | -. 57 |


| 6 |  | 48 | 54.2 | 55.0 | -.9 | -.05 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 40 | 57.5 | 48.7 | 8.8 | .52 |
|  |  | 42 | 59.5 | 48.3 | 11.2 | .65 |
| 8 | 53.0 | 194 | 56.2 | 54.6 | 1.5 | .05 |

## School's Overall Comparative Performance:

About the same as expected

## Evaluation

Data is not yet available to determine whether the school met this measure. Although the Institute found that the school performed "about the same as expected" in 2007, a closer look at the data shows that seventh and eighth grade performed "higher than expected". The chart below shows the school's effect size as students progress through the grades and the school's academic interventions begin to take effect.

## 2007 New York State ELA Exam Comparative Performance



The fifth graders' low performance is to be expected; Harlem Village Academy actively recruits students from New York City's most underperforming school districts. Our school serves fifth graders who enter the school with significant academic challenges and gaps in basic skills. Harlem Village Academy teaches those basic skills so that, over time, students are able to score proficient. The school's "effect size" increases with each year that students have been enrolled.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of the Institute's regression analysis for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. Harlem Village Academy seventh and eighth graders scored higher than expected in both years.

## English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent <br> Eligible for <br> Free Lunch | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2005-06$ | $5-7$ | 55.3 | 151 | 55.6 | 48.4 | .24 |
| $2006-07$ | $5-8$ | 53.0 | 194 | 56.2 | 54.6 | .05 |

## 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 2007-08 and also have a state exam score in 2006-07. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2006-07 and 75 percent proficient in 2007-08. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2006-07, 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

The table below shows the results of the Harlem Village Academy grade-level cohorts on the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 New York State ELA exam.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2006-07 to 2007-08

| Grade | Cohort | Percent at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  | Target |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Size | $2006-07$ | Target | $2007-08$ | Achieved |
| 5 | 11 | $9.1 \%$ | $42.0 \%$ | $63.6 \%$ | Yes |
| 6 | 43 | $62.8 \%$ | $68.9 \%$ | $62.8 \%$ | No |
| 7 | 43 | $51.2 \%$ | $63.1 \%$ | $86.0 \%$ | Yes |
| 8 | 30 | $66.7 \%$ | $70.8 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | No |
| All | 127 | $55.1 \%$ | $65.1 \%$ | $70.1 \%$ | Yes |

## Evaluation

Village Academy students exceeded the Added Value measure in fifth and seventh grades, but not in sixth or eighth. The seventh grade cohort exceeded their target scored and showed an improvement of $34.8 \%$. The fifth grade cohort showed an improvement of $54.5 \%$. The sixth and eighth grade cohorts did not meet their target scores.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of grade-level cohorts in the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school years. In 2007-2008, half of the schools grade-level cohorts met their target score, an improvement from 20062007.

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

| School Year | Cohort <br> Grades | Number of <br> Cohorts Meeting <br> Target | Number of <br> Cohorts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | $6^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 1 | 3 |
| $2007-08$ | $5^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 2 | 4 |

## Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

As shown below, Harlem Village Academy met or partially met all four of the outcome measures for which data is available from the 2006-2007 school year. On the New York State ELA exam, the school performance exceeded that of the local community school district and New York City by a wide margin and the school met its No Child Left Behind accountability measure. The school met the absolute and growth measures only in certain grades, and is planning improvements to the ELA program that we anticipate will allow all students to reach that measure in subsequent years.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are <br> enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or <br> above Level 3 on the New York State examination. | Met in seventh grade <br> Did not meet in fifth, <br> sixth or eighth |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) <br> on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable <br> Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB <br> accountability system. | Exceeded |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are | Exceeded by a wide |

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|c|l|c|}\hline & \begin{array}{l}\text { enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or } \\
\text { above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that } \\
\text { of all students in the same tested grades in the local school } \\
\text { district. }\end{array} & \text { margin } \\
\hline \text { Comparative } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of } \\
\text { performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect } \\
\text { Size. }\end{array} & \text { Data not available } \\
\hline \text { Growth } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Each year, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half } \\
\text { the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the } \\
\text { previous year's State exam and } 75 \text { percent at or above } \\
\text { Level 3 on the current year's State exam. }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Met in fifth and } \\
\text { seventh grade }\end{array}
$$ <br>
Did not meet in sixth <br>

or eighth\end{array}\right]\)

## MATHEMATICS

## Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will meet or exceed state standards for mastery of skills and content knowledge in the area of mathematics. Students will demonstrate further proficiency in advanced skills in mathematics necessary for admission into and success in college.

## 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 fifth through eighth grade in March 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.

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.

## 2007-08 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total <br> Tested | Not Tested ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Total <br> Enrolled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IEP | ELL | Absent |  |
| 5 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 72 |
| 6 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 43 |
| 7 | 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| 8 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| All | 189 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 190 |

## Results

The table below shows the results of the 2008 State math exam. Overall, $96.9 \%$ of students in at least their second year at the school scored proficient.

> Charter School Performance on 2007-08 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 | 2.8\% | 23.9\% | 63.4\% | 9.9\% | 73.2\% | 72 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 18.2\% | 81.8\% | 0\% | 81.8\% | 11 |
| 6 | All Students | 0\% | 4.7\% | 86.0\% | 9.3\% | 95.3\% | 43 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 4.7\% | 86.0\% | 9.3\% | 95.3\% | 43 |
| 7 | All Students | 0\% | 0\% | 72.7\% | 27.3\% | 100\% | 44 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 0\% | 72.7\% | 27.3\% | 100\% | 44 |
| 8 | All Students | 0\% | 0\% | 76.7\% | 23.3\% | 100\% | 31 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 0\% | 76.7\% | 23.3\% | 100\% | 31 |
| All | All Students | 1.1\% | 10.1\% | 72.9\% | 16.0\% | 88.8\% | 1884 |
|  | Students in At Least 2nd Year | 0\% | 3.1\% | 78.9\% | 18.0\% | 96.9\% | 128 |

## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin. Every seventh and eighth grade student scored proficient on the 2008 math exam, and one quarter scored at the advance level. $95.3 \%$ of sixth graders also scored proficient. Overall, $96.9 \%$ of students enrolled in at least their second year scored proficient.

## Additional Evidence

[^2]The table below shows the percentage of students in at least their second year scoring proficient on the New York State math exam. The school's percentage of students scoring proficient has increased each year. Over $90 \%$ of students enrolled in at least their second year scored proficient in both of the last two years.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2003-04 |  | 2004-05 |  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 81.8\% | 11 |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 78.9\% | 38 | 86.1\% | 36 | 95.3\% | 43 |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 95.5\% | 44 | 97.0\% | 33 | 100\% | 44 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | 39 | 100\% | 31 |
| All |  |  |  |  | 86.0\% | 86 | 92.1\% | 114 | 96.9\% | 128 |

## 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 2007-08 is 102 . 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 table below shows the calculation of the school's Performance Index.

## Calculation of 2007-08 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)



## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin. The Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) for math in the 2007-2008 school year was 102. Harlem Village Academy's Performance Index was 188.

## Additional Evidence

As shown in the table below, the school's Performance index has increased each year. The percentage of students scoring at level 1 and 2 decreased from $45 \%$ in the $2005-2006$ school year to $11 \%$ in the 20072008 school year.

## Mathematics Performance Index (PI) and Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) by School Year

| Year | Grades | Number <br> Tested | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  | PI | AMO |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |  |  |
| 2005-06 | $5^{\text {th }}$-7th | 151 | 1\% | 43\% | 54\% | 2\% | 155 | 86 |
| 2006-07 | $5^{\text {th }} 8^{\text {th }}$ | 193 | 1\% | 15\% | 71\% | 13\% | 183 | 86 |
| 2007-08 | $5^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 188 | 1\% | 10\% | 72\% | 16\% | 188 | 102 |

## Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will score at least 65 on a New York State Regents mathematics exam by the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.

## Method

The school administered the New York State Regents Integrated Algebra exams. Regents are scored on a scale from 0 to 100 , and students must score at least 65 to pass. This measure requires students in each Accountability Cohort to pass any one of the Regents mathematics exams by their fourth year in the cohort. Students may have taken a particular Regents mathematics exam multiple times or have taken multiple mathematics exams; once they passed a mathematics exam, their performance on subsequent exams did not affect their status as passing. Students had until the summer of their fourth year to pass a mathematics exam.

## Results

This measure is not yet applicable, but the 2007 Accountability Cohort has exceeded this measure three years early.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of the Integrated Algebra Regents exam administered this spring. $97.1 \%$ of the ninth grade class passed on their first attempt.

## Mathematics Regents Passing Rate by Accountability Cohort and Year

| Cohort | 2007-08 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cohort <br> Size | Percent <br> Passing |
| 2007 | 34 | $97.1 \%$ |

## 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

The table below shows the results of the 2007-2008 math exam for Harlem Village Academy and Community School District 5.

| 2007-08 State Mathematics Exam |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |
| Grade | Charter School Students <br> In At Least $2^{\text {nd }}$ Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 5 | 81.8\% | 11 | 61.1\% | 1086 |
| 6 | 95.3\% | 43 | 65.6\% | 1303 |
| 7 | 100\% | 44 | 59.6\% | 1198 |
| 8 | 100\% | 31 | 46.4\% | 1235 |
| All | 96.9\% | 128 | 58.2\% | 4822 |

2007-2008 NYS Math Harlem Village Academy and Community School Dist. 5


## Evaluation

Evaluation: Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin. Every grade level outperformed the local school district. The Harlem Village Academy eighth grade class also had the highest percentage of students scoring proficient of any non-selective school in New York City for the second year in a row.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of Harlem Village Academy and Community School District 5 on the New York State math exams from 2005-2006 to 2007-2008. Harlem Village Academy has outperformed the local community school district in each tested grade since the first administration of the math test.

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

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2003-04 |  | 2004-05 |  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  |
|  | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local <br> District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 81.8\% | 61.1\% |
| 6 |  |  |  |  | 78.9\% | 45.2\% | 86.1\% | 55.3\% | 95.3\% | 65.6\% |
| 7 |  |  |  |  | 95.5\% | 34.0\% | 97.0\% | 44.9\% | 100\% | 59.6\% |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% | 31.7\% | 100\% | 46.4\% |
| All |  |  |  |  | 86.0\% | 39.4\% | 92.1\% | 43.3\% | 96.9\% | 58.2\% |

## 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 2007-08 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2006-07 results, the most recent ones available.

## Results

The table below shows the Comparative Performance Analysis for the 2006-2007 school year.
2006-07 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 |  |  |
| 5 |  | 64 | 67.2 | 71.3 | -4.1 | -. 24 |
| 6 |  | 46 | 82.6 | 65.0 | 17.6 | . 95 |
| 7 |  | 41 | 97.6 | 57.6 | 40.0 | 1.85 |


| 8 |  | 42 | 97.6 | 49.6 | 48.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All | 53.0 | 193 | 83.9 | 62.2 | 21.8 |

## School's Overall Comparative Performance: <br> Higher than expected to a large degree

## Evaluation

Evaluation: The data is not yet available to determine whether the school met this measure. Harlem Village Academy students scored "Higher Than Expected to a Large Degree" on the 2007 New York State math test.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of the Institute's regression analysis for the 2005-2006 and 2006-2007 school years. Harlem Village Academy scored higher than expected in both years.

## Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent <br> Eligible for <br> Free Lunch | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2005-06$ | $5^{\text {th }-7 \text { th }}$ | 55.3 | 153 | 81.7 | 51.8 | 1.30 |
| $2006-07$ | $5^{\text {th }}-8^{\text {th }}$ | 53.0 | 193 | 83.9 | 62.2 | 1.03 |

## 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 2007-08 and also have a state exam score in 2006-07. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2006-07 and 75 percent proficient in 2007-08. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2006-07, 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

The table below shows the results of the Harlem Village Academy grade-level cohorts on the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 New York State math exam.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2006-07 to 2007-08

| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  | Target Achieved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2006-07 | Target | 2007-08 |  |
| 5 | 11 | 36.4\% | 55.7\% | 81.8\% | Yes |
| 6 | 43 | 74.4\% | 74.7\% | 95.3\% | Yes |
| 7 | 44 | 84.1\% | 84.2\% | 100\% | Yes |
| 8 | 30 | 96.7\% | 96.8\% | 100\% | Yes |
| All | 128 | 79.7\& | 79.8\% | 96.9\% | Yes |

## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin at all grade levels. Each grade-level cohort showed improvement from the 2006 school year. Fully $100 \%$ of the seventh and eighth grade cohorts, $95.3 \%$ of the sixth grade cohort and $81.8 \%$ of the fifth grade cohort scored proficient on the 2008 NYS math exam.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of grade-level cohorts in the 2006-2007 and 2007-2008 school years. Every grade-level cohort met the target score in both years.

## Cohort Performance on Mathematics Exam

 Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year| School Year | Cohort <br> Grades | Number of <br> Cohorts Meeting <br> Target | Number of <br> Cohorts |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2006-07$ | $6^{\text {th }-88^{\text {th }}}$ | 3 | 3 |
| $2007-08$ | $5^{\text {th }} 8^{\text {th }}$ | 4 | 4 |

## Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Village Academy students have consistently shown strong achievement in mathematics. $100 \%$ of Harlem Village Academy seventh and eighth grade students scored proficient on the New York State mathematics exam. This mark made Harlem Village Academy eighth grades students the highest achieving of any openenrollment eighth grade class in the city for the second year in a row. The eighth grade class was also the first
class of students in all of Harlem history to score $100 \%$ proficient on the math exam. Harlem Village Academy met every mathematics measure in their accountability plan.

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

## SCIENCE

## Goal 3: Science

Students will meet and exceed state standards for mastery of skills and content knowledge in the area of science.

## Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in $8^{\text {th }}$ grade in spring 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

The table below shows the results of the 2008 State science exam. Every student scored proficient and more than half scored at the advanced level.

## Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | Population | Percent at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  | Number Tested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 3/4 |  |
| 8 | All Students | 0\% | 0\% | 48.3\% | 51.7\% | 100\% | 29 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 0\% | 48.3\% | 51.7\% | 100\% | 29 |

## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin. Every eighth grader scored proficient on the 2008 science exam. More than half, $51.3 \%$, scored at the advanced level.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of the 2007 and 2008 New York State science exams. The percent of students scoring proficient increased by $24 \%$ from 2007 to 2008.

## Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2003-04 |  | 2004-05 |  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 75.6\% | 37 | 100\% | 29 |

## 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

Local community school district data is not available at this time.

## Summary

Village Academy students have consistently shown strong achievement in science. 100\% of Harlem Village Academy eighth grade students scored proficient on the New York State science exam. The school met every measure for which data is available.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are <br> enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or <br> above Level 3 on the New York State examination. | Exceeded by a wide <br> margin |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are <br> enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or <br> above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that <br> of all students in the same tested grades in the local school <br> district. | Data not available |

## SOCIAL STUDIES

## Goal 4: Social Studies

Students will meet and exceed state standards for mastery of skills and content knowledge in the area of social studies.

[^3]
## Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in 8th grade in June 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

The table below shows the results of the 2008 State social studies exam. Every student scored proficient and nearly one-third scored at the advanced level.

## Charter School Performance on 2007-08 State Social Studies Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | Population | Percent at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  | Number Tested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | Level 3/4 |  |
| 8 | All Students | 0\% | 3.4\% | 65.5\% | 31.0\% | 96.6\% | 29 |
|  | Students in At Least 2 ${ }^{\text {nd }}$ Year | 0\% | 3.4\% | 65.5\% | 31.0\% | 96.6\% | 29 |

## Evaluation

Harlem Village Academy exceeded this measure by a wide margin. $96.6 \%$ of eighth graders scored proficient on the 2008 social studies exam.

## Additional Evidence

The table below shows the results of the 2007 and 2008 New York State social studies exams. The percent of students scoring proficient increased by $34 \%$ from 2007 to 2008.

## Social Studies Performance

by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2003-04 |  | 2004-05 |  | 2005-06 |  | 2006-07 |  | 2007-08 |  |
|  | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { Tested } \end{aligned}$ | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 62.1\% | 37 | 96.6\% | 29 |

## 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

Local community school district data is not available at this time.

## Summary

Harlem Village Academy met every measure for which data was available. $96.6 \%$ of students scored proficient on the New York State social studies exam, and nearly one-third scored at the advance level.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in <br> at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the <br> New York State examination. | Exceeded by a <br> wide margin |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in <br> at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on <br> the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the <br> same tested grades in the local school district. | Data not <br> available |

## NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB
Students at Village Academy will meet and exceed state standards in all areas required by NCLB accountability guidelines.

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

## Method

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

## Results

The school exceeded the Annual Measurable Objective in both ELA and mathematics. The school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" for the 2007-2008 school year.

## Evaluation

## Harlem Village Academy met this measure.

## Additional Evidence

The school has been in good standing every year.
NCLB Status by Year

| Year | Status |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2005-06$ | Good Standing |
| $2006-07$ | Good Standing |
| $2007-08$ | Good Standing |


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

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

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam
    ${ }^{4}$ The state has not reported the score of one student who was tested

[^3]:    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.

