

Accountability Plan Progress Reports for the 2008-09 School Year

Reader's Guide

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, up through 2009-10, 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.

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School

2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

08/03/2009

Mr. Kay Madati – Board President

856 Quincy Street

Brooklyn, New York 11221

(p) 718.246.5681

(f) 718.246.5864

Dr. Thomas DeMarco prepared this 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Mr. Kay Madati	President
James Bernard	Vice President
Corey Martin	Treasurer
Erika Humphrey	Secretary
Stephanie Cuba	Trustee
Carol Schulhof	Trustee
Omar Wasow	Trustee

Contents

Introduction 1

English Language Arts..... 2

Mathematics..... 12

Science..... 21

Social Studies 24

Additional Required Academic Measure 27

Introduction

The State University of New York's Board of Trustees ("SUNY") authorized Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School ("Brooklyn Excelsior") in March 2002. After taking a planning year, the school opened its doors to 206 K-4 students in the fall of 2003. Brooklyn Excelsior was located in a temporary facility during its first year of operation. The following year the school moved into its permanent facility located at 856 Quincy Street in Brooklyn, New York. In the fall of 2007, Brooklyn Excelsior added the 8th grade. During the 2008-09 school year, Brooklyn Excelsior served 720 students in grades K-8.

Brooklyn Excelsior has improved its performance since it opened in 2003. Following are some highlights in regards to the school's performance:

- Brooklyn Excelsior received a five-year renewal without conditions from the Charter Schools Institute (CSI).
- The school was recognized by CSI for being one of six schools (out of 15 that applied) to receive a full-term renewal in 2008-09.
- Brooklyn Excelsior was named a "rapidly improving" school for the 2006-07 school year by the New York State Education Department.

We are pleased with Brooklyn Excelsior's progress and will work to ensure all students continue to grow and learn.

Brooklyn Excelsior's student body is comprised of 94% Black, 5% Hispanic, and 1% American Indian/Alaskan or Asian/Pacific Islander. Just over ninety-five percent of the students qualified for the National School Lunch Program.

The mission of Brooklyn Excelsior is:

"Working in partnership with parents and community, Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School will offer a challenging character-based education by providing a strong curriculum and an atmosphere of high expectations."

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2003-04	38	40	47	44	43					212
2004-05	113	98	75	76	74	50				486
2005-06	98	97	98	74	67	67	49			550
2006-07	77	97	98	97	70	69	70	41		619
2007-08	78	74	94	94	100	71	53	54	38	656
2008-09	88	80	80	103	109	97	68	45	50	720

Note: Enrollment for years 2003-04 through 2007-08 is based on enrollment at the end of the school year. Enrollment for 2008-09 is based on the school's enrollment on October 1, 2008.

English Language Arts

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Language Arts.

Background

The English Language Arts (“ELA”) curriculum provides students with the skills, strategies, and knowledge necessary for success in reading, writing, speaking, listening, and viewing. Indeed, a student’s mastery in all areas of ELA is a key component for learning in every content area. By interacting with a wide variety of texts, students develop their ability to think critically, communicate effectively, and make connections to the world around them.

Early reading instruction focuses on the building blocks of reading – phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency. These building blocks lay the foundation for the intellectual processes necessary for students to remember, understand, analyze, evaluate, and apply the ideas they encounter while reading.

In all grade levels, students read and view a variety of high-quality classic and contemporary texts, informational texts, and media (print and non-print). Students engage in the writing process to demonstrate their thinking and individual voice, producing works that include narrative, persuasive, expository, and expressive texts. Through writing and explicit instruction, students learn proper English language conventions and usage, including spelling, vocabulary, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and penmanship.

The ELA curriculum also provides students with speaking, listening, and viewing instruction and practice to help foster the critical communication skills necessary in today’s world.

- I. Absolute Measure:** Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of third through eighth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) ELA assessment.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in third through eighth grade in January 2009. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested			Total Enrolled*
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	99	0	0	0	99
4	107	0	0	0	107
5	96	0	0	0	96
6	69	0	0	0	69
7	44	0	0	0	44
8	50	0	0	0	50
All	465	0	0	0	465

*Total Enrolled based on the total number of students enrolled on the date of the ELA exam.

Results

Overall, Brooklyn Excelsior had 84% of students in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 on the 2008-09 administration of the ELA exam. Over 80% of students (all and second year students) in grades three through six were identified as proficient on the exam. Notably, over 90% of students in fifth and sixth grade performed at or above Level 3.

**Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
3	All Students	3%	13%	70%	14%	84%	99
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	2%	13%	70%	14%	84%	83
4	All Students		11%	83%	6%	89%	107
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		12%	82%	6%	88%	85
5	All Students		8%	75%	17%	92%	96
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		8%	74%	17%	92%	86
6	All Students		4%	91%	4%	96%	69
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		5%	91%	5%	95%	65
7	All Students		34%	61%	5%	66%	44
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		34%	61%	5%	66%	44
8	All Students		38%	62%		62%	50
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year		39%	61%		61%	49
All	All Students	1%	15%	75%	9%	84%	465
	Students in At Least 2nd Year	0%	16%	75%	9%	84%	412

Evaluation

The absolute measure was met. Of the students tested who were enrolled in at least their second year, 84% performed at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA exam.

Additional Evidence

The percentage of students enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 has increased by over 300% since 2004-05. The school increased the percentage of students performing at or above Level 3 by 14 percentage points from 2006-07 to 2007-08 and by 13 percentage points from 2007-08 to 2008-09.

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									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
3			63%	51	59%	80	77%	83	84%	83
4	23%	35	60%	55	69%	52	71%	90	88%	85
5			65%	46	48%	44	92%	59	92%	86
6			50%	40	60%	50	51%	53	95%	65
7					41%	32	75%	59	66%	44
8							49%	37	61%	49
All	23%	35	60%	192	57%	258	71%	381	84%	412

- II. **Absolute Measure:** Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYSTP ELA assessment will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year's English language arts AMO, which for 2008-09 is 133. The PI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 200.

Results

During the 2008-09 school year, only 1% of students in grades three through eight performed at Level 1 on the ELA exam. A majority of the students (84%) performed at Level 3 and Level 4, with 15% of students performing at Level 2. The school had a PI of 183 for the 2008-09 school year.

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

Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3-8	1%	15%	75%	9%	465

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The school's PI was 183; therefore, the school exceeded the state's AMO by 50 points.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior exceeded the state's AMO in 2005-06, 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09. The school's PI remained stable during the 2005-06 and 2006-07 school years, but it increased during the 2007-08 and 2008-09 school year. Further, the school has seen the following decreases/increases since 2005-06: the percentage of students performing at Level 1 has decreased from 6% to 1%; the percentage of students performing at Level 2 has

decreased from 34% to 15%; the percentage of students performing at Level 3 has increased from 56% to 75%; and the percentage of students performing at Level 4 has increased from 4% to 9%. This indicates that more students are performing at Levels 3 and 4 with less students performing at Levels 1 and 2.

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

Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2005-06	3-6	256	6%	34%	56%	4%	153	122
2006-07	3-7	354	3%	43%	51%	3%	151	122
2007-08	3-8	421	2%	26%	67%	5%	170	133
2008-09	3-8	465	1%	15%	75%	9%	183	133

- III. 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 percentage of students enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 was 84% for Brooklyn Excelsior; the percentage of students in District 16 performing at or above Level 3 was 60%. Brooklyn Excelsior outperformed the local District at each grade level and as an aggregate.

**2008-09 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	84%	83	64%	865
4	88%	85	63%	909
5	92%	86	71%	856
6	95%	65	57%	694
7	66%	44	59%	810
8	61%	49	43%	821
All	84%	412	60%	4955

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this comparative measure. The school exceeded the District's aggregate performance by 24 percentage points. Most notably, the sixth grade class of students enrolled in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior outperformed the District by 38 percentage points.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has met this measure for the last four school years.

English Language Arts Performance of charter School and Local District By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2 nd Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3			63%	44%	59%	48%	77%	52%	84%	64%
4	23%	46%	60%	44%	69%	50%	71%	56%	88%	63%
5			65%	43%	48%	43%	92%	63%	92%	71%
6			50%	30%	60%	29%	51%	33%	95%	57%
7					41%	28%	75%	45%	66%	59%
8							49%	29%	61%	43%
All	23%	46%	60%	40%	57%	40%	71%	46%	84%	60%

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

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school's actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of poverty data, the 2008-09 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2007-08 results; the most recent ones available.

Results

Brooklyn Excelsior's Effect Size was higher than expected to a large degree for 2007-08. The predicted percentage of students performing at Levels 3 and 4 was 49.62. The actual percentage of students at Levels 3 and 4 was 71.33. The school exceeded the predicted percentage by 21.70 percentage points. The school's Effect Size was 1.47, thus performing higher than expected.

2007-08 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3 & 4		Difference Between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		97	76.30	51.08	25.22	1.85
4		102	70.60	52.17	18.43	1.23
5		72	91.60	61.58	30.02	2.06
6		54	50.00	42.17	7.83	0.47
7		59	74.60	48.01	26.59	1.64
8		38	47.40	29.52	17.88	1.22
All	86.96	422	71.33	49.62	21.70	1.47

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

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The Effect Size was 1.47, which is higher than expected to a large degree. Notably, all grades but the sixth grade had an Effect Size higher than expected to a large degree. Grade six had an Effect Size that was higher than expected to a small degree. Thus, all grades, and the school as a whole, performed better than predicted.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has performed better than predicted each year. In 2005-06, the school's Effect Size was 0.57, in 2006-07 the school's Effect Size was 0.44, and in 2007-08 the school's Effect Size was 1.47. Each year the Effect Size was higher than expected.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06	3-6	73%	255	59.6	48.9	0.57
2006-07	3-7	78%	354	54.2	47.4	0.44
2007-08	3-8	87%	422	71.3	49.6	1.47
2008-09	3-8				n/a	n/a

- V. **Value-Added Measure:** Each year, each grade-level cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2008-09 and also have a state exam score in 2007-08. It also includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2007-08 and 75 percent proficient in 2008-09. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2007-08, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. In addition,

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Brooklyn Excelsior had six cohorts; of the six cohorts tested, five cohorts achieved their target. The aggregate of all cohorts also achieved its target.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
4	85	78%	Positive growth	88%	Yes
5	84	71%	2%	92%	Yes
6	65	92%	Positive Growth	95%	Yes
7	44	43%	16%	66%	Yes
8	49	78%	Positive Growth	61%	No
All	327	74%	1%	83%	Yes

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior did not meet this measure. Five out of the six cohorts tested achieved their target; and the aggregate of the cohorts achieved their target. As mentioned, the criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference. While only one cohort did not meet its target, the cohort group as a whole increased the percentage of students performing at Levels 3 and 4 by nine percentage points.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior's cohort of students performing at or above Level 3 on the ELA exam have improved since 2006-07. In 2006-07, five cohorts were tested and one cohort met its target. During the 2007-08 school year, four of six cohorts met their target. In 2008-09, five out of the six cohorts met their target. This demonstrated growth over the previous year's results.

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

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2006-07	4-7	1	5
2007-08	4-8	4	6
2008-09	4-8	5	6

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Brooklyn Excelsior's student performance has increased since the 2006-07 administration of the ELA exam. The improvements made over the 2008-09 school year demonstrate that students are learning and achieving more.

Brooklyn Excelsior met its first absolute measure: 84% of students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3. The school also met its second absolute measure and its first comparative measure. The results for the 2008-09 regression analysis are not yet available, so the data reported is for the 2007-08 school year. Brooklyn Excelsior met the measure during the 2007-

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

08 school year. The Value-Added Measure was not met, but the school came very close to meeting the measure: five out of the six cohorts tested met their targets.

We recognize that the school needs to continue improving and increasing student performance. Since four of the five measures were met, we know that the accountability plan goal of having all students proficient in ELA has not been met. We will continue working actively to this end. See below for the initiatives we will put in place during the 2008-09 school year to increase student proficiency.

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

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior recognizes that the goal of having all students proficient in ELA has not been met. As a means to continue increasing student learning, the school identified specific areas of focus for each grade and created grade-level action plans to specifically address the areas in need of improvement.

Grade Level	Area of Focus	Action Plan
Kindergarten	Fluency and Vocabulary	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to fluency and vocabulary development. 2. Model instructional strategies of fluency, vocabulary and word structure, and concepts of print; as well as phonics and comprehension. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused, differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. 6. More focus on higher order thinking questions and wait time during read alouds and discussions. Writing will be incorporated into this by allowing for written responses as well as verbal responses.
1st Grade	Comprehension	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to comprehension and vocabulary and word structure. 2. Model instructional strategies of comprehension and vocabulary and word structure through the use of graphic organizers and use of context clues. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons.

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused, differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. 6. More focus on higher order thinking questions and wait time during read alouds and discussions. Writing will be incorporated into this by allowing for written responses as well as verbal responses.
2nd Grade	Competencies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to comprehension. 2. Model instructional strategies of comprehension with a focus on sequencing, identifying themes, and differentiating between fact and opinion. 3. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. 4. Use NWEA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused, differentiated instruction. 5. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from NWEA reports and formative assessment. 6. More focus on higher order thinking questions and wait time during read alouds and discussions. Writing will be incorporated into this by allowing for written responses as well as verbal responses.
3rd Grade	Competencies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan weekly grade level team meetings to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and daily editing. 2. Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. 3. Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts. 4. Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. 5. Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers 6. Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
4th Grade	Competencies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly grade level team meetings to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to comprehension and cause and effect. 2. Use of paraprofessionals to Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. 3. Apply state writing and editing rubrics to the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. 4. Use formative as well as summative assessments to evaluate student skills in writing, editing, and listening. 5. Use instructional coach to provide professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers 6. Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in comprehension skills.
5th Grade	Competencies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Weekly grade level team meetings to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to comprehension, diagramming sentences and text resources. 2. Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. 3. Instructional specialist will conduct training to incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program. 4. Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. 5. Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers 6. Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

6th Grade	Analysis and Evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and text resources. 2. Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. 3. Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. 4. Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. 5. Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers 6. Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
7th Grade	Analysis and Evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to daily editing, response journals, and other passages to promote writing and grammar. 2. Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. 3. Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. 4. Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. 5. Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers 6. Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.
8th Grade	Information and Understanding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to diagramming sentences and text resources. 2. Identify and provide targeted instruction for those students who fell below New York State ELA proficiency levels and below 50% tile levels on MAP assessments. 3. Incorporate state writing and editing rubrics into the teaching and assessment of Language Arts program, grades K-8. 4. Pre/Post test students in grades 2-8 on writing, editing, and listening assessments. 5. Professional development in teaching reading skills and teacher training on state extended writing response and editing rubrics using anchor papers 6. Use former New York State ELA assessment and complete item analyses to identify Title I students and differentiate instruction in areas of weakness.

Mathematics

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Mathematics.

Background

To prepare students for mathematical skills they will need in everyday life, as well as for the rigors of high school and post-high school mathematics, a strong mathematics curriculum that emphasizes computational and procedural skills, problem solving, communicating, reasoning and proof, making connections, and using representations is implemented.

As students gain fluency in computational and procedural skills, they develop a deeper understanding of the mathematical concepts and reasoning required for problem solving. Students learn to represent and communicate ideas through the use of signs, symbols, models, graphs, mathematical terms, and through writing. Students investigate and analyze problems and possibilities using logical thinking, reasoning, and proofs. Connections among mathematical ideas, as well as connections to other subject areas are explored. Mathematical thinking, problem solving, and reasoning skills and strategies are refined in topic areas.

- I. Absolute Measure:** Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of third through eighth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Mathematics assessment.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in third through eighth grade in March 2009. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

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

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

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	98	0	0	0	98
4	107	0	0	0	107
5	95	0	0	0	95
6	69	0	0	0	69
7	44	0	0	0	44
8	50	0	0	0	50
All	463	0	0	0	463

*Total Enrolled based on the total number of students enrolled on the date of the math exam.

Results

More than 75% of all students and students enrolled in at least their second year at

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

Brooklyn Excelsior performed at or above Level 3 on the New York state math exam, thus meeting the measure. The composite score for all grades was 95% of students performing at Level 3 or 4.

Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
3	All Students	0%	1%	66%	33%	99%	98
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0%	1%	66%	33%	99%	83
4	All Students	0%	1%	37%	62%	99%	107
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0%	0%	36%	64%	100%	85
5	All Students	0%	4%	51%	45%	96%	95
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0%	4%	49%	47%	96%	85
6	All Students	0%	0%	48%	52%	100%	69
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0%	0%	49%	51%	100%	65
7	All Students	0%	5%	61%	34%	95%	44
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0%	5%	61%	34%	95%	44
8	All Students	2%	26%	34%	38%	72%	50
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	2%	27%	35%	37%	71%	49
All	All Students	0%	5%	50%	46%	95%	463
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	0%	5%	50%	45%	95%	411

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met the absolute measure of having 75% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 on the math exam. Brooklyn Excelsior not only met the goal, but the students exceeded the goal by 20 percentage points. Nearly 100% of students performed at or above Level 3 on the math assessment. In grades four and six, 100% of students performed at Level 3 or 4. In grade three, 99% of second year students performed at Level 3 or 4.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has seen improvements each year. In 2004-05, 66% of students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3 on the math exam. The school improved its performance each year, ultimately having 95% of second year students perform at or above Level 3 on the 2008-09 math exam.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
3			86%	49	95%	78	99%	81	99%	83
4	66%	32	76%	54	88%	52	90%	89	100%	85
5			54%	46	81%	43	100%	58	96%	85
6			68%	40	80%	49	87%	53	100%	65
7					48%	31	75%	57	95%	44
8							73%	37	71%	49
All	66%	32	71%	189	83%	253	89%	375	95%	411

- II. Absolute Measure:** Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the NYSTP Mathematics assessment will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards all students being proficient by the year 2013-14. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal that 100 percent of students will ultimately be proficient in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Index (PI) value that equals or exceeds this year's mathematics AMO, which for 2008-09 is 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

Brooklyn Excelsior had all but 5% of its students perform at Level 3 or 4. Only 5% of the student body performed at Level 2 and no students performed at Level 1.

Calculation of 2008-09 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)					
Grades	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				Number Tested
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
3-8	0%	5%	50%	46%	463

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The school's PI for the 2008-09 school year was 197, exceeding the AMO by 95 points.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has exceeded the state's AMO each year since 2005-06. Most notably, in 2008-09, almost 50% of students performed at Level 4, a nearly 100% increase over the prior year's performance. As seen by the table below, the percentage of students scoring at Levels 1, 2, and 3 is decreasing. No students scored at Level 1, only 5% of students scored at Level 2, and 50% of students scored at Level 3. More students are moving from the Levels 1, 2, and 3 to Level 4.

Mathematics Performance Index (PI) and Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) by School Year								
Year	Grades	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level				PI	AMO
			Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		
2005-06	3-6	262	7%	23%	60%	10%	163	86
2006-07	3-7	349	1%	17%	59%	23%	181	86
2007-08	3-8	414	1%	10%	63%	26%	189	102
2008-09	3-8	463	0%	5%	50%	46%	197	102

- III. 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 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 percentage of Brooklyn Excelsior students enrolled in at least their second year performing at or above Level 3 was greater than the local district in every grade tested and as an aggregate.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	99%	83	90%	866
4	100%	85	81%	922
5	96%	85	79%	856
6	100%	65	64%	692
7	95%	44	69%	812
8	71%	49	61%	823
All	95%	411	74%	4971

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. In every grade tested, the percentage of second year students performing at or above Level 3 was higher than that of the local district. Notably, grade six outperformed District 16's grade six by 36 percentage points, and grade four outperformed District 16's grade four by 19 percentage points.

Additional Evidence

Students enrolled in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior have outperformed the local district every year. Brooklyn Excelsior continues to increase the percentage of students enrolled in at least their second year identified as proficient.

Mathematics Performance of charter School and Local District By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2 nd Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3			86%	59%	95%	72%	99%	83%	99%	90%
4	66%	65%	76%	54%	88%	59%	90%	75%	100%	81%
5			54%	46%	81%	58%	100%	68%	96%	79%
6			68%	34%	80%	42%	87%	52%	100%	64%
7					48%	35%	75%	56%	95%	69%
8							73%	41%	71%	61%
All	66%	65%	71%	48%	83%	54%	89%	63%	95%	74%

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

Method

The Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. Regression analysis is used to control for the percentage of students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State. The school's actual performance is then compared to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar free lunch statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3 is considered performing higher than expected to a small degree, which is the requirement for achieving this measure. Given the timing of the state's release of poverty data, the 2008-09 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2007-08 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

Brooklyn Excelsior's students performed better than predicted in every grade and as a composite on the math assessment. The school's predicted performance level was 68.45; their actual performance level was 89.60, thus performing better than predicted to a large degree.

2008-09 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3 & 4		Difference Between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		94	97.80	81.93	15.87	1.36
4		101	90.10	72.22	17.88	1.23
5		71	100.00	70.60	29.40	1.79
6		54	87.10	61.46	25.64	1.36
7		57	75.40	58.14	17.26	0.89
8		37	73.00	45.88	27.12	1.29
All	86.96	414	89.60	68.45	21.15	1.33

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

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The predicted performance level was 68.45, with the school achieving a performance level of 89.60. The difference between the actual and predicted was 21.15, thereby producing a large Effect Size of 1.33. The school, therefore, performed higher than expected to a large degree.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has performed better than predicted on the state math assessment each year that the comparative performance analysis has been completed. Notably, the school increased the Effect Size by over 100% from 2005-06 to 2007-08.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2005-06	3-6	73.3%	262	69.8	57.3	0.63
2006-07	3-7	77.8%	349	81.9	64.1	1.02
2007-08	3-8	87.0%	414	89.6	68.5	1.33
2008-09	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

- V. **Value-Added Measure:** Each year, each grade-level cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Mathematics exam and seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Mathematics exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds seventy-five percent (75%) at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2008-09 and also have a state exam score in 2007-08. It also includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for each grade-level cohort to halve the difference between the percentage of students proficient in 2007-08 and 75 percent proficient in 2008-09. If a cohort had already achieved 75 percent proficient in 2007-08, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. In addition, the aggregate of all cohorts is examined to determine the growth of all students who took a state exam in both years.

Results

Five of the six cohorts achieved their target scores. While one did not achieve the target score, grade four and six had 100% of its cohort students perform at or above Level 3, and grade five and seven had 95% or more of its cohorts students identified as proficient. The aggregate of all cohorts met their target—94% of students in the cohort performed at Level 3 or above.

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

Grade	Cohort Size	Percent at Levels 3 and 4			Target Achieved
		2007-08	Target	2008-09	
4	85	98%	Positive growth	100%	Yes
5	83	92%	Positive growth	96%	Yes
6	65	100%	Maintain	100%	Yes
7	44	84%	Positive growth	95%	Yes
8	48	75%	Positive growth	73%	No
All	325	91%	Positive growth	94%	Yes

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior did not meet the measure. Five of the six cohorts achieved their target score. Grade eight, while not showing growth, still had 73% of cohort students perform at Levels 3 and 4. Grade four and six, notably, had 100% of its students perform at Levels 3

and 4.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior's math scores have increased substantially in the past years. Due to this, many students were already performing at Level 3 or above on the state math assessment. In 2006-07 all cohorts met their targets; in 2007-08, four of the six cohorts met their targets; and in 2008-09 five of the six cohorts met their targets.

Cohort Performance on State Mathematics Exam Since the Advent of the Grades 3-8 Testing Program by School Year

School Year	Cohort Grades	Number of Cohorts Meeting Target	Number of Cohorts
2006-07	3-7	5	5
2007-08	3-8	4	6
2008-09	3-8	5	6

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Brooklyn Excelsior met four of the five measures. The school met both of its absolute measures and both of its comparative measures. While the school did not meet the value-added measure, five of the six cohorts did meet the measure, with two of the cohorts having 100% of students performing at Levels 3 or 4.

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

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior recognizes that the goal of having all students proficient in mathematics has not been met. As a means to continue increasing student learning, the school identified specific areas of focus for each grade and created grade-level action plans to specifically address the areas in need of improvement.

Grade Level	Area of Focus	Action Plan
Kindergarten	Number Sense and Number Systems	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to number sense and number systems. 2. Model instructional strategies on number sense and number systems daily through

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

		<p>the use of morning meeting calendar studies. (Focus on numbers 1-31)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused differentiated instruction. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary by measurement topics.
1st Grade	Addition and Subtraction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to addition and subtraction. Model instructional strategies on addition and subtraction with a focus on strategies to solve word problems. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. Use PGA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused differentiated instruction. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from PGA reports and formative assessment. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary by measurement topics.
2nd Grade	Measurement Systems	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Meet once a week with grade level team to examine student work and formative assessments in order to pull out areas of need. These areas of need will be the driving force for choosing the learning objectives and lesson planning with attention to measurement systems. Model instructional strategies on measurement focusing on defining various units of measurement, converting units, and estimating units. Utilize formative assessments on a regular basis in order to monitor students' progress and effectiveness of lessons. Use NWEA reports to identify students with common needs. This will facilitate more small group and center time with focused differentiated instruction. Utilize paraprofessionals to work with small groups based on common needs from NWEA reports and formative assessment. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary by measurement topics.
3rd Grade	Measurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Weekly meetings with grade level teams to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies, and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and using geometry and measurement in problem solving. Meet with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers weekly.. Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. Mentor teachers in math skills as part of on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
4th Grade	Measurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State Math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses Grade teacher meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants. Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and other objects to increase capacity and familiarity with

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

		measurement tools and integrate daily two step word problems
5th Grade	Measurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grade level team meetings to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and other objects to increase capacity and familiarity with measurement tools and using geometry in problem solving 2. Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State Math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP in measurement and geometry. 3. Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. 4. Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. 5. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. 6. Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants
6th Grade	Measurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and other objects to increase capacity and familiarity with measurement tools. 2. Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State Math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses 3. Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. 4. Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. 5. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. 6. Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
7th Grade	Measurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to integrating appropriate process and vocabulary to solve word problems. 2. Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State Math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses 3. Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. 4. Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. 5. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. 6. Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.
8th Grade	Measurement	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet once a week with grade level team to discuss lesson objectives, formative assessment strategies and instruction with attention to using standard and metric manipulatives and other objects to increase capacity and familiarity with measurement tools. 2. Identify students who fell below proficiency levels on New York State Math assessment and on the NWEA-MAP and analyze data on skill weaknesses 3. Weekly meetings with paraprofessionals and Title I coordinator to develop strategies to support classroom teachers. 4. Enhance classroom instruction by incorporating higher level thinking questions (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation) into all math lesson plans. 5. Build a math word wall to incorporate math vocabulary, by content strands, that students will encounter on the state test. 6. Each grade level (K-8) will receive on-going training in the five New York state standards of numbers and operations, measurement, geometry, algebra, and data analysis provided by the Principal , instructional team and paid consultants.

Science

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Science.

Background

An engaging science curriculum that encourages students to actively participate in scientific inquiry while developing scientific literacy is implemented at Brooklyn Excelsior. When participating in inquiry, students describe objects and events, ask questions, construct explanations, test those explanations against current scientific knowledge and communicate their ideas to others. This includes engaging all students with relevant, real-world activities that develop students' knowledge, communication skills and scientific process skills.

Through a wide range of content, students are given the opportunity to work extensively in a variety of inquiry-based settings, including investigative, collaborative and technological, with appropriate materials, measuring devices, and scientific instruments in order to develop the scientific thinking skills, behaviors, and science content knowledge needed for future success in any endeavor. Across all grade levels, students' scientific knowledge is developed in the areas of The Nature of Science, The Living Environment, Physical Science, and Earth and Space Science.

I. Absolute Measure: Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of students in each grade tested, who are enrolled in at least their second year, will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Science assessment.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in fourth and eighth grade in spring 2009. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

More than 75% of fourth grade and eighth grade students enrolled in at least their second year at Brooklyn Excelsior performed at or above Level 3 on the science exam. The composite score for grades four and eight was 88% of second year students performing at Level 3 or 4.

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

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
4	All Students	1%	2%	19%	78%	97%	106
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	1%	2%	21%	75%	96%	84
8	All Students	2%	24%	50%	24%	74%	50
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	2%	24%	51%	22%	73%	49
All	All Students	1%	9%	29%	61%	90%	156
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	2%	11%	32%	56%	88%	133

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this absolute measure. Brooklyn Excelsior not only met this measure, but the students exceeded the measure by 13 percentage points with 88% of second year students performing at Level 3 or 4.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has seen improvements year over year. In 2004-05, 48% of fourth grade students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3 on the science exam. The school improved its performance each year, ultimately having over 95% of fourth grade students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 for three consecutive years. The 2007-08 school year was the first year Brooklyn Excelsior served eighth grade students. In 2007-08, 76% of eighth grade students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3 on the exam. In 2008-09, 73% of eighth grade students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3 on the exam. As a composite, 88% of students enrolled in at least their second year performed at or above Level 3.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
4	48%	23	80%	50	98%	54	97%	86	96%	84
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	76%	37	73%	49
All	48%	23	80%	50	98%	54	90%	123	88%	133

- II. **Comparative Measure:** Each year in each grade tested, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State Exam will be greater than that of students in the respective grade 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

The state science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2009; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	96%	84	n/a	n/a
8	73%	49	n/a	n/a
All	88%	133	n/a	n/a

Brooklyn Excelsior Charter School 2008-09 Accountability Plan Progress Report

Evaluation

The state science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2009; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

Additional Evidence

The state science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2009; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

Science Performance of Charter School and Local District By Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2 nd Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	48%	51%	80%	60%	98%	57%	97%	63%	96%	n/a
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22%	76%	31%	73%	n/a
All	48%	51%	80%	60%	98%	47%	90%	53%	88%	n/a

Summary of the Science Goal

The state science assessment was administered between April and the first week of May of 2009; however, assessment results are not yet available for the comparison district.

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

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior met its absolute measure in science. Results for the comparison district are not yet available; therefore, we are unable to determine whether this goal was met.

Social Studies

GOAL: Students will be proficient in Social Studies.

Background

The Social Studies curriculum was designed with the goal of providing all students with a common and core Social Studies curriculum that gives them the building blocks of knowledge and skills. The curriculum is robust in the study of United States history from the earliest grades. It includes the examination of historical documents so students can demonstrate their understanding of the major themes, developments, and turning points in our nation. The curriculum emphasizes the study of United States and World Geography, developing geographic principles that allow students to comprehend and reason through current events on a national and international level. Students learn World History, including eras, themes, and significant events that are central to understanding the experiences of other times and other nations.

The curriculum builds a strong knowledge of economic principals so students understand the impact of economic forces both internationally and personally in their daily lives. Additionally, the curriculum is comparative in examination of world cultures. This creates a point of reference by which students compare the freedoms of American life with non-democratic societies both historically and today. Our students will be reminded of the rights and liberties they enjoy with due reason to participate in and protect those liberties.

- I. Absolute Measure:** Each year, seventy-five percent (75%) of students in each grade tested, who are enrolled in at least their second year, will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) Social Studies assessment.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in fifth grade in November 2008 and eighth grade in June 2009. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4.

Results

Brooklyn Excelsior's grade five students had 96% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3 on the state social studies exam. In addition, Brooklyn Excelsior's grade eight students had 67% of students enrolled in at least their second year perform at or above Level 3. As an aggregate, 86% of Brooklyn Excelsior's second year students performed at or above Level 3.

**Charter School Performance on 2008-09 State Social Studies Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grade	Population	Percent at Each Performance Level					Number Tested
		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3/4	
5	All Students	2%	2%	34%	62%	96%	95
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	1%	2%	32%	65%	96%	85
8	All Students	2%	30%	58%	10%	68%	50
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	2%	31%	57%	10%	67%	49
All	All Students	2%	12%	42%	45%	86%	145
	Students in At Least 2 nd Year	1%	13%	41%	45%	86%	134

Evaluation

Goal met. Brooklyn Excelsior had 86% of its second year students perform at Level 3 or 4 on the state social studies assessment.

Additional Evidence

The percentage of second year students performing at or above Level 3 on the social studies has increased 37.7 percentage points since 2004-05. Nearly all fifth grade students enrolled in at least their second year performed at Level 3 or 4 on the state assessment. Sixty-seven percent of second year eighth grade students performed at Level 3 or 4. Results for students in grade eight are only available for the 2007-08 school year as the school did not serve eighth grade students prior to 2007-08.

**Social Studies Performance
by Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested	%	# Tested
5	48%	29	89%	45	87%	45	95%	60	96%	85
8	n/a						68%	37	67%	49
All	48%	29	89%	45	87%	45	85%	97	86%	134

- II. **Comparative Measure:** Each year in each grade tested, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State Exam will be greater than that of students in the respective grade 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

The state grade five social studies assessment was administered in November 2008 and the grade eight assessment was administered in June 2009. Data for the local district has not yet been published. Therefore, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to determine whether this measure was met.

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

Grade	Percent of Students at Levels 3 and 4			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
5	96%	85	n/a	n/a
8	67%	49	n/a	n/a
All	86%	134	n/a	n/a

Evaluation

The state grade five social studies assessment was administered in November 2008 and the grade eight assessment was administered in June 2009. Data for the local district has not yet been published. Grade eight assessment results for Brooklyn Excelsior are also unavailable. Once the data is published, we will update this report.

Additional Evidence

The state grade five social studies assessment was administered in November 2008 and the grade eight assessment was administered in June 2009. Data for the local district has not yet been published for the 2008-09 school year. Grade eight assessment results for Brooklyn Excelsior are also unavailable. Therefore, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to determine whether this measure was met. Once the data is published, we will update this report.

**Social Studies Performance of charter School and Local District
By Grade Level and School Year**

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in At Least 2 nd Year and All District Students at Levels 3 and 4									
	2004-05		2005-06		2006-07		2007-08		2008-09	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
5	48%	44%	89%	53%	87%	52%	95%	68%	96%	n/a
8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	14%	68%	16%	67%	n/a
All	48%	44%	89%	53%	87%	7%	85%	8%	86%	n/a

Summary of the Social Studies Goal

The state social studies assessment was administered in November 2008 and June 2009; however, assessment results for grade eight and the local district are not yet available. At this time, Brooklyn Excelsior is unable to report on the absolute and comparative measure for Social Studies.

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

Action Plan

Brooklyn Excelsior's students performed favorably on the state social studies assessment. The school will continue working until all students perform at or above Level 3 on the exam. Due to the positive results, the school will continue implementing the social studies program as done in past years.

Additional Required Academic Measure

- I. **NCLB 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

Brooklyn Excelsior's accountability status for the 2008-09 school year is in "good standing."

Evaluation

Brooklyn Excelsior met this measure. The school was deemed in "good standing" for the 2008-09 school year.

Additional Evidence

Brooklyn Excelsior has been deemed a school in "good standing" each year of its charter.

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2004-05	Good Standing
2005-06	Good Standing
2006-07	Good Standing
2007-08	Good Standing
2008-09	Good Standing