

**ARK COMMUNITY
CHARTER SCHOOL**

2009-10

**ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 3, 2010

By Mary Theresa Streck, Principal/Director

Ark Community Charter School

762 River Street

Troy, New York 12180

Phone: (518) 274-6312 Fax: (518) 274-3615

Email: accs@arkcharter.org Website: www.arkcharter.org

Mary Theresa Streck prepared this 2009-10 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

| Trustee's Name | Board Position |
|---------------------|---|
| Steven Axelrod | President, all committees |
| Bruce Backer | Vice President, Building Committee |
| Peter McDermott | Secretary, Education and Personnel Committees |
| David Levow | Treasurer, Finance Committee |
| Christina Francis | Parent Representative |
| Rosetta DeVito | Member |
| Ron Eglash | Member |
| Joseph Fama | Member, Building Committee |
| Kathleen Gormley | Member, Education and Personnel Committees |
| Shelley Emmons | Teacher Representative |
| Mary Theresa Streck | Director/Principal, all committees |
| Stephen Downs | Member, Building Committee |

INTRODUCTION

The Ark Community Charter School (ACCS) is located in Troy, New York and serves students in Kindergarten through 6th grade. The school's enrollment lottery is open to all students with preference given to children from families who qualify for free or reduced lunch. ACCS is based on the belief that quality education and quality human interactions are ethical issues. The staff provides a hospitable environment within the school where mutual respect, co-responsibility and dialogue are the norm. ACCS provides a creative and challenging community of learning in which innovation, skilled inquiry, and teamwork are encouraged. The school is a shared enterprise among students, parents and guardians, ACCS staff and the Board of Trustees. ACCS operates in a spirit of openness and honesty, and in the practice of full disclosure.

ACCS Mission Statement

The Ark Community Charter School's continuing mission is to create within the city of Troy a community that fosters the academic, social and spiritual growth of our members in an environment that is both supportive and challenging. In this community everyone is celebrated, respected, and heard; all are intellectually engaged, socially concerned, ethically responsible, and culturally open-minded. The ACCS mission is achieved through the following key design elements:

Key Design Elements

Strong Academic Support- Low Teacher/Student Ratio

Academic success for all students is the vision of all stakeholders at ACCS - the board, leadership team, faculty, students and parents. All other Key Design Elements support this vision. Strong academic support is evident in the board's monthly meetings, in the weekly meetings of the leadership team and faculty, in the low teacher/student ratio and in the ongoing communications between staff and parents.

Longer School Day – Enrichment Programs

ACCS provides 50 additional minutes to the school day compared to the local school district. This additional time allows for increased instructional time and provides the flexibility to integrate high quality art, music and movement programs into our curriculum. ACCS offers space and support for after-school and summer programs that provide additional academic support and enrichment.

Small School

ACCS is an intentionally small school community with a student population capped at 200 students. The small school size creates a more personalized and successful learning environment.

Safe Environment – Responsive Classroom Training

ACCS creates a school culture that fosters an academic learning environment. In this culture students' thoughts and feelings are respected and students work collaboratively with classmates and other members of the community. ACCS staff are trained in the principles of Responsive Classroom.

Families as Partners

ACCS families are respected collaborators in the educational process. Staff listens carefully to parents and requires their active partnership in implementing an effective educational plan for their children. The school has an open-door policy for parents/guardians, who have formal representation on the ACCS Board of Trustees.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| 2005-06 | 40 | 40 | 21 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 0 | | | | | | | 159 |
| 2006-07 | 44 | 42 | 32 | 23 | 21 | 22 | 17 | | | | | | | 201 |
| 2007-08 | 45 | 42 | 35 | 25 | 21 | 17 | 15 | | | | | | | 200 |
| 2008-09 | 43 | 38 | 34 | 26 | 20 | 20 | 11 | | | | | | | 192 |
| 2009-10 | 43 | 40 | 32 | 31 | 25 | 18 | 19 | | | | | | | 208 |

The following table provides some demographic characteristics of our current student population:

2009-10 School Profile by Grade Level

| Grade | Grand Total | Active at Yr End | Exited Before Yr End | Non-White | Hispanic | Poverty | Special Education | ESL | History of Retention | AIS | Enrolled in K |
|-------|-------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|---------------|
| K | 43 | 42 | 1 | 38 | 10 | 42 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 43 |
| 1 | 40 | 39 | 1 | 37 | 8 | 38 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 34 |
| 2 | 32 | 32 | | 31 | 6 | 30 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 30 |
| 3 | 31 | 30 | 1 | 29 | 8 | 29 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 18 | 26 |
| 4 | 25 | 23 | 2 | 23 | 4 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 17 |
| 5 | 18 | 17 | 1 | 18 | 7 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 8 |
| 6 | 19 | 19 | | 19 | 3 | 17 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| Total | 208 | 202 | 6 | 195 | 46 | 193 | 21 | 13 | 40 | 71 | 163 |
| | 100% | 97% | 3% | 94% | 22% | 93% | 10% | 6% | 19% | 34% | 78% |

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

Students will read, write, listen, and speak for information and understanding, for literacy response and expression, for critical analysis and evaluation, and for social interaction.

Background

ACCS uses the Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street Program (Reading Street) which is aligned with the NYS Learning Standards, provides direct, systematic instruction across the grades in the five essential elements of reading, and meets the criteria for Scientifically Based Reading Research (SBRR). All classrooms use a literacy block, and the instruction within that time is consistent in pacing and is organized in ways that effectively promote high literacy gains in low performing students. Reading Street offers structure and guidance for the reading block and strong support for students reading on multiple reading levels. For ELA Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in grades 1-6, ACCS staff use Sidewalks, a supplemental, intervention program that is directly integrated with the core Reading Street program. The "Interactive Strategies Approach" is used for kindergarten. This program incorporates sight word practice, reading, writing, letter-sound practice, blending, letter-identification, etc.

Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street – Three Tier Program

Tier I is the core classroom instruction for all children. It consists of a core reading program and benchmark testing at least five times a year to determine children's instructional needs. A validated baseline group test helps teachers determine how students should be grouped for instruction. Ongoing progress monitoring tracks student learning and enables teachers to differentiate instruction. Results of day 5 assessments and unit benchmark tests help teachers make regrouping decisions at the end of each subsequent unit.

Tier II is supplemental small-group instruction for strategic intervention in addition to the regular instruction in the core reading program. It is designed to prevent struggling readers from falling behind. Daily strategic intervention instruction is provided in the differentiated instruction section of the teacher's editions in Pearson Scott Foresman Reading Street. It supports and enhances core classroom instruction by providing re-teaching of core concepts, additional teacher modeling and feedback, additional scaffolding, multiple opportunities for practice, and more time on task for Tier II students.

Frequent progress monitoring ensures adequate progress and learning. Progress monitoring of priority skills happens daily and weekly in the core program. In grades 1 and 2 assessment is also differentiated; they are tested on the same skills as on-level children, but using simpler text. Progress for fluency and retelling is monitored more frequently for children in Tier II (every two weeks) than for on-level or advanced students (once per unit). Children exit Tier II when they reach on-level benchmarks for priority skills. Reading Street also provides significant support for the development of oral vocabulary (Amazing Words) and building of concepts. Research

indicates this kind of built-in intervention provides a significant instructional advantage for children in this tier.

Tier III instruction for Reading Street consists of an intensive intervention program, Sidewalks, that is parallel to the core program in concepts and vocabulary, but more slowly paced in skill instruction. Student readers contain four selections per week, or about 16 to 20 pages of text. Children in Tier III require more instructional time than students in Tiers I and II. The instruction in the Sidewalks program is used in addition to a regular classroom reading program. It is possible that some children may be in the core program, receiving strategic intervention in the classroom, and receiving intensive intervention as a pull-out program.

Writing

In addition to the Scott Foresman embedded writing program, ACCS uses the Houghton Mifflin Write Source writing program. The Write Source program reflects the latest and best research on writing and learning and provides everything students need to become better writers, thinkers, and learners. The program covers the writing process and the six traits of writing to help students become focused writers and readers. It integrates mechanics, usage, and grammar throughout every unit. Strategies for developing skills including listening, making oral presentations, and note taking are also emphasized. All classrooms engage in two writing workshop blocks each week beyond the writing that happens in all the content areas. For writing Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in grades 1-6, ACCS staff uses the “Struggling Learners” component of the writing program found embedded in each chapter. The kindergarten uses the writing component of the Scott-Foresman program.

Ongoing assessment and diagnosis are coupled with strategic intervention to meet the individual needs of students, including frequent and timely student assessments integrated throughout the program to demonstrate student understanding and guide and monitor instruction. Writing samples from across the curriculum are assessed using the NYS, Scott Foresman, and teacher created rubrics.

The staff employs a common language and knowledge that supports strategies that promote scientifically based reading instruction and participates in ongoing professional development provided by the ACCS Curriculum Coordinators and professional conferences. As a result of this ongoing support, ACCS staff possesses the special knowledge and training needed to effectively teach students to read, write, listen, and speak for information and understanding, for literary response and expression, for critical analysis and evaluation, and for social interaction.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English language arts examination.

In 2009-10, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State English language arts examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in grades 3 through 6 in April 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level. Through 2008-09, the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a Scale Score of 650 or above.

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.

**2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested ¹ | | | Total Enrolled |
|-------|--------------|-------------------------|-----|--------|----------------|
| | | IEP | ELL | Absent | |
| 3 | 30 | | | | 30 |
| 4 | 23 | | | | 23 |
| 5 | 17 | | | | 17 |
| 6 | 19 | | | | 19 |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| All | 89 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

Results

The following table presents the state English language arts test results for all students and for those students enrolled in at least their second year in 3rd through 6th grade. Because all 89 students tested were enrolled in at least their second year, the statistics are identical. In 2010-11, 85 percent of tested students scored at or above a Scale Score of 650.

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.

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

| Grade | Population | Percent Scoring at or above 650 | Number Tested |
|-------|---|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 3 | All Students | 83% | 30 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 83% | 30 |
| 4 | All Students | 96% | 23 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 96% | 23 |
| 5 | All Students | 88% | 17 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 88% | 17 |
| 6 | All Students | 74% | 19 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 74% | 19 |
| 7 | All Students | | |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | | |
| 8 | All Students | | |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | | |
| All | All Students | 85% | 89 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 85% | 89 |

Evaluation

Schoolwide, ACCS surpassed this goal with 85 percent of students scoring at 650 or above. Grades 3, 4 and 5 each exceeded the 75 percent target by comfortable margins (83 percent, 96 percent and 88 percent proficient). Grade 6 hovered just under 75 percent, with 74 percent of students scoring at or above 650.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows the school's English Language Arts performance over the past four years. The school has continued its strong and systematic growth, almost doubling its rate of proficiency over the past four years, from 44 percent in 2006-07 to 85% this year. For the second consecutive year, ACCS has surpassed the goal of 75 percent proficiency maintaining a high level of performance.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10 | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | 54% | 13 | 67% | 18 | 84% | 25 | 83% | 30 |
| 4 | 15% | 13 | 81% | 16 | 61% | 18 | 96% | 23 |
| 5 | 38% | 13 | 58% | 12 | 88% | 17 | 88% | 17 |
| 6 | 63% | 16 | 39% | 13 | 90% | 10 | 74% | 19 |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | 44% | 55 | 63% | 59 | 80% | 70 | 85% | 89 |

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 2009-10 is 155.² 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

ACCS did not meet this measure for the current year. The school’s Performance Index (PI) value of 134 was below the current Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 155. We understand that the State Education Department is reviewing the AMO as they adjust their definitions of proficiency.

Calculation of 2009-10 English Language Arts Performance Index (PI)

| Grades | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | | Number Tested |
|--------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | |
| 3-6 | 11% | 44% | 42% | 3% | 89 |

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{PI} &= 44 + 42 + 3 = 89 \\
 &+ 42 + 3 = 45 \\
 \text{PI} &= 134
 \end{aligned}$$

² With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

Evaluation

ACCS did not meet this measure for the current year. The school’s Performance Index (PI) value of 134 was below the current Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 155. We understand that the State Education Department is reviewing the AMO as they adjust their definitions of proficiency.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows the school’s progress over the past five years towards reaching the NCLB goal that all students will be proficient in English Language Arts by the year 2013-14. This is the first time in the past four years that our Performance Index has been lower than the state’s AMO. We understand that the State Education Department is reviewing the AMO as they adjust their definitions of proficiency.

English Language Arts 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 | | |
| 2006-07 | 3-6 | 76 | 13% | 47% | 38% | 1% | 126 | 122 |
| 2007-08 | 3-6 | 72 | 0% | 40% | 56% | 4% | 160 | 133 |
| 2008-09 | 3-6 | 75 | 1% | 20% | 77% | 1% | 177 | 144 |
| 2009-10 | 3-6 | 89 | 11% | 44% | 42% | 3% | 134 | 155 |

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 compares the performance of ACCS to the Troy School District on the 2009-10 English language arts exam. School wide, ACCS outperformed the Troy City School District in grades 3-6, with 45 percent proficiency compared to 37 percent proficiency for the aggregate of those grades in Troy.

**2009-10 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 | 47% | 30 | 39% | 298 |
| 4 | 52% | 23 | 34% | 293 |
| 5 | 24% | 17 | 36% | 250 |
| 6 | 53% | 19 | 38% | 250 |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | | | | |
| All | 45% | 89 | 37% | 1091 |

Evaluation

ACCS met this measure. We exceeded the aggregate district performance of Troy by eight percentage points and exceeded Troy’s performance at all grade levels except our 5th grade which underperformed Troy’s 5th graders by 12 percent. We note that this particular cohort of students has performed less well than other ACCS students (in the 4th grade, these students performed only marginally better than the district’s 4th graders (61% compared to 59%).

Additional Evidence

The table below compares the English language arts performance of ACCS with Troy over the last four years. ACCS has continued to outperform the district for three consecutive years.

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

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 3 | 54% | 54% | 67% | 55% | 84% | 53% | 47% | 39% |
| 4 | 15% | 48% | 81% | 53% | 61% | 59% | 52% | 34% |
| 5 | 38% | 56% | 58% | 64% | 88% | 72% | 24% | 36% |
| 6 | 63% | 48% | 39% | 61% | 90% | 74% | 53% | 38% |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | 44% | 52% | 63% | 58% | 80% | 64% | 45% | 37% |

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.

Results

Given the timing of the state’s release of poverty data, the 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available. The school’s overall comparative performance to predictions of other schools with a similar free lunch percentage is “higher than expected to a large degree” placing the school in the highest possible comparative performance group.

2008-09 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 | | 25 | 84.0 | 61.9 | 22.1 | 1.45 | |
| 4 | | 19 | 63.2 | 62.8 | 0.4 | 0.03 | |
| 5 | | 21 | 76.2 | 69.7 | 6.5 | 0.49 | |
| 6 | | 11 | 90.9 | 66.7 | 24.2 | 1.64 | |
| 7 | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | |
| All | | 82.7 | 76 | 77.6 | 65.0 | 53.3 | 0.85 |

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

Evaluation

ACCS exceeded this measure in 2008-09. The school’s aggregate Effect Size of .85 placed it in the highest comparative performance group and is a powerful indicator of the success of the ACCS program.

Additional Evidence

2009-10 results are not yet available at the time of this report, but over a three-year period, ACCS’s comparative performance improved from “About the same as expected” in 2006-07 to “Higher than expected to a large degree” in 2008-09.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

| School Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch | Number Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| 2006-07 | 3-6 | 89.4 | 76 | 39.5 | 43.4 | -0.29 |
| 2007-08 | 3-6 | 83.3 | 72 | 59.69 | 53.36 | 0.44 |
| 2008-09 | 3-6 | 82.7 | 76 | 77.6 | 65.0 | 0.85 |
| 2009-10 | | | | | | |

Goal 1: Growth Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-09, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. 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 growth for each current grade level cohort. Two of the three cohorts - grades 4 and 5 - achieved their growth targets. The 6th grade did not.

Cohort Growth on State English Language Arts Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent Performing At or Above 650 | | | Target Achieved |
|-------|-------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------|
| | | 2008-09 | Target | 2009-10 | |
| 4 | 22 | 86% | gain | 96% | YES |
| 5 | 16 | 63% | 76% | 88% | YES |
| 6 | 18 | 83% | gain | 72% | NO |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| All | 56 | 79% | gain | 86% | YES |

School wide, we met this outcome measure. Students taking the ELA exam for two consecutive years showed a five percentage point gain over last year, with 86 percent performing at or above 650. The 4th and 5th grade cohorts each showed substantial growth, with ten and 25 percentage point increases. The 6th grade was the only cohort that lost ground: 72 percent were proficient compared to 83 percent who reached the 650 target last year. A contributing factor is that this cohort has a particularly high degree of special needs: one in four students in this cohort either has an IEP or is an ESL student.

Additional Evidence

The table below summarizes the English language arts cohort performance over the past four years. In 2006-07, only one (Grade 6) of the three cohorts met the target. In 2007-08, Grades 4 & 5 met the target. In 2008-09, Grades 5 and 6 both met their growth targets and the 4th grade was two percentage points shy of the target. This year, Grades 4 and 5 met their growth targets but the 6th grade cohort did not.

The NYS ELA tests for grades 4 and 6 include a writing component that is not included in the other grades. Our new writing program that will be implemented in fall 2010 addresses the rigor of this test by providing more direct instruction in writing.

**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 | 4-6 | 1 | 3 |
| 2007-08 | 4-6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2008-09 | 4-6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2009-10 | 4-6 | 2 | 3 |

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
|-------------|---|-----------------|
| Absolute | 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State examination. | Achieved |
| Absolute | Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state’s NCLB accountability system. | Did Not Achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size. | Achieved |
| Growth | Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. | Did Not Achieve |

Action Plan

ACCS has included a re-teach/enrichment instructional block into each classroom teacher's schedule. This is designated time to focus on specific skills and is supplemental to AIS. In order to reach our target goals for the next school year, ACCS will implement the following action plan for all grades:

A. ELA Grades K-6: Scott Foresman Reading Street

1. Teachers will administer their grade level baseline test during the first full week of school. Based on an item analysis of the benchmark results, students will be grouped for instruction.
2. Teachers in grades 1-6 will administer Scott Foresman selection tests biweekly. Every five to six weeks, teachers in grades K-6 will administer a unit benchmark test to assess skills and strategies taught in the unit. These test questions mirror the NYS ELA test. Students who have not mastered the skills based on the item analysis will be re-taught the skills by the teacher, TA, AIS support teacher, during the daily reteach block, or in after school tutoring sessions. Scott Foresman provides an immediate intervention plan that can be used for re-teaching any concept.
3. In grades K-2, the teachers will administer the Scott Foresman Word List in February and June. The Word List at each grade contains key sight words that students need to master for that grade. Students not mastering the words are re-taught by the teacher, TA, or AIS support teacher.
4. In grades K-6, the teachers will administer an end of the year test during the second week of June. After completing a test item analysis for each student, teachers will meet with curriculum coordinators to discuss the results. These test results, along with other assessments, will be used to review student grade level progress for the year and to determine AIS grouping for the next school year.
5. All testing results will be used to inform instruction and as one component in determining students report card grades.

B. Basic Reading Inventory-BRI (Grades 1-6)

1. Teachers/AIS Staff will administer a BRI to those students who fail the comprehension section of the selection test two times consecutively.
2. After scoring the BRI, teachers will meet with the ELA Curriculum Coordinator to discuss results and plan appropriate strategies for students.

C. Test Preparation using results from NYS ELA Test (grades 3-6)

1. In September, the ELA Curriculum Coordinator and the classroom teachers will review the item analysis for the NYS 2010 ELA test. Teachers will use the item analysis results and the previous teacher's recommendations (work on comprehension strategies, writing responses to short answer questions, and essay writing) as a teaching tool to prepare the students for the next ELA Test.
2. In September, Grade 3 teachers and the ELA Curriculum Coordinator will review the second grade results on the Terra Nova. They will use the results to create lessons in preparing the students for the next ELA Test.
3. In January, the teachers in grades 3-6 will administer the previous year's ELA test as a practice test. Upon correction of the test and item analysis, teachers will meet with the

ELA Coordinator to discuss the test results and determine strengths and areas of need in preparing for the upcoming NYS assessments.

4. Starting in January, the teachers in grades 3-6 will use the NYS Coach Test Prep books from Triumph Learning as part of their center activities during the ELA block. These books are aligned to the standards, performance indicators, and test structure.
5. Additional ELA test prep lessons will be determined and assigned as needed.

D. ELA Grades K-6: Using Great Source Write Source

- Teachers will use the Write Source books to teach the writing process, the six traits of writing (ideas, organization, voice, word choice, sentence fluency and convention), the forms of writing, and the basic elements of writing.
- During the 2009-2010 school year, the ELA Curriculum Coordinator and ACCS teachers worked with an ELA specialist to implement a writing program in the fall of 2010 that is aligned with Scott Foresman Reading Street and the NYS writing standards. This program, used with the Write Source, will strengthen the ACCS writing program.

E. Academic Support (AIS)

1. Criteria for Inclusion:

- Students who score at a Level 1 or 2 on the state test
- Students in First and Second Grade who score at the 30th percentile or less on Terra Nova
- Students who score less than 75% performance on the report card
- Students who score low on Kindergarten screening tests and baseline tests
- Students receiving a low 3 on either the NYS ELA test or Terra Nova Test will be targeted to receive AIS in the beginning of the school year. The length of time in the program will be determined by classroom performance along with selection and unit benchmark test scores throughout the school year.

2. AIS Support:

- The teachers will administer pre-post tests to students and record results.
- The teachers will use the scientifically based Sidewalks from Scott Foresman. Sidewalks is an intensive intervention program that is parallel to the core program in concepts and vocabulary, but more slowly paced in skill instruction. The intervention strategies will be tailored to the specific needs of the students.
- The teachers will use Ladders for Success from Triumph Learning to provide test prep intervention for their students in grades 3-6. This program is designed to help struggling students master fundamental grade appropriate reading skills that are essential to success in both the curriculum and on the NYS ELA test.
- The ELA Curriculum Coordinator will meet with the Director of Curriculum and Instruction and the AIS staff monthly to discuss student progress.

F. Curriculum Team

1. The curriculum team will meet with each teacher on a regular basis (biweekly) to discuss students' individual progress.

2. On Monday and Tuesday of each week, the curriculum team will meet with the Director of Curriculum and Instruction to discuss individual class progress and concerns as well as individual student progress and concerns. (Monday-ELA Tuesday-Math).
3. Each week, the curriculum team will review lesson plans and test results posted on the ACCS server.
4. The curriculum coordinator will report and discuss possible candidates for AIS or IST meetings to the Director for Curriculum and Instruction during their weekly meetings.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

Students will understand the concepts and become proficient with the skills of mathematics; communicate and reason mathematically; and become problem solvers by using appropriate tools and strategies through the integrated studies of number sense and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and probability

Background

ACCS uses the Pearson Scott Foresman Mathematics Program which is aligned with the NYS Learning Standards, and provides direct, systematic instruction across the grades. All classrooms use a daily math block. Scott Foresman Program offers structure and guidance for the mathematics block and strong support for students performing at multiple levels. For mathematics Academic Intervention Services (AIS) in grades K-6, ACCS staff uses the Math Diagnosis and Intervention System which is a component of the Scott Foresman program and Investigations, another Scott Foresman program that focuses on the use of manipulatives to teach and reinforce concepts .

Scott Foresman Mathematics promotes mathematical proficiency by focusing on the development of both mathematics skills and essential understandings. This is accomplished through an articulation of essential outcomes and conceptual understandings for both teacher and student; questioning strategies that develop higher order-thinking skills embedded into the student and teacher materials; and the development of mathematical communication as a means of building a deep understanding of important mathematics.

Ongoing assessment and diagnosis are coupled with strategic intervention to meet the individual needs of students, including frequent and timely student assessments integrated throughout the program to demonstrate student understanding and to guide and monitor instruction.

The staff employs a common language and knowledge to support strategies that promote scientifically based math instruction. The staff participates in ongoing professional development provided by the ACCS Curriculum Coordinators and professional conferences. As a result of this ongoing support, ACCS staff possesses the special knowledge and training needed to effectively teach students to understand the concepts of and become proficient with the skills of mathematics; to communicate and reason mathematically; and to become problem solvers by using appropriate tools and strategies.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State mathematics examination.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3 through 6 grades in May 2010. Each student's raw score has been converted to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. Through 2008-09 the criterion for success on this measure required students who have been enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at Levels 3 or 4. For 2009-10, the criterion for success on this measure requires students to have a scale score of 650 or above.

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.

**2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested ³ | | | Total Enrolled |
|-------|--------------|-------------------------|-----|--------|----------------|
| | | IEP | ELL | Absent | |
| 3 | 30 | | | | 30 |
| 4 | 23 | | | | 23 |
| 5 | 17 | | | | 17 |
| 6 | 19 | | | | 19 |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| All | 89 | | | | 89 |

Results

The following table presents the state math test results for all students and for those students enrolled in at least their second year in 3rd through 6th grade. Because all 89 students tested were enrolled in at least their second year, the statistics are identical. In 2009-10, 91 percent of tested students scored at or above a Scale Score of 650.

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

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 State Mathematics Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

| Grade | Population | Percent Scoring at or above 650 | Number Tested |
|-------|---|---------------------------------|---------------|
| 3 | All Students | 93% | 30 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 93% | 30 |
| 4 | All Students | 96% | 23 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 96% | 23 |
| 5 | All Students | 82% | 17 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 82% | 17 |
| 6 | All Students | 89% | 19 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 89% | 19 |
| 7 | All Students | | |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | | |
| 8 | All Students | | |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | | |
| All | All Students | 91% | 89 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 91% | 89 |

Evaluation

School wide and at each grade level, ACCS surpassed the 75 percent target.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows the school’s math performance over the past four years. Since falling just shy of reaching the 75 percent target in 2006-07, the school has attained and maintained a high level of performance for the past three years, exceeding the passing rate by double-digit percentage points each year.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 through 2008-09 and a Scale Score of 650 in 2009-10 | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 3 | 77% | 13 | 88% | 17 | 100% | 25 | 93% | 30 |
| 4 | 85% | 13 | 94% | 16 | 90% | 20 | 96% | 23 |
| 5 | 54% | 13 | 70% | 10 | 89% | 18 | 82% | 17 |
| 6 | 75% | 16 | 100% | 13 | 91% | 11 | 89% | 19 |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | 73% | 55 | 89% | 56 | 93% | 74 | 91% | 89 |

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 2009-10 is 135⁴. 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 presents the calculation of the school’s Performance Index (PI) for mathematics for the current year. The aggregate PI value for 2009-10 is 167, exceeding the current Mathematics Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) of 135.

Calculation of 2009-10 Mathematics Performance Index (PI)

| Grades | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level | | | | Number Tested |
|--------|---|---------|---------|---------|---------------|
| | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 | |
| 3-6 | 7% | 19% | 44% | 30% | 89 |

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 19 & + & 44 & + & 30 & = & 93 \\
 & & & & + & & 30 & = & 74 \\
 & & & & & & \text{PI} & = & \mathbf{167}
 \end{array}$$

Evaluation

ACCS has surpassed this measure.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows the school’s substantial progress over the past four years towards reaching the NCLB goal that all students will be proficient in mathematics by the year 2013-14. Our Performance Index continues to exceed the state’s AMO each year.

⁴ With the change in Proficiency Scores, the State Education Department is currently reviewing the current Annual Measurable Objectives in English language arts and mathematics.

**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 | | |
| 2006-07 | 3-6 | 55 | 2% | 25% | 62% | 11% | 162 | 86 |
| 2007-08 | 3-6 | 56 | | 11% | 56% | 33% | 190 | 102 |
| 2008-09 | 3-6 | 74 | | 7% | 73% | 20% | 189 | 119 |
| 2009-10 | 3-6 | 89 | 7% | 19% | 44% | 30% | 167 | 135 |

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 compares the performance of ACCS to the Troy School District on the 2009-10 mathematics exam. Schoolwide, ACCS outperformed the Troy City School District in all grades 3-6, with 74% percent proficiency compared to 40% percent proficiency for the aggregate of those grades in Troy.

**2009-10 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 | 80% | 30 | 39% | 300 |
| 4 | 78% | 23 | 37% | 294 |
| 5 | 59% | 17 | 49% | 247 |
| 6 | 73% | 19 | 35% | 252 |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | | | | |
| All | 74% | 89 | 40% | 1093 |

Evaluation

ACCS met this measure. We exceeded the aggregate district performance of Troy schools by 34 percentage points and exceeded Troy’s performance at all grade levels.

Additional Evidence

The table below compares mathematics performance of ACCS with Troy over the last four years. ACCS has continued to outperform the district as a whole for the fourth consecutive year. With the change in proficiency scoring, both the school and the district declined substantially in our respective rates of passing, but the performance gap between the district and ACCS increased dramatically, from a 19 percentage point difference last year to a 34 point gap this year.

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

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 3 | 77% | 72% | 88% | 82% | 100% | 78% | 80% | 39% |
| 4 | 85% | 60% | 94% | 70% | 90% | 75% | 78% | 37% |
| 5 | 54% | 54% | 70% | 60% | 89% | 74% | 59% | 49% |
| 6 | 75% | 52% | 100% | 63% | 91% | 70% | 73% | 35% |
| 7 | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | 73% | 59% | 89% | 69% | 93% | 74% | 74% | 40% |

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 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available.

Results

The table below presents the performance of the school on the mathematics test compared to predictions of public schools with a similar free lunch percentage. Given the timing of the state’s

release of poverty data, the 2009-10 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2008-09 results, the most recent ones available. The school’s overall comparative performance is “higher than expected to a medium degree” for 2008-09.

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 | | 25 | 100.0 | 88.2 | 11.8 | 1.23 |
| 4 | | 20 | 90.0 | 79.6 | 10.4 | 0.83 |
| 5 | | 20 | 80.0 | 80.0 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| 6 | | 11 | 90.9 | 70.3 | 20.6 | 1.18 |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| All | 82.7 | 76 | 90.8 | 81.2 | 9.6 | 0.79 |

| |
|--|
| School’s Overall Comparative Performance: |
| <i>Higher than expected to a medium degree</i> |

Evaluation

ACCS met this measure in 2008-09. The school’s aggregate Effect Size exceeded the 0.3 level and missed the highest possible rating group (Higher than expected to a large degree) by 0.01. We expect the 2009-10 results to be comparable.

Additional Evidence

ACCS has consistently met this measure.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School Year | Grades | Percent Eligible for Free Lunch | Number Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect Size |
|-------------|--------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| 2006-07 | 3-6 | 89.4 | 76 | 69.6 | 62.2 | 0.40 |
| 2007-08 | 3-6 | 83.3 | 69 | 89.8 | 73.6 | 1.06 |
| 2008-09 | 3-6 | 82.7 | 76 | 90.8 | 81.2 | 0.79 |
| 2009-10 | 3-6 | 86.5 | 89 | | | |

Goal 2: Growth Measure

Each year through 2008-09, 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.

In 2009-10, each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent of students at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 in 2008-09, that cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the percentage in 2009-10

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and in 2009-10 the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above a Scale Score of 650. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2009-10 and also have a state exam score in 2008-09. It includes students who repeated the grade. Students who repeated the grade should be included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. 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 growth for each current grade level cohort. Overall, the cohort did not show a gain, yet maintained a strong 89% percent proficiency rate. The 4th grade dropped from 100% to 95% representing one student who did not show sufficient growth. The 5th grade did not show growth (with a seven percentage point drop in proficiency), but remained over the 75% target. The 6th grade achieved a six percentage point gain.

Cohort Growth on State Mathematics Exam from 2008-09 to 2009-10

| Grade | Cohort Size | Percent Performing At or Above 650 | | | Target Achieved |
|-------|-------------|------------------------------------|--------|---------|-----------------|
| | | 2008-09 | Target | 2009-10 | |
| 4 | 22 | 100% | 100% | 95% | NO |
| 5 | 16 | 88% | gain | 81% | NO |
| 6 | 18 | 83% | gain | 89% | YES |
| 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | |
| All | 56 | 91% | gain | 89% | NO |

Evaluation

We did not meet this outcome measure. Schoolwide, students taking the math exam for two consecutive years maintained a strong 89% percent proficiency rate but did not achieve an overall gain. The only cohort to achieve its growth target was Grade 6. Grade 4 maintained a very strong 95 percent rate but could not replicate last year's perfect rate. Grade 5 was the only cohort to lose ground, declining by seven percentage points in 2009-10.

Additional Evidence

The table below summarizes the mathematics cohort performance over the past four years. In 2006-07, two cohorts met the target (Grade 5 did not). In 2007-08, all three cohorts met their growth target. As our performance stabilizes at a high performance level, showing growth becomes more

difficult. Both last year in 2008-09 and this year, only one cohort met its growth target (Grade 6 in both years).

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

| School Year | Cohort Grades | Number of Cohorts Meeting Target | Number of Cohorts |
|-------------|---------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| 2006-07 | 4-6 | 2 | 3 |
| 2007-08 | 4-6 | 3 | 3 |
| 2008-09 | 4-6 | 1 | 3 |
| 2009-10 | 4-6 | 1 | 3 |

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

The Ark Community Charter School has met four of the five accountability measures for mathematics in 2009-10. The growth measure becomes more difficult to reach as our performance stabilizes at a high level.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
|-------------|---|-----------------|
| Absolute | 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the New York State examination. | Achieved |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size. | Achieved |
| Growth | Each grade-level cohort will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2008-09 state exam and 75 percent at or above a Scale Score of 650 on the 2009-10 state exam. | Did Not Achieve |

Action Plan

ACCS will continue to use the Pearson Scott Foresman Mathematics Program which is aligned with the New York State Math Standards and performance indicators. Grades 3-6 will follow curriculum guidance materials provided by New York State Education Department. The guidance materials coincide with the Pearson Scott Foresman text pacing materials. Text pacing has been structured so that appropriate topics will be covered prior to the NYS testing in May.

Based on the 2009-10 NYS Mathematics test results and the item analysis for each grade, ACCS will take the following actions:

1. All grades will continue to follow the recommended NYS Curriculum and testing guidance information for their grades. They will continue to emphasize answering constructive response type questions.

2. Content areas that will be a focus for the upcoming year are:
 - Grade 4 – multiplication and division, geometry and graphing
 - Grade 5 – fractions and geometry
 - Grade 6 – fractions and decimals, graphing and elapsed time
3. The daily academic schedule for 2010 -11 has been redesigned to provide an instructional time period each day for re-teaching and reviewing of concepts.

In order to reach our target goal in Mathematics, ACCS will implement the following action plan for all grade levels:

A. Mathematics Grades K-6: Using Scott Foresman Mathematics Program

1. Teachers will follow the recommended Scott Foresman program and NYS Mathematics standards for their grade level.
2. In addition to daily instruction in mathematics concepts we will emphasize the following areas in both our classroom mathematics instruction and Academic Intervention Services throughout the 2010 - 2011 school year: mathematics vocabulary, mastery of basic facts ($=$, $-$, \times , \div) and solving and writing responses to constructive response type questions.
3. Teachers will administer their grade level baseline test during the first full week of school. After grading the test, teachers will complete an item analysis for each student and then meet with the curriculum coordinator to discuss the results. At this time, individual student and whole class strengths /areas of need will be determined. This data will be used in planning instruction throughout the school year.
4. Teachers will administer Scott Foresman test prep activities daily. These activities will review and reinforce previously learned mathematics concepts.
5. Teachers will administer both chapter tests and cumulative review tests throughout the program as an assessment of specific concept mastery. Students identified as needing additional support/review in various Performance Indicators will receive assistance during the Mathematics teaching block by the classroom teacher or teaching assistant or during the scheduled daily re-teach block.
6. All testing results will be used to inform instruction and will be used as one component in determining students' report card grades.
7. Teachers will administer the Cumulative test (Final Exam) for Chapters 1 – 12 during the second week in June. After grading this test, teachers will complete an item analysis for each student. These results along with other assessments given throughout the school year will be used to review students' grade level progress for the year. Results of these tests will be used when determining eligible students for Academic Intervention Services for the school year 2010 - 2011.
8. Teachers will meet with the Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator bi-weekly to discuss students' progress, lessons, planning, pacing, mathematics testing results and concerns.

B. Mathematics: Test Preparation for the NYS Mathematics Test Grades 3 – 6

1. The Mathematics Curriculum Coordinator will meet in September with teachers to review the results of the previous year's NYS Mathematics test. Teachers will use these results (strengths and areas of need) when structuring lessons in preparing their students for the upcoming spring test. (In Grade 3, teachers will review the Terra Nova results from Grade 2.)
2. During the month of January, teachers will administer a practice NYS Mathematics test using the previous year's test. After completion of both test correction and an item analysis, teachers at these grade levels will meet with the Coordinator to discuss the test results and determine a plan to prepare their students for the upcoming NYS assessment. Additional mathematics support will be determined and assigned at this time, if needed.
3. Teachers in Grades 3- 6 will administer Scott Foresman test preparation activities daily. These activities will reinforce previously learned mathematics concepts both at the present grade level and from previous grade instruction.
4. Beginning in January, teachers in Grades 3 – 6 will use the Coach Test Prep Books from Triumph Learning as part of their small group activities during the Mathematics block.
5. Additional test preparation activities will be determined as needed.

C. Academic Intervention Services(AIS)

The eligibility criteria for receiving AIS services are:

- Students scoring at level 1 or 2 on the NYS tests.
- Students in Grades 1 and 2 scoring at the 30th percentile or less on the Terra Nova test.
- Students receiving scores less than 75% performance on their report cards.
- Students receiving a low 3 on either the NYS Mathematics Test or Terra Nova Test will be targeted to receive AIS in the beginning of the school year. The length of time in the program will be determined by classroom performance and chapter and cumulative test scores throughout the school year.

AIS Assessments

1. Teachers will administer pre/post tests to students.
2. Teachers will use two scientifically based programs from Scott Foresman for their interventions based on the specific needs of their students.
 - Math Diagnosis and Intervention System – paper/pencil driven program
 - Investigations – a hands – on program that stresses both concepts and skills
3. Teachers will use Ladders for Success from Triumph Learning to provide Test Prep intervention for their students. This program focuses on specific skills/concepts that are part of NYS Mathematics Core Curriculum.
4. The Mathematics Coordinator will meet with the AIS staff as needed.

English Language Learners (ELL)

1. Students being served by the ESL teacher and not performing at expected levels in Mathematics within the regular classroom setting will receive additional instruction in mathematics during the school year: mathematics vocabulary, learning basic mathematics facts (+, -, x, ÷), and solving and then writing responses when completing constructive response type questions.
2. The Mathematics Coordinator will meet with the Director for Curriculum and Instruction and the ESL teacher when deemed appropriate.

D. Curriculum Team

1. The curriculum team will meet with each teacher on a regular basis (biweekly) to discuss both the class and students' individual progress.
2. On Monday and Tuesday of each week, the curriculum team will meet with the Director for Curriculum and Instruction to discuss individual class and student progress and concerns. (Monday-ELA Tuesday-Math).
3. The curriculum coordinator will review lesson plans/ test results for classes weekly.
4. The curriculum coordinator will report and discuss possible candidates for AIS or IST meetings to the Director for Curriculum and Instruction during their weekly meetings.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

Students will understand and apply scientific concepts, principles, and theories pertaining to the physical setting and living environment and recognize the historical development of ideas in science.

Background

The ACCS science curriculum is based on the New York State Core Curriculum in Science. The program prepares students to understand, explain, analyze and interpret the relationships, processes, mechanisms and application of our physical setting and our living environment. All classrooms are scheduled for two science blocks weekly, as well as time integrated with the arts. Since students learn most effectively when they are actively engaged in the discovery process, the elementary and intermediate science programs emphasize a hands-on, inquiry-based approach to learning. This approach to science instruction provides students with opportunities to interact directly with the natural world or through laboratory settings to practice problem-solving skills, develop positive science attitudes, learn new science content, and increase their scientific literacy.

Multiple assessments are used to evaluate student knowledge and to inform instruction. Assessments include classroom work, homework, test and quizzes in the classroom, rubrics for lab work, exhibitions and portfolios. The faculty employs a common language and knowledge to support strategies for hands-on science instruction and participates in ongoing professional development provided by the ACCS Curriculum Coordinators and professional conferences. As a result of this ongoing support, teachers possess the special knowledge and skill to effectively teach students to understand and apply scientific concepts, principles, and theories pertaining to the physical setting and living environment.

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

Results

The following table presents the state science test results for all students and for those students enrolled in at least their second year in Grade 4. In 2009-10, 100 percent of students who were enrolled in at least their second year scored at or above Level 3 (proficient).

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 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 | | | 43% | 57% | 100% | 23 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | | | 43% | 57% | 100% | 23 |
| 8 | All Students | | | | | | |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | | | | | | |

Evaluation

ACCS achieved this goal. 100 percent passed and over half (57 percent) reached the highest mastery level, Level 4.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows the school’s science performance trends over the past four years. We have historically performed well in science and continue to improve our performance from 69 percent proficient in 2004-05 to 100 percent in 2009-10.

**Science Performance
by Grade Level and School Year**

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Levels 3 and 4 | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 4 | 69% | 13 | 88% | 17 | 94% | 17 | 100% | 23 |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | 69% | 13 | 88% | 17 | 94% | 17 | 100% | 23 |

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

Statewide science results are not yet publicly available for 2009-10, so we are unable to compare our performance with Troy.

**2009-10 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 | 100% | 23 | Not Yet Available | |
| 8 | | | | |

Evaluation

Statewide science results are not yet publicly available for 2009-10, so we are unable to compare our performance with Troy. However, given Troy’s relatively solid performance over the past several years (ranging from 81 to 87 percent proficient), we expect that we have outperformed them in science this year by a substantial margin.

Additional Evidence

The table below compares the science performance of ACCS with Troy over the past four years. After several years of performing below the district, ACCS has steadily improved and we hope to outperform Troy for the third consecutive year. Where Troy outperformed ACCS by 18 percentage points in 2006-07, we reversed that trend in 2007-08 and continue to widen the gap. We expect to outperform them again this year.

**Science Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year**

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 4 | 69% | 87 | 88% | 85 | 94% | 81% | 100% | Not yet available |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | | | | | | | | |

Summary

The Ark Community Charter School anticipates meeting both accountability measures of the science goal for 2009-10. We have met and substantially exceeded the absolute measure and await the release of the science scores to verify our expectation that we will also meet the comparative measure.

| 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. | Not Yet Available |

Action Plan

The results of our students on the science assessment indicate that our science curriculum is effective. In order to maintain this high level of performance and encourage an even greater percentage of students to reach the mastery level, ACCS will implement the following action plan:

A. Grades K-6: Using the NYS Elementary and Intermediate Core Curriculum

1. Teachers in Grades K – 4 will follow the recommended NYS Elementary Core Curriculum and NYS Science standards for their grade level. Teachers in Grades 5-6 will follow the recommended NYS Intermediate Science Core Curriculum, NYS Science Skills and Standards and supplement grade level curriculum with the Scott Foresman Science program. The following assessments are used to evaluate student knowledge and inform instruction:

- **Classroom Assessments.** Students will demonstrate performance at standard through class work, homework, tests and quizzes.
- **Lab Work and Exhibitions.** Lab work demonstrations of student knowledge and skill are assessed using rubrics and checklists.
- **Portfolios.** Portfolios are collections of artifacts that document student work over time and are assessed using rubrics and checklists.

2. Teachers will meet monthly with the Curriculum Coordinator to discuss lesson plans, pacing, and assessment results. Students who do not master a concept will be re-taught the skill by the teacher or TA.

B. Test Preparation using results from NYS Science Test

1. In August, the Curriculum Coordinator and the teacher will review the results of the previous year’s NYS Science test. Based on the results, teachers will adjust the K-4th grade science curriculum.

2. In December, the 4th grade teacher will administer the previous year's Science test. Upon correction of the test, the teacher and the Coordinator will determine students' strengths and weakness. Results will be used to inform instruction.
3. The Fourth grade teacher will use the Measure Up program from September through April. This program reviews all the NYS science standards and skills.
4. Curriculum Coordinator will meet with 5th and 6th grade teachers after each unit assessment to evaluate and adjust the science curriculum.

C. Criteria for Inclusion in AIS

Students qualify for AIS when they score at a level 1 or 2 on a state test.

D. Curriculum Coordinator

1. The Curriculum Coordinator will review lesson plans weekly.
2. The Curriculum Coordinator will meet bi-weekly with the 4th grade teacher to discuss students' progress.
3. The Curriculum Coordinator will meet monthly with the K-6 teachers to discuss students' progress, assessments and teaching strategies.
4. The curriculum coordinator will provide a monthly report on student progress to the Director for Curriculum and Instruction.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Goal 4: Social Studies

Students will use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of history, geography, government and economic systems of New York, the United States, and the world. They will also demonstrate their understanding of civics and citizenship.

Background

The school's social studies curriculum is based on the New York State Social Studies Core Curriculum. All classrooms are scheduled for two social studies blocks each week, as well as time integrated with the arts. Through explorations of history, geography, economics, government, and civics, students learn about the people, places, eras and events that shape our world.

Multiple assessments are used to evaluate student knowledge and to inform instruction. Assessments include classroom work, homework, test and quizzes in the classroom, rubrics for exhibitions and portfolios.

The faculty receives ongoing professional development provided by the curriculum coordinators and through professional conferences. With this support, the faculty possesses the special knowledge and training needed to effectively teach students to use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of culture, major ideas, eras, themes, developments, and turning points in the history of New York, our country and the world.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

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

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program social studies assessment to students in 5th grade in November 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

The following table presents the state social studies results for all students and for those students enrolled in at least their second year. In 2009-10, all students were at least in their second year so the two groups are identical. In 2009-10, 88 percent of the 5th graders performed at or above Level 3.

**Charter School Performance on 2009-10 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 | 12% | | 76% | 12% | 88% | 17 |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | 12% | | 76% | 12% | 88% | 17 |
| 8 | All Students | | | | | | |
| | Students in At Least 2 nd Year | | | | | | |

Evaluation

ACCS achieved this goal. With 88 percent of students scoring at Level 3 or above, the school exceeded the measure by 13 percentage points.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows the school’s social studies performance trends over the past four years. The school had inconsistent results before 2007, but for the past three years, our 5th grade cohorts surpassed the 75 percent target by comfortable margins. We believe our performance has stabilized at a high level of performance due to substantial changes begun in the fall of 2006 to our writing program.

**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 | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested |
| 5 | 33% | 12 | 83% | 12 | 88% | 17 | 88% | 17 |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | | | | | | | | |

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

Statewide social studies results are not yet publicly available for 2009-10, so we are unable to compare our performance with Troy

**2009-10 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 | 88% | 17 | Not Yet Available | Not Yet Available |
| 8 | | | | |

Evaluation

Statewide social studies results are not yet publicly available for 2009-10, so we are unable to compare our performance with Troy. However, given Troy’s relatively stable performance over the past several years (ranging from 77 to 85 percent proficient), we anticipate their social studies scores to be somewhere in the high 70s to low 80s. If that assumption is accurate, we will outperform Troy by at least several percentage points.

Additional Evidence

The table below compares the social studies performance of ACCS with Troy over the past four years. After several years of inconsistent performance, ACCS has steadily improved and, we predict will now outperform the district as a whole for the third consecutive year.

**Social Studies Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year**

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students at Levels 3 and 4 and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | 2006-07 | | 2007-08 | | 2008-09 | | 2009-10 | |
| | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 5 | 33% | 78% | 83% | 77% | 88% | 79% | 88% | Not Yet Available |
| 8 | | | | | | | | |
| All | | | | | | | | |

Summary

The Ark Community Charter School anticipates meeting both accountability measures of the social studies goal for 2009-10. We have exceeded the absolute measure and await the release of the social studies scores to verify our expectation that we will also meet the comparative measure.

| 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. | Not Yet Available |

Action Plan

The test results of our students on the social studies assessment indicate that our social studies curriculum is effective. In order to maintain this high level of performance and encourage an even greater percentage of students to reach the mastery level, ACCS will implement the following action plan:

A. Social Studies Grades K-6: Using the NYS Core Curriculum

1. Teachers in Grades K – 6 will follow the recommended NYS Social Studies Core Curriculum and NYS Social Studies standards for their grade level. Teachers in Grades 2-6 supplement grade level curriculum with the Scott Foresman Social Studies program. The following assessments are used to evaluate student knowledge and inform instruction:
 - **Classroom Assessments.** Students will demonstrate performance at standard through class work, homework, tests and quizzes.
 - **Performances and Exhibitions.** Performances and exhibitions are demonstrations of student knowledge and skill and are assessed using rubrics and checklists.
 - **Portfolios.** Portfolios are collections of artifacts that document student work over time and are assessed using rubrics and checklists.
2. Teachers will meet with the Curriculum Coordinator to discuss lessons plans, pacing, and assessment results. Students who do not master a concept/skill will be re-taught the skill or concept by the teacher or TA.

B. Criteria for Inclusion in AIS

Students qualify for AIS when they score at a level 1 or 2 on classroom assessments.

C. Curriculum Coordinator

1. The Curriculum Coordinator will meet monthly with the K-6 teachers to discuss teaching strategies, assessments and students' progress.
2. The Curriculum Coordinator will review lesson plans weekly.
3. The Curriculum Coordinator will provide a monthly report on student progress to the Director of Curriculum and Instruction.

NCLB

Goal 5: NCLB
 Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

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 has met this measure in 2009-10 with a rating of “Good Standing”.

Evaluation

The table below shows that the school has historically met this measure.

Additional Evidence

The table below shows that the school has historically met this measure.

NCLB Status by Year

| Year | Status |
|---------|---------------|
| 2005-06 | Good Standing |
| 2006-07 | Good Standing |
| 2007-08 | Good Standing |
| 2008-09 | Good Standing |
| 2009-10 | Good Standing |