

**Progress Toward Goal Attainment
2009-2010**

Charter School Name: Community Roots Charter School

School Year: 2009-2010

Goal/Objective: Desired Level of Attainment	Actual Result: Observed Level of Attainment	Measure Used To Indicate Attainment of The Goal/Objective	Was the Goal/ Objective Met? (Y/N)	Explanation if Not Met																																																								
1. 75% of students will meet or exceed state standards on New York State standardized tests by scoring in levels 3 or 4.	<p>The following are the percentage of CRCS students scoring level 3 and 4 on the ELA and Math tests in 2010.</p> <p>Grade 3: ELA: 58% Math: 60%</p> <p>Grade 4: ELA: 70% Math: 72%</p>	New York State Standardized Tests including ELA in 3 rd , 4 th ; Mathematics in 3 rd , 4 th ; Science in 4 th Grade.	No	<p>We did not meet our proficiency goal for the 2009-2010 school year. This year the State issued new proficiency standards that had major effects on all school’s performance, causing on average a 23%-26% drop in test scores across the city. We too experienced such a decline in test scores.</p> <p>That said, approximately 60% of our students were proficient in ELA this year and approximately 70% were proficient in math. Our students outperformed the State, the City and our District.</p> <table><tr><th>ELA</th><th colspan="4">2010</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><th>CRCS</th><th>STATE</th><th>CITY</th><th>District 13</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>58%</td><td>54.7%</td><td>46.5%</td><td>44.8%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>60%</td><td>56.7%</td><td>45.6%</td><td>42.2%</td></tr></table> <table><tr><th>Math</th><th colspan="4">2010</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><th>CRCS</th><th>STATE</th><th>CITY</th><th>District 13</th></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>70%</td><td>59.1%</td><td>54.3%</td><td>46.9%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>72%</td><td>63.8%</td><td>58.4%</td><td>52.4%</td></tr></table> <p>Additionally, we found that if we had used last year’s scoring we would have met our goals, as evidenced in the charts below.</p> <table><tr><th>ELA</th><th>2009 Results (% scoring 3’s and 4’s)</th><th>2010 ELA Results (% scoring level 3 and 4)</th><th>2010 ELA Results (% scoring level 3 and 4) Using 2009 Scoring Ranges</th></tr><tr><th>Grade</th><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>84%</td><td>58%</td><td>86%</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>NA</td><td>60%</td><td>78%</td></tr></table> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•3rd Grade: 14 children/28% fell between 649-661 meaning they got between 25-28 out of 33 points and therefore scored a level 2 when last year they would have scored a level 3.•4th Grade: 9 children/18% fell between 649 and 667 and therefore scored a level 2 when last year they would have scored a level 3.•4th Graders across the city dropped 23% on average from 2009 to 2010.	ELA	2010				Grade	CRCS	STATE	CITY	District 13	3	58%	54.7%	46.5%	44.8%	4	60%	56.7%	45.6%	42.2%	Math	2010				Grade	CRCS	STATE	CITY	District 13	3	70%	59.1%	54.3%	46.9%	4	72%	63.8%	58.4%	52.4%	ELA	2009 Results (% scoring 3’s and 4’s)	2010 ELA Results (% scoring level 3 and 4)	2010 ELA Results (% scoring level 3 and 4) Using 2009 Scoring Ranges	Grade				3	84%	58%	86%	4	NA	60%	78%
ELA	2010																																																											
Grade	CRCS	STATE	CITY	District 13																																																								
3	58%	54.7%	46.5%	44.8%																																																								
4	60%	56.7%	45.6%	42.2%																																																								
Math	2010																																																											
Grade	CRCS	STATE	CITY	District 13																																																								
3	70%	59.1%	54.3%	46.9%																																																								
4	72%	63.8%	58.4%	52.4%																																																								
ELA	2009 Results (% scoring 3’s and 4’s)	2010 ELA Results (% scoring level 3 and 4)	2010 ELA Results (% scoring level 3 and 4) Using 2009 Scoring Ranges																																																									
Grade																																																												
3	84%	58%	86%																																																									
4	NA	60%	78%																																																									

Math	2009 Mathematics Results (% scoring level 3 and 4)	2010 Mathematics Results (% scoring level 3 and 4)	2010 Mathematics Results (% scoring level 3 and 4) Using 2009 Scoring Ranges
Grade			
3	96%	70%	100%
4	NA	72%	98%

Notes:

- 3rd Grade: 15 children/30% fell between 661-683 meaning they got between 24-33 out of 39 points and therefore scored a level 2 when last year they would have scored a level 3.
- 4th Grade: 13 children/26% fell between 661 and 683 and therefore scored a level 2 when last year they would have scored a level 3.
- 4th Graders across the City dropped an average of 26% between 2009 and 2010.

With only two years of testing data including a year where there was a change in scoring it is difficult to make a significant analysis of our students' progress. We feel very strongly the assessments measures we use to regularly measure students' growth and progress allow us to make instructional and programmatic decisions to insure children's needs are being met and academic gains are being made.

However, we do believe that we can take the following steps to improve our test scores. We are looking at the data from last year's tests to determine where students struggled. This data will be coded by teachers and then used to inform instruction. For example, if we find that students in third grade struggled with particular concepts, then that will become a focus for instruction, embedded in test prep and during readers' workshop. Test taking strategies are taught throughout the week in each grade in addition to embedding strategies in other content areas. Grade level teams map out the skills that need to be taught based on an examination of previous state tests and placing them into a calendar. The calendar includes when to teach the skills, a suggested time frame for covering the skills, and the skills and strategies to be taught.

Additionally, teachers in grades 3 through 5 have met to discuss a shared language and set of strategies that can be used when teaching test taking skills. It is important to also note that when looking at last year's testing data, we will look at individual student performance as well as trends across the grade. That information will follow the group of students whose data it represents as well as the grade level it represents. For example, we will look at the third grade's data and make instructional decisions for that group in fourth grade as well as make adjustments where

				needed in the third grade instruction. Lastly, we will have after school test prep for students beginning in third grade.																														
2.	<p>The percentage of students meeting or exceeding state standards by scoring a Level 3 or Level 4 on the state’s ELA and mathematics exams will exceed the respective percentages in our district.</p>	<p>The following are the percentage of CRCS students scoring level 3 and 4 on the ELA and Math tests in 2010.</p> <p>Grade 3: ELA: 58% Math: 60%</p> <p>Grade 4: ELA: 70% Math: 72%</p>	<p>The following are the percentage of students in District 13 scoring level 3 and 4 on the ELA and Math tests in 2010.</p> <p>Grade 3: ELA: 44.8% Math: 46.9%</p> <p>Grade 4: ELA: 42.2% Math: 52.4%</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>N/A</p>																														
3.	<p>Value Added Goal – Each student in grades k-5 will show more than one academic year’s progress on a norm referenced test from September to September</p>	<p>Terra Nova Results – Grade Mean Equivalents and NY Group Performance Levels</p> <table><tr><td>1st Grade</td><td>September</td><td>June</td></tr><tr><td></td><td><i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i></td><td><i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i></td></tr><tr><td>Reading</td><td>1.3</td><td>2.7</td></tr><tr><td>Language</td><td>1.3</td><td>2.9</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>.5</td><td>2.5</td></tr></table> <table><tr><td>2nd Grade</td><td>September</td><td>June</td></tr><tr><td></td><td><i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i></td><td><i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i></td></tr><tr><td>Reading</td><td>2.6</td><td>3.1</td></tr><tr><td>Language</td><td>1.9</td><td>2.6</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>2.0</td><td>2.8</td></tr></table>	1st Grade	September	June		<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>	<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>	Reading	1.3	2.7	Language	1.3	2.9	Math	.5	2.5	2nd Grade	September	June		<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>	<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>	Reading	2.6	3.1	Language	1.9	2.6	Math	2.0	2.8	<p>Terra Nova – Administered in September and June of First and Second Grade. Please see Student Assessment Data for complete results.</p>	<p>Yes – First Grade</p> <p>No – Second Grade</p> <p>In First Grade, according to the Terra Nova students made more than one academic year’s progress in all areas; Reading, Language and Math. In Math students were found to have made 2 years progress.</p> <p>In Second Grade according to the Terra Nova students did not make more than 1 year’s progress in Reading, Language or Math.</p> <p>We do not feel that the Terra Nova presents an accurate picture of student’s progress or achievement in any content area. This becomes obvious when our First Grade scores from Spring 2009 are compared with our Second Grade scores from Fall 2009. This is almost exactly the same cohort of students. In Spring of their First Grade year in Language students were said to be performing on a 2nd Grade 7 month level (2.7 Grade Mean Equivalent). These same students, tested in the Fall of their Second Grade year, just 3 months later tested on a First Grade 9 month (1.9 Grade Mean Equivalent). This is just one example of how this assessment is not giving us reliable data.</p> <p>We have not found a norm- referenced test that assesses First and Second Grade students and yields reliable and valid data that can be used to inform instruction. The data from the Terra Nova because it does not match any other data that we are gathering on our youngest students is not a useful tool in terms of helping us prepare for the State assessments and is not useful in making curricular adjustments or helping us to get an accurate picture of our students strengths and needs. We are proposing</p>
1st Grade	September	June																																
	<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>	<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>																																
Reading	1.3	2.7																																
Language	1.3	2.9																																
Math	.5	2.5																																
2nd Grade	September	June																																
	<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>	<i>Grade Mean Equivalent</i>																																
Reading	2.6	3.1																																
Language	1.9	2.6																																
Math	2.0	2.8																																

				using the DRA, components of ECLAS-2, End of Unit and Interim math assessments, weekly spelling and phonics assessments and conferencing as our gauge of student progress and achievement in grades K-2.	
4.	<p>Show continuous improvement on tests taken in accordance with Individualized Education Plans for students with an IEP.</p>	<p>7 out of 7 students with IEPs continuous improvement in kindergarten showed on the DRA from the beginning of the school year to the end. (Students take the DRA every other month.)</p> <p>4 out of 4 students in 1st grade showed continuous improvement on the DRA.</p> <p>9 out of 11 students in second grade showed continuous improvement on the DRA.</p> <p>11 out of 11 students in third grade showed continuous improvement on the DRA.</p> <p>6 out of 7 students in the fourth grade showed continuous improvement on the DRA.</p> <p>On the ELA, looking at the same cohort of students with IEPs from third grade to fourth grade, 3 out of 4 students went down one level, and one student went up one level. On the math test, 3 out of 4 students went down one level and 1 student stayed the same.</p> <p>All students with IEPs met the promotional criteria as stated on their IEP.</p>	<p>DRA-2 Assessment</p> <p>State Test for ELA and Math</p>	<p>No</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Students receive intervention services as well as test prep.</p> <p>The two students in second grade who did not make progress on the DRA made progress in their intervention groups as evidenced by the PAF (Preventing Academic Failure) assessments. The one student in fourth grade who did not make progress on the DRA made progress according to (Qualitative Reading Inventory) which assessed the student's comprehension. The reason for her DRA score stagnating is because her fluency did not improve. She is currently receiving fluency instruction in the 2010 school year.</p> <p>Due to the change in scoring it is difficult to assess whether or not students made one year's progress on the State testing. However, because we are not satisfied with their scores, we have implemented new structures to build upon our pre-existing test prep curriculum as evidenced in our response to question 1.</p>
5.	<p>Meet or exceed the requirements and annual goals of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 including</p>	<p>We made AYP in 3 out of 3 groups for ELA, 3 out of 3 for Math, and 1 out of 1 for Science, according to our School Accountability Report.</p>	<p>New York State Standardized Tests including ELA in 3rd, 4th; Mathematics in 3rd, 4th; Science in 4th Grade</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Annual Yearly Progress.																
6. Meet or exceed CRCS exit outcomes, aligned with New York State Standards in all content areas in each grade.	<table><tr><td>Spring 2010</td><td>Average % of Students meeting or exceeding the Exit Outcomes</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>K-4th Grade</td></tr><tr><td>Social/Emotional</td><td>83%</td></tr><tr><td>ELA</td><td>87%</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>88%</td></tr><tr><td>Social Studies</td><td>95%</td></tr></table>	Spring 2010	Average % of Students meeting or exceeding the Exit Outcomes		K-4 th Grade	Social/Emotional	83%	ELA	87%	Math	88%	Social Studies	95%	<p>Community Roots Charter School Checklist Reports</p> <p>The Community Roots curriculum in all content areas is driven by the Community Roots Exit Outcomes, which are aligned with State Standards and detail what every child needs to know and be able to do in all content areas by the end of each grade. Teachers are constantly assessing children's mastery of these Exit Outcomes through looking at student work, holding weekly reading and writing conferences and using end of unit assessments. Children's progress at meeting Exit Outcomes is reported to parents three times per year, twice through detailed checklist reports and once a year through narrative reports. To assess whether Community Roots has met the above stated goal we have compiled the results of the Spring Checklist Reports demonstrating the percentage of students who have met or exceeded each Exit Outcome in each content</p>	Yes	It is difficult to say whether or not Community Roots met the above stated goal because we did not indicate a target percentage to meet or exceed Exit Outcomes. Students in all grades in all content areas exceeded the goal of 75% meeting or exceeding exit outcomes, which would correlate to outperforming our target percentage for students scoring levels three and four on State tests in 3 rd , 4 th and 5 th grades.
Spring 2010	Average % of Students meeting or exceeding the Exit Outcomes															
	K-4 th Grade															
Social/Emotional	83%															
ELA	87%															
Math	88%															
Social Studies	95%															

		area.			
7.	Community Roots will have a higher than 94.1% student stability rate, which is the student stability rate of District 13 where Community Roots is housed.	98.8% student stability	Student attrition is tracked through ATS.	Yes	N/A
8.	Students will maintain a 95% or higher average daily attendance rate for the year.	94.7%	Student attendance is tracked through ATS. Teacher's take their class attendance each morning and hand it in to the office. Attendance is entered into ATS each day.	No	<p>Our school fell .3% short of meeting its target of 95% average daily attendance. However, our average daily attendance improved from the previous year by .7%, when our average daily attendance was 94%.</p> <p>For the 2010-2011 school year we will continue to implement the processes we put in place this year. However, we will no longer send home weekly notices with attendance information as we did not find this to be effective and used an astronomical amount of paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. We will have our school aide make initial phone calls each day to all student's homes who are not in attendance and who have not called in.2. If a child is absent for two consecutive days the teacher will call home to check in and if a child is absent for three consecutive days with out explanation the Co-Director will call home and if necessary schedule a home visit with a social worker.3. Children with chronic attendance and lateness issues are flagged for social workers who work with families to make plans for insuring attendance improves.
9.	90% of all families indicating "satisfied" or "extremely satisfied" as an overall rating of CRCS. CRCS will have the additional goal that parent and staff satisfaction will increase over	97% of families who filled out the CRCS family survey indicated they were "extremely satisfied" or "satisfied" with their child's education at Community Roots.	Family Satisfaction Survey	Yes	N/A

the first five years and then stabilize at 95%.				
10. 90% of all staff indicating “satisfied” or “extremely satisfied” as an overall rating of CRCS. CRCS will have the additional goal that parent and staff satisfaction will increase over the first five years and then stabilize at 95%.	95% of staff indicated they were “satisfied or “extremely satisfied” with their experience at Community Roots.	Staff Satisfaction Survey	Yes	N/A