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Derrick Dunlap has served as the Lower School Principal since 2018.
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Community Partnership Charter School (CPCS) was founded in 2000 by a group of parents in Fort Greene, Brooklyn and the Beginning with Children Foundation (BwCF). At CPCS, families, educators, and community members join together in creating a supportive community that nurtures the talent of the future leaders of tomorrow. Our rigorous academic program teaches students to creatively solve complex problems and explore and develop their own special talents through learning opportunities in and outside of the classroom. Our graduates are well-rounded, engaged students who recognize the importance of perseverance, collaboration and teamwork.

## Key Design Elements include:

- An intensive, longer school day and school year that results in no less than 20\% more time on task that NYC Department of Education schools
- An emphasis on the development of writing, literacy, and mathematical skills, devoting at least $50 \%$ of academic time to these subjects
- Social studies, science, music, art, technology and physical education as core subjects taught by specialists
- Assessment to drive curriculum and staff development which is responsive to individual students' needs
- Leadership team members assigned to specific teachers to support literacy and math instruction, data management and classroom culture and discipline
- An after-school program which provides academic enrichment programs, utilizes best practices and is aligned with the regular school day
- Saturday Enrichment Academy for at-risk students in order to ensure their classroom success
- Development of fully inclusionary intervention model provided primarily in the context of a regular classroom
- Dynamic community partnerships which support enrichment programs that teach students to become life-long learners and active citizens
- Parent/Guardian involvement at all levels of the student community

In an effort to accelerate the academic turnaround of CPCS, the Board of Trustees hired Derrick Dunlap in June 2018 to be principal of the Lower School. Mr. Dunlap has 20 years of experience in education and achieved a remarkable turnaround as principal of Rochdale Early Advantage, a pre-K$5^{\text {th }}$ grade charter school in Queens. In his first year at CPCS Lower School, Mr. Dunlap and his team achieved significant progress in the ELA and Math proficiency rates of our Lower School students, with all students in grades 3-5 demonstrating an average proficiency of 60\% in ELA and 63\% in Math on the 2018-19 NYS Exam.

In July 2019, the Board appointed Janna Tsimprea, a six-year veteran of Community Partnership, as principal of the Middle School.
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School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School <br> Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2014-15$ | 45 | 43 | 52 | 45 | 44 | 46 | 39 | 55 | 33 | 402 |
| $2015-16$ | 40 | 52 | 51 | 48 | 55 | 51 | 62 | 50 | 47 | 456 |
| $2016-17$ | 34 | 33 | 45 | 43 | 43 | 38 | 54 | 52 | 38 | 380 |
| $2017-18$ | 30 | 37 | 44 | 39 | 39 | 53 | 46 | 46 | 49 | 383 |
| $2018-19$ | 44 | 39 | 42 | 45 | 43 | 47 | 54 | 45 | 44 | 406 |

Note: In addition to numbers listed above, there were three ungraded students enrolled at CPCS in 2018-19.

## GOAL 1: ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

## Goal 1: English Language Arts <br> CPCS students will become proficient readers and writers of the English language.

## BACKGROUND

At Community Partnership Charter School (CPCS) we believe that learning is a process, and that all children deserve rigorous instruction that is differentiated to meet their individual needs. We also believe in holding children to high expectations because children will reach the expectations that we set for them. Our literacy curriculum reflects this ideology through Common Core based instruction that is embedded into every lesson and unit for our classes in English Language Arts, and Writing.

The Lower School continued to utilize Journeys by Houghton Mifflin for English Language Arts, Lucy Calkins' Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing for Writing, and Success for All KinderPhonics and Fast-Track Phonics programs for Phonics. All teachers continued to receive training and coaching for these programs during our two-week Summer Institute in August, and throughout the school year to deepen their understanding of the core curricula. Our core curricula continues to be supplemented with authentic texts in a variety of instructional formats, including read-alouds, shared reading, guided reading, and novel studies. These supplemental texts connect to the curriculum, support instructional objectives, and develop a love for reading.

The schedules developed at the lower school continue to devote between 150-200 minutes of literacy instruction per day. This includes two 50-minute blocks to English Language Arts (ELA), one 50-minute block to Writing, and one 50-minute block of Phonics for scholars in kindergarten and first grade. Teachers use a workshop approach in literacy that gradually releases the responsibility of learning to scholars. Teachers scaffold instruction by first modeling for scholars, then guiding scholars' practice, and finally moving to independent practice.

The first 50 minute block of ELA instruction is whole group instruction that focuses on developing a main idea using thinking frames for each new text read, and comprehension skills and strategies outlined by Journeys. Through Journeys, teachers engage scholars in reading texts from a variety of genres while utilizing thinking frames. Thinking frames are a series of questions that scholars should be asking themselves as they read to support reading comprehension of specific genres. During the first read of each new text, teachers ask scholars text-dependent questions to lead scholars to establish a main idea, or deeper understanding of the text using thinking frames. The second block of ELA instruction is focused on guided reading. Guided reading is an instructional approach that involves a teacher working with a small group of students who demonstrate similar reading behaviors and can read similar levels of texts. The goal of guided reading is to provide scholars with instruction to develop the skills and strategies necessary, so they gain the ability to apply them independently. Through guided reading, our scholars receive differentiated instruction, strengthen their independent reading skills/strategies, develop habits for discussing texts, engage in in-depth text discussions, and become more independent through routines.

During the 50-minute writing block, teachers utilize Lucy Calkins' Units of Study in Opinion, Information, and Narrative Writing, and the writing workshop model in grades K-5. Through this curriculum, scholars explore the writing process by writing in different genres. For the 2018-19
school year scholars in grades K-2 engaged in genre writing 5 times a week, whereas scholars in grades 3-5 engaged in genre writing 3 times a week and response to literature 2 times a week. In response to literature, teachers in grades 3-5 engaged scholars in reading a text and responding to the text through teacher-created text-dependent questions. Scholars will continue to use the RAC2E strategy to tackle both short and extended response questions. This response to literature period will continue to support scholar preparation for the type of writing required on the New York State English Language Arts test.

Scholars in kindergarten and first grade engage in an additional 50-minute block of phonics instruction everyday. During this block teachers utilize Success for All's KinderPhonics and FastTrack Phonics programs to develop phonological and phonemic awareness in scholars. This program was also used as an intervention component for struggling scholars in second grade. Teachers (kindergarten, first grade, second grade, and SETSS providers) continue to receive professional development and coaching throughout the year to maintain the fidelity of the program's implementation.

All students are assessed 3 times a year using the Fountas \& Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System. Scholars not meeting end-of-year benchmarks for their grade level are assessed two additional times to measure growth more frequently between the 3 larger cycles. This assessment provides students, teachers, parents, and administrators with data on student mastery of reading accuracy, fluency, within the text comprehension, beyond the text comprehension, and about the text comprehension. It also provides teachers with direction on a scholar's ability to infer meaning, synthesize information, respond to the author's craft, understand complex plots, and use background information to interpret texts.

Finally, CPCS lower school began morning, after school, Saturday, and summer programs to support the literacy needs of scholars. The Morning ELA intervention program is designed to enhance the reading and writing skills of scholars through strategy and skill-based small group instruction. This program runs from 7:45am-8:20am allowing for scholars in grades 3-5 to receive individualized coaching in focus areas of development two days per week. ELA Academic after school also supports scholars in grades 3-5 with the development of their literacy skills using a standards-based approach. This program runs from 4:00pm-5:30pm one day per week. Saturday Academy for ELA is an additional literacy support provided to scholars in grades 3-5. This program begins in January and provides each grade level with 120 minutes of instruction per session for 8 sessions. With these programs scholars are assessed every 6-8 weeks to determine mastery. We also held a Summer Program this year, which was a community theme-based program that incorporated 90 minutes of literacy instruction (whole group instruction and guided reading) 3 days a week for 3 weeks.

In the Middle School, for the 2018-2019 school year, literacy teachers in grades 6 used Journeys Common Core and in grades 7-8 continued to implement the Collections curriculum. Our implementation of Collections and Journeys emphasizes using close-reading to maneuver through complex texts. Each Collections/Journeys unit is comprised of text sets of various genres that are compiled to support an anchor that is chosen to target a specific skill. Each unit is centered around a guiding question that will be used at the end of each unit to construct a performance task.

In addition to Journeys and Collections curricula, teachers in grades 6-8 taught literacy through novel units. Each week, teachers administered SAFEs (Short and Frequent Exams) to assess the standards taught throughout the week. The questions were formatted using question stems that
were aligned to state standards. This assessment practice provided teachers with data that would inform their instruction and allowed them the clarity needed to work with scholars on an individual basis.

Our Response to Intervention for the 2018-2019 school year was very targeted. Teachers regularly assessed and grouped scholars accordingly. They created plans to address student weaknesses and to build on students' areas of strength. As a team, we collectively shared that data and strategized on how to address trends across grade levels. Student data was also used to create focused action plans based on individual student learning paths, that allowed for individual interventions throughout the week based on individual deficits or strengths. For our students with disabilities, in addition to in-class supports they also received small group pull-out supports informed by their individualized education plans. For at-risk students, early morning interventions using l-ready texts and data were put in place to support growth.

During the 18/19 school year, both the elementary school and the middle school also administered standards aligned Interim Assessments. The teacher-created, network-vetted assessments consisted of short and extended constructed responses. The data from both the F\&P and Interim Assessments was stored in our Learning Management System, Illuminate and used by teachers and administration to plan for mastery of standards. The data is analyzed frequently and used to customize instruction to meet the needs of our students. For example, Fountas and Pinnell data is used to create reading groups and set learning and instructional goals within the groups.

With regards to data and report cards, staff continued to use Journeys/Collections/NYS Standards as the basis of the report cards sent home to families. Through the support of the Beginning with Children Foundation, CPCS has continued to refine its standards-based reports. The report cards and progress reports were assessment based and provided our students' families with a clear understanding of their child's progress towards meeting Common Core standards.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

## METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts ("ELA") assessment to students in $3^{\text {rd }}$ through 8th grade in April 2019. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year).

## 2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam

Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total Tested | Not Tested ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | Total Enrolled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | No <br> Assessment |  |
| 3 | 41 |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 45 |
| 4 | 38 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 42 |
| 5 | 40 | 1 |  |  | 3 | 3 | 47 |
| 6 | 47 | 2 |  |  |  | 5 | 54 |
| 7 | 43 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 8 | 40 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 42 |
| All | 249 | 4 |  | 1 | 9 | 11 | 274 |

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure. 43 percent of students in at least their second year scored at proficiency on the 2018-19 NYS ELA exam. Scores ranged from a high of $81 \%$ in fourth grade to a low of $15 \%$ in seventh grade. However, our Lower School exhibited significant progress in this measure: the average proficiency of students in at least their second year in grades 3,4 and 5 was 59\%.

Performance on 2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grades | All Students |  | Enrolled in at least their <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
|  | $68 \%$ | 41 | $71 \%$ | 31 |
| 4 | $74 \%$ | 38 | $81 \%$ | 31 |
| 5 | $38 \%$ | 40 | $24 \%$ | 21 |
| 6 | $28 \%$ | 47 | $24 \%$ | 37 |
| 7 | $16 \%$ | 43 | $15 \%$ | 39 |
| 8 | $50 \%$ | 38 | $49 \%$ | 35 |
| All | $45 \%$ | 247 | $43 \%$ | 194 |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

As evidenced in the following table, CPCS has demonstrated a positive trajectory in overall ELA proficiency rates over the past three years, from $34 \%$ to $38 \%$ to $43 \%$ proficient and for grades 3, 4 and 5 , the proficiency rates have climbed from $32 \%$ to $36 \%$ to $59 \%$.
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## ELA Performance by Grade Level and Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2016-17$ |  | $2017-18$ |  | 2018-19 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | $34 \%$ | 32 | $49 \%$ | 37 | $71 \%$ | 31 |
| 4 | $41 \%$ | 27 | $36 \%$ | 33 | $81 \%$ | 31 |
| 5 | $21 \%$ | 33 | $23 \%$ | 35 | $24 \%$ | 21 |
| 6 | $22 \%$ | 36 | $34 \%$ | 29 | $24 \%$ | 37 |
| 7 | $42 \%$ | 48 | $41 \%$ | 39 | $15 \%$ | 39 |
| 8 | $43 \%$ | 35 | $43 \%$ | 46 | $49 \%$ | 35 |
| All | $\mathbf{3 4 \%}$ | 211 | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | 219 | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | 194 |

## Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the State English language arts exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

## METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the English language arts test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or $3 \& 4$ ). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2018-19 English language arts MIP for all students of 105. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS achieved this ELA measure in 2018-19. The 2019 ELA Performance Index calculates to 139 exceeding the Measure of Interim Progress of 105 set by the state.

English Language Arts 2018-19 Performance Index

| Number in Cohort | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Level 1 |  | Level 2 |  | Level 3 |  | Level 4 |  |  |
| 247 | 23 |  | 32 |  | 31 |  | 14 |  |  |
|  | PI | = | 32 | + | 31 | + | 14 | = | 87 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 31 | + | 14 | = | 45 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | + | (.5)*14 | = | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PI | $=$ | 139 |
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## Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

## METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district. ${ }^{2}$

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure. Overall, 43 percent of CPCS scholars in at least their second year at the school performed at proficiency in ELA, whereas $48 \%$ did so at the local district \#13.

CPCS is making steady progress toward this metric, having an overall increase in proficiency of 5 points to the district's 1 point advance. Additionally, CPCS Lower School (grades 3-5) had an overall increase of almost 23 points, compared to the district's 2 point increase for those grades.

## 2018-19 State English Language Arts Exam <br> Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students <br> In At Least 2nd Year | All District Students |  |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | $71 \%$ | 31 | $60 \%$ | 894 |
| 4 | $81 \%$ | 31 | $58 \%$ | 996 |
| 5 | $24 \%$ | 21 | $44 \%$ | 930 |
| 6 | $24 \%$ | 37 | $38 \%$ | 681 |
| 7 | $15 \%$ | 39 | $39 \%$ | 671 |
| 8 | $49 \%$ | 35 | $42 \%$ | 605 |
| All | $43 \%$ | 194 | $48 \%$ | 4777 |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Proficiency in ELA is increasing at CPCS, especially in the lower grades. As those students advance to the upper school, it is anticipated that the overall scores to improve schoolwide.

[^1]English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or <br> Above Proficiency Compared to District Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2016-17$ |  |  | $2017-18$ |  | $2018-19$ |  |
|  | Charter <br> School | District <br> 13 | Charter <br> School | District 13 | Charter <br> School | District 13 |  |
| 3 | $34 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $71 \%$ | $60 \%$ |  |
| 4 | $41 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $57 \%$ | $81 \%$ | $58 \%$ |  |
| 5 | $21 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $44 \%$ |  |
| 6 | $22 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $38 \%$ |  |
| 7 | $42 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $39 \%$ |  |
| 8 | $43 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $42 \%$ |  |
| All | $\mathbf{3 4 \%}$ | $40 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ | $47 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 3 \%}$ | $48 \%$ |  |

## Goal 1: Comparative Measure

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

## METHOD

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

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this ELA measure based on the most recent analysis available, 2017-18. The overall comparative performance was deemed slightly higher than expected with an effect size of 0.24 , however; just below the target of 0.3 .

## 2017-18 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent <br> Economically <br> Disadvantaged | Number <br> Tested | Percent of Students <br> at Levels 3\&4 |  | Difference <br> between Actual <br> and Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Predicted |  |  |  |
| 3 | 81.4 | 39 | 46.2 | 41.8 | 4.4 | 0.24 |
| 4 | 92.3 | 38 | 36.8 | 34.7 | 2.1 | 0.12 |
| 5 | 90.4 | 45 | 20.0 | 24.2 | -4.2 | -0.29 |
| 6 | 91.5 | 42 | 31.0 | 34.0 | -3.0 | -0.19 |
| 7 | 89.4 | 42 | 42.9 | 26.8 | 16.0 | 0.94 |
| 8 | 83.7 | 48 | 43.8 | 38.2 | 5.5 | 0.29 |
| All | 81.4 | 39 | 46.2 | 41.8 | 4.4 | $\mathbf{0 . 2 4}$ |


| School's Overall Comparative Performance: |
| :---: |
| Slightly higher than expected |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The 2017-18 effect size is likely below 0.3 because the percent economically disadvantaged in 201718 was listed at just 81.4\%. Having scored at higher proficiency in 2019 and having an ED percentage of 89 will increase the effect size.

## English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent <br> Economically <br> Disadvantaged | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2015-16$ | $3-8$ | 85 | 289 | 28.2 | 25.4 | 0.17 |
| $2016-17$ | $3-8$ | 90.3 | 260 | 32.3 | 25.0 | 0.44 |
| $2017-18$ | $3-8$ | 81.4 | 39 | 46.2 | 41.8 | 0.24 |

## Goal 1: Growth Measure ${ }^{3}$

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50 .

## METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2017-18 and also have a state exam score from 2016-17 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2016-17 score are ranked by their 2017-18 score and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a
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school to perform above the target for this measure, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Growth Model data available. ${ }^{4}$

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In 2017-18, CPCS did achieve this measure with an overall mean growth percentile of 50.8. Grade 7 demonstrated the most growth with a MGP of 59.9.

## 2017-18 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | Target |
| 4 | 42.7 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 54.7 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 53.1 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 59.9 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 43.8 | 50.0 |
| All | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{5 0 . 8}}}$ | 50.0 |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

CPCS has been consistently achieving this growth measure.

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

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | $2017-18$ | Target |
| 4 | 46.8 | 48.6 | 42.7 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 45.4 | 59.8 | 54.7 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 56.1 | 56.7 | 53.1 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 59.4 | 45.8 | 59.9 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 56.7 | 48.3 | 43.8 | 50.0 |
| All | $\underline{\mathbf{5 3 . 7}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{5 1 . 6}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{5 0 . 8}}$ | 50.0 |
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## SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Although Community Partnership Charter School is still working toward having at least 75 percent of scholars in at least their second year at CPCS scoring at proficiency levels of 3 and 4, performance is improving year after year. CPCS continues to demonstrate growth in ELA and is on track to outperform the district in coming years and reach 75 percent proficient in all grades.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least <br> their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English <br> language arts exam for grades 3-8. | Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts <br> exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA <br> accountability system. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least <br> their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English <br> language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested <br> grades in the school district of comparison. | Did Not Achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the <br> state English language arts exam by an effect size of 0.3 or above <br> (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a <br> regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students <br> among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2017-18 results.) | Did Not Achieve |
| Growth | Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted <br> growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades <br> 4-8 will be above the target of 50. (Using 2017-18 results.) | Achieved |

## ACTION PLAN

Lower School:

- Continue to utilize Journeys across all grade levels with a more structured block format
- Implement curriculum following newly established curriculum map
- Continue the implementation of effective guided reading instruction for every scholar across each grade level
- Continue execution of novel studies for grades 3-5, and Success for All's KinderPhonics and Fast-Track Phonics programs for grades K and 1
- Formalize usage of thinking frames to establish a main idea and deeper understanding of texts from a variety of genres across all grade levels K-5
- Restructure the literacy and writing blocks to incorporate response to literature in classrooms across grades K-5
- Adopt NY Ready ELA assessments, I-ready diagnostic assessments, Fountas \& Pinnell reading benchmark assessment, weekly adapted Journeys assessments, and network interim assessments as formative and summative assessments
- Administer, discuss, and norm campus-wide and network-wide assessments
- Formalize classroom data discussions with scholars in grades 3-5 on summative assessments
- Continue implementation of Morning ELA Intervention, ELA Academic After school, and Saturday Academy programs for grades 3-5
- Incorporate daily on-the-spot assessments and data tracking throughout the literacy blocks
- Collaborate during common-planning opportunities to discuss data, lesson plan facilitation, and scholar work
- Establish lesson plan feedback procedures that promote vertical alignment of literacy skills/strategies K-5
- On-going professional development opportunities and data discussions during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), individualized teacher coaching, and professional development days will be utilized to promote literacy goals


## Middle School

- Implementing small class sizes of 12-15 students. This drastically increases the opportunity for small group guided reading instruction. In ICT and 12:1:1 classes, there will be a 1:6 ratio of teachers to students.
- Adopting bi-weekly School Leadership-created, Network-wide formative assessments that will serve as blind assessments. This will lead to more accurate student data throughout the year and serve as a cross-campus collaborative planning tool.
- Formalize grade-wide novel studies connected to Social Studies content
- Implementing more authentic texts in various genres across all three grade levels.
- Continue 90-minute blocks of English Language Arts instruction.
- Adding an additional 45 minutes of foundational reading comprehension skills for our 6th grade students.
- Responding to the 2018-19 NYS Math Assessment data by adjusting pacing and scope of the 6th, 7th and 8th grade curriculum and bringing greater focus to the following standards:
- 6th Grade
- RL 6.5 - Analyze how a sentence, chapter, scene, or section fits into the overall structure of a text
- RL 6.6 - Explain how an author develops point of view
- RL 6.2 - Determine a theme or central idea
- RI 6.2 - Determine a central idea
- 7th Grade
- RI 7.3 - Analyze interactions between individuals, events, and ideas in a text
- RI 7.8 - Trace and evaluate arguments
- RL 7.3-Analyze how elements of a story or drama interact

■ RL 7.6-Analyze points of view

- 8th Grade

■ RI 8.3 - Analyze text connections

- RI 8.8 - Delineate and evaluate arguments
- RL 8.3 - Analyze story parts
- RL 8.6 - Analyze points of view


## GOAL 2: MATHEMATICS

## Goal 2: Mathematics

CPCS students will become proficient in the Understanding and Application of Mathematical Skills and Concepts.

## BACKGROUND

At Community Partnership Charter School, we believe that mathematics instruction should be focused on identifying skills and strategies in core mathematics domains. The 2018-2019 school year marked our 6th year using the Math in Focus curriculum. This curriculum helps scholars make sense of math through hands-on learning and visuals, which allow for each scholar's understanding to grow conceptually. All teachers continued to receive training and coaching for this program during our two-week Summer Institute in August, and throughout the school year to deepen their understanding of the core curriculum. Our core curriculum continues to be supplemented with resources such as Eureka Math, that connects to the curriculum, supports instructional objectives, and develops a love for mathematics.

Math in Focus provides teachers with easy-to-use teaching and learning pathways proven to develop foundational understanding in scholars. This curriculum is built on a framework developed by the Singapore Ministry of Education, which highlights problem solving as the focus of mathematical learning and draws on best practices from around the world.

Instruction in the 2018-2019 school year shifted from individual problems to multi-step word problems in real-life scenarios. Scholars often solve these word problems in partners or small groups to promote thinking through steps and discussion of the problem and solution. During this time, scholars are encouraged to write to explain the steps they used to solve the problem using precise vocabulary.

The schedules developed at the lower school continue to devote 100-150 minutes of mathematics instruction per day. This includes two 50 -minute blocks of mathematics to increase scholar success in math for all grades, and an additional 50-minute block once a week in grades 3-5 for math constructed response questions. Teachers use the gradual release of responsibility model of instruction, which gradually releases the responsibility of learning to scholars. Teachers scaffold instruction by first modeling for scholars, then guiding scholars' practice, and finally moving to independent practice.

The first 50-minute block of math instruction is whole group instruction that focuses on a particular strategy/skill within a domain. The second block of math instruction is focused on center activities including, reteach, enrichment, and differentiated instruction to support various learning styles. During the 50-minute math extended response block (grades 3-5), scholars explore math constructed response questions, and learn the attributes of effective responses. The teacher engages scholars in responses that are revealed in complete thoughts/sentences, make sense, can stand alone with question reference, and include the solve, diagram, and explain components. Teachers in grades K-2 spend one day a week during their second 50-minute math block utilizing number stories (story problems) to encourage the same components of effective constructed responses across the school.

## 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Finally, CPCS lower school began lunch labs, after school, Saturday, and summer programs to support the mathematical needs of scholars. The Math Lunch Labs program is designed to enhance the math knowledge of scholars (placed in homogeneous groups) through strategy and skill-based instruction. This program runs for a 50-minute block during lunch, allowing for scholars in grades 35 to receive individualized coaching in focus areas of development one or two days per week. Math Academic after school also supports scholars in grades 3-5 with the development of their math skills using a standards-based approach. This program runs from 4:00pm-5:30pm one day per week. Saturday Academy for Math is an additional mathematics support provided to scholars in grades 35. This program begins in January and provides each grade level with 120 minutes of instruction per session for 8 sessions. With these programs, scholars are assessed every $6-8$ weeks to determine mastery. We also held a Summer Program this year, which was a community theme-based program that incorporated 30 minutes of math instruction (whole group instruction) 3 days a week for 3 weeks.

In the Middle School for the 2018-2019 school year, the math department taught using a revised pacing calendar that allowed for better alignment with the NYS Testing Program calendar. The math departments model emphasized both a gradual release model and small group instruction. To effectively implement both models, grades 6-8 used both Engage NY and Ready NY curriculum resources to support scholars in mastering grade level standards. CPCMS also used the I-ready diagnostic assessment to measure scholars individual grade level in the beginning of the school year and reassessed them during the middle of the school year and the end of the school to measure the growth

In Grade 6, instructional time focused on four critical areas: (1) connecting ratio and rate to whole number multiplication and division and using the concepts of ratio and rate to solve problems; (2) completing understanding of division of fractions and extending the notion of number to the system of rational numbers, which includes negative numbers; (3) writing, interpreting, and using expressions and equations; and (4) developing understanding of statistical thinking.

In Grade 7, instructional time focused on four critical areas: (1) developing understanding of and applying proportional relationships; (2) developing understanding of operations with rational numbers and working with expressions and linear equations; (3) solving problems involving scale drawings and informal geometric constructions, and working with two- and three-dimensional shapes to solve problems involving area, surface area, and volume; and (4) drawing inferences about populations based on samples.

In Grade 8, instructional time focused on three critical areas: (1) formulating and reasoning about expressions and equations, including modeling an association in bivariate data with a linear equation, and solving linear equations and systems of equations; (2) grasping the concept of a function and using functions to describe quantitative relationships; (3) analyzing two- and threedimensional space and figures using distance, angle, similarity, and congruence, and understanding and applying the Pythagorean Theorem.

## Gradual Release Model

We utilized the Gradual Release Model of instruction, which requires the teacher to guide students toward using different skills, strategies and procedures independently. In this model of instruction, the students assume more responsibility with less support from the teacher throughout the course of the lesson. The gradual release model provided students the opportunity to grapple with a realworld problem while using investigation to learn the skills necessary to solve the example. Our 90minute block consisted of 60 minutes using EngageNY materials and 30 minutes of Number Stories (Problem of the Day).

## Small Group Instruction

Small group instruction is used to differentiate instruction, reinforce new topics, and create a community feel between a small number of students with similar needs. Differentiating instruction by working in a small group allows the teacher to break down the lesson into smaller steps for students who need to learn in a different way. Working with students in a small group allows the instructor to hone in on the ways that individual students learn best and target areas that require additional work or instruction. The smaller group also encourages students to open up to the instructor about their needs and the gaps they have within the lesson.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure
Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

## METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in $3^{\text {rd }}$ through $8^{\text {th }}$ grade in April 2019. Each student's raw score has been converted to a gradespecific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

| 2018-19 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  | ested ${ }^{5}$ |  |  | Total |
| Grade | Tested | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | No <br> Assessment | Enrolled |
| 3 | 44 |  |  |  |  |  | 44 |
| 4 | 38 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 42 |
| 5 | 42 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 3 | 48 |
| 6 | 46 | 1 |  |  |  | 8 | 55 |
| 7 | 43 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 44 |
| 8 | 38 | 1 |  |  |  | 4 | 42 |
| All | 251 | 3 |  | 1 | 3 | 18 | 276 |

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure as 47 percent of all students enrolled in at least their second year at the school performed at proficiency on the NYS math assessment. Grades 3 and 5 performed the best with $67 \%$ at levels 3 and 4 . Our Lower School as a whole exhibited significant progress in this measure: the average proficiency of students in at least their second year in grades 3,4 and 5 was $65 \%$.

Performance on 2018-19 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grades | All Students |  | Enrolled in at least their <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
|  | $64 \%$ | 44 | $67 \%$ | 33 |
| 4 | $61 \%$ | 38 | $61 \%$ | 31 |
| 5 | $64 \%$ | 42 | $67 \%$ | 21 |
| 6 | $35 \%$ | 46 | $36 \%$ | 36 |
| 7 | $21 \%$ | 43 | $21 \%$ | 39 |
| 8 | $46 \%$ | 38 | $44 \%$ | 36 |
| All | $\mathbf{4 8 \%}$ | 251 | $\underline{47 \%}$ | 196 |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

In addition to the year to year growth seen on the NYS ELA exam, the math scores continue to improve as well from $26 \%$ overall in 2016-17 to $33 \%$ in 2017-18 to the most recent outcome of $47 \%$ proficient in math. For grades 3, 4 and 5, the proficiency rates have climbed from $27 \%$ to $33 \%$ to 65\%.
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## Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year <br> Achieving Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2016-17$ |  | $2017-18$ |  | 2018-19 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | $31 \%$ | 32 | $44 \%$ | 36 | $67 \%$ | 33 |
| 4 | $23 \%$ | 26 | $27 \%$ | 33 | $61 \%$ | 31 |
| 5 | $26 \%$ | 31 | $29 \%$ | 34 | $67 \%$ | 21 |
| 6 | $20 \%$ | 35 | $14 \%$ | 28 | $36 \%$ | 36 |
| 7 | $28 \%$ | 47 | $49 \%$ | 39 | $21 \%$ | 39 |
| 8 | $27 \%$ | 33 | $31 \%$ | 42 | $44 \%$ | 36 |
| All | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | 204 | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | 196 |

Goal 2: Absolute Measure
Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index ("PI") on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's state Measure of Interim Progress ("MIP") set forth in the state's ESSA accountability system.

## METHOD

In New York State, ESSA school performance goals are met by showing that an absolute proportion of a school's students who have taken the mathematics test have scored at the partially proficient, or proficient and advanced performance levels (Levels 2 or $3 \& 4$ ). The percentage of students at each of these three levels is used to calculate a PI and determine if the school has met the MIP set each year by the state's ESSA accountability system. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PI value that equals or exceeds the state's 2018-19 mathematics MIP for all students of 107. The PI is the sum of the percent of students in all tested grades combined scoring at Level 2, plus two times the percent of students scoring at Level 3, plus two-and-a-half times the percent of students scoring at Level 4. Thus, the highest possible PI is 250.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS achieved this math measure in 2018-19. The 2019 mathematics Performance Index calculates to 122 exceeding the Measure of Interim Progress set by the state of 107.

Mathematics 2017-18 Performance Level Index (PI)


## 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

## METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district. ${ }^{6}$

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS math students met this comparative outcome measure in math versus the local district 13 with an overall $3-8$ proficiency rate of $47 \%$ to their $42 \%$. With the exception of grade 7 , each grade outperformed same grades in the district. Additionally, our Lower School (grades 3-5) significantly outperforms its district peers, with an average proficiency rate of $67 \%$ for those grades, compared to a district average of 50\% for grades 3-5.

## 2018-19 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at or Above Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students <br> In At Least 2nd Year | All District Students |  |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | $67 \%$ | 33 | $54 \%$ | 892 |
| 4 | $61 \%$ | 31 | $49 \%$ | 985 |
| 5 | $67 \%$ | 21 | $47 \%$ | 937 |
| 6 | $36 \%$ | 36 | $29 \%$ | 674 |
| 7 | $21 \%$ | 39 | $31 \%$ | 670 |
| 8 | $44 \%$ | 36 | $25 \%$ | 470 |
| All | $47 \%$ | 196 | $42 \%$ | 4628 |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

2018-19 marks the first year recently that CPCS has outperformed the local district in math.
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# Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Local District by Grade Level and School Year 

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at <br> Proficiency Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2016-17$ |  |  | $2017-18$ |  | 2018-19 |  |
|  | Charter <br> School | District 13 | Charter <br> School | District 13 | Charter <br> School | District 13 |  |
| 3 | $31 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $54 \%$ |  |
| 4 | $23 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $49 \%$ |  |
| 5 | $26 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $67 \%$ | $47 \%$ |  |
| 6 | $20 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $29 \%$ |  |
| 7 | $28 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $49 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $21 \%$ | $31 \%$ |  |
| 8 | $27 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $25 \%$ |  |
| All | $\mathbf{2 6 \%}$ | $32 \%$ | $\mathbf{3 3 \%}$ | $39 \%$ | $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ | $42 \%$ |  |

## Goal 2: Comparative Measure

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

## METHOD

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

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2017-18 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2017-18 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

Based on the 2017-18 report, CPCS did not meet this measure performing slightly higher than expected in math compared to other similar schools. The overall effect size calculated to 0.11 , however grades $7 \& 8$ had effect sizes of 1.33 and 0.46 , greater than the target of 0.3 .

## 2017-18 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economically Disadvantaged | Number Tested | Percent of Students <br> at Levels 3\&4 |  | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Actual | Predicted |  |  |
| 3 | 81.4 | 38 | 42.1 | 44.7 | -2.6 | -0.12 |
| 4 | 92.3 | 38 | 28.9 | 32.9 | -4 | -0.2 |
| 5 | 90.4 | 43 | 27.9 | 28 | -0.1 | -0.01 |
| 6 | 91.5 | 42 | 11.9 | 26.8 | -14.9 | -0.9 |
| 7 | 89.4 | 42 | 52.4 | 24.4 | 28 | 1.33 |
| 8 | 83.7 | 44 | 31.8 | 22.1 | 9.7 | 0.46 |
| All | 88.1 | 247 | 32.4 | 29.5 | 2.9 | 0.11 |


| School's Overall Comparative Performance: |
| :---: |
| Slightly higher than expected |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The 2017-18 effect size improved since 2016-17. With the ED enrollment and math score increase of 2018-19, it's anticipated that the effect size will also increase.

## Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent <br> Economically <br> Disadvantaged | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2015-16$ | $3-8$ | 85.0 | 292 | 25.6 | 24.6 | 0.06 |
| $2016-17$ | $3-8$ | 90.6 | 248 | 23.0 | 22.6 | 0.04 |
| $2017-18$ | $3-8$ | 88.1 | 247 | 32.4 | 29.5 | 0.11 |

## Goal 2: Growth Measure ${ }^{7}$

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the target of 50 .

## METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2017-18 and also have a state exam score in 2016-17 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2016-17 scores are ranked by their 2017-18 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order
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for a school to meet the measure, the school would have to achieve a mean growth percentile above the target of 50 .

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2018-19 analysis is not yet available. This report contains $\underline{2017-18}$ results, the most recent Growth Model data available. ${ }^{8}$

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

In 2017-18, CPCS achieved this measure with an overall mean growth percentile of 57.4. Grade 7 demonstrated the most growth with an MGP of 75.8.

## 2017-18 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | Target |
| 4 | 44.4 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 59.6 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 56.8 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 75.8 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 49.7 | 50.0 |
| All | $\underline{\mathbf{5 7 . 4}}$ | 50.0 |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The mean growth percentile has been increasing each year.

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

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2015-16$ | $2016-17$ | $2017-18$ | Target |
| 4 | 41.6 | 45.8 | 44.4 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 24.3 | 61.1 | 59.6 | 50.0 |
| 6 | 55.0 | 49.1 | 56.8 | 50.0 |
| 7 | 48.2 | 43.4 | 75.8 | 50.0 |
| 8 | 44.3 | 54.5 | 49.7 | 50.0 |
| All | $\underline{\mathbf{4 3 . 3}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{4 9 . 9}}$ | $\underline{\mathbf{5 7 . 4}}$ | 50.0 |
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## SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

CPCS continues to make gains in math proficiency and outscored the local district 13 in 2018-19. The mean growth percentile was greater than 50 in 2017-18 and we anticipate it will be again in 2018-19. We look forward to seeing this trend continue and are hopeful to see the numbers for 2018-19 in growth and the regression analysis.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least <br> their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State <br> mathematics exam for grades 3-8. | Did Not Achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate PI on the state's English language arts <br> exam will meet that year's state MIP as set forth in the state's ESSA <br> accountability system. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least <br> their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics <br> exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the <br> school district of comparison. | Achieved |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the <br> state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing <br> higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression <br> analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all <br> public schools in New York State. (Using 2017-18 results.) | Did Not Achieve |
| Growth | Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted <br> growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will <br> be above the target of 50. (Using the 2017-18 results.) | Achieved |

## ACTION PLAN

Lower School:

- Continue to utilize Math in Focus across all grade levels with a more structured block format
- Implement curriculum following newly established curriculum map
- Continue the implementation of math constructed response instruction for every scholar across each grade level (Math Extended Response for Grades 3-5, and Number Stories for Grades K-2)
- Formalize the use of C.U.B.E.S. and solve, diagram, explain as a school-wide problem-solving norms
- Incorporate operations chants into each mathematics lesson school-wide
- Adopt NY Ready Math assessments, I-ready diagnostic assessments, beginning of year, midyear, and end-of year benchmark assessments, chapter assessments, and network interim assessments as formative and summative assessments
- Administer, discuss, and norm campus-wide and network-wide assessments
- Formalize classroom data discussions with scholars in grades 3-5 on summative assessments
- Continue implementation of Math Lunch Labs, Math Academic After school, and Saturday Academy programs for grades 3-5
- Incorporate daily on-the-spot assessments and data tracking throughout the math block
- Partner with consultant, Marylee Lebowski (from BOCES) to work with teachers once a month in grade bands to provide resources and small group coaching
- Continue providing additional instructional support to scholars in the following domains:
- 3rd Grade
- Operations \& Algebraic Thinking- Multiplication (3.OA.1) and Multi-Steps Word Problems (3.OA.D.8)
- Numbers \& Operations- Fractions (3.NF.A1)
- Measurement \& Data- Intervals of time (3.MD.A1)
- 4th Grade
- Operations \& Algebraic Thinking- Multiplication (4.OA.1) and Multi-Steps Word Problems (4.OA.A3)
- Numbers \& Operations- Fractions (4.NF.A1) and Compare two fractions with different numerators/denominators (4.NF.A2)
- Geometry- Draw points, lines, line segments, rays, angles (right, acute, obtuse), perpendicular lines, and parallel lines (4.G.A1 \& 4.G.A2)
- 5th Grade
- Numbers \& Operations- Fractions (5.NF.A1)
- Measurement \& Data- Converting Measurements (5.MD.A1)
- Geometry- Volume (5.G.A1)
- Collaborate during common-planning opportunities to discuss data, lesson plan facilitation, and scholar work
- Establish lesson plan feedback procedures that promote vertical alignment of mathematics skills/strategies K-5
- On-going professional development opportunities and data discussions during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), individualized teacher coaching, and professional development days will be utilized to promote mathematics goals


## Middle School

- Adopting bi-weekly School Leadership-created, Network-wide formative assessments that will serve as blind assessments to teachers and students. The bi-weekly assessments are part of a multiple measures approach that will provide early warning data. In addition, these assessments will provide an opportunity for leadership teams and teacher teams to collaborate and plan across campuses.
- Implementing small class sizes of 12-15 students, increasing the opportunity for individualized small group instruction. In ICT and 12:1:1 classes classes, there will be a 1:6 ratio of teachers to students.
- Continuation of the 90 minute math block for all students.
- Offering an Algebra I Regents course through an additional 30 minutes of high-quality mathematics instruction for interested/qualified 8th grade students.
- Continuation of the use of ReadyNY math tools as formative/summative assessments.
- Responding to the 2018-19 NYS Math Assessment data by adjusting pacing and scope of the 6th, 7th and 8th grade curriculum and bringing greater focus to the following standards:
- 6th Grade

Expressions and Equations

- 6.EE.A - Write expressions, evaluate expressions
- Ratios and Proportional Relationships
- 6.RP.A - Rate and Ratio, solve unit rate problems
- Number System
- 6.NS.A - Quotient of Fractions
- 6.NS.B - Greatest Common Factor, Least Common Factor
- 7th Grade
- Expressions and Equations
- 7.EE.B - Rational number problems

Ratios and Proportional Relationships

- 7.RP.A - Multistep ratio and percent problems
- 7.RP.A - Proportional relationships
- 8th Grade
- Expressions and Equations
- 8.EE.A - Scientific Notation
- 8.EE.B - Equation of a line
- 8.EE.C - Linear equation example

Functions

- 8.F.A - Definition of a function
- 8.F.B - Use functions to model relationships


## GOAL 3: SCIENCE

## Goal 3: Science <br> CPCS students will become proficient in Science.

## BACKGROUND

At CPCS lower school, we continued to incorporate science as a specialty class with a full-time science teacher, which strengthens science instruction school-wide. Ms. Maison teaches science to all scholars in grades K-5 twice a week.

As the science specialist, Ms. Maison received Science Dimensions training during August Summer Institute. This provided support with the learning environment, scientific reasoning, developing and applying scientific concepts, formative and summative assessments, and utilizing technology to instruct science.

In addition to specialist science classes, scholars in fourth grade received additional support and instruction in preparation for the New York State Science Test. CPCS lower school started Science Saturday Academy in May for fourth grade scholars, which consisted of four 90-minute sessions. Additional science class sessions and teachers were added to the fourth grade schedule throughout the week, beginning in May, to further support scholars taking the science test. Science test kits were also utilized to provide scholars in grade 4 with additional hands-on learning opportunities.

In grades 6-8, CPCS science specialists implemented the Full Option Science System (FOSS) NGS Program during science periods. Some of the key elements of CPCS's science program are described below.

The FOSS program supports teachers in providing students with scaffolded and explicit instruction in the key areas of science. Students visit and revisit key science topics within the 6-8 scope and sequence. The goals of the program are to promote:

- Familiarity with the natural world, its diversity, and its interdependence
- Understanding the disciplinary core ideas and the cross-cutting concepts of science, such as patterns; cause and effect; scale, proportion, and quantity; systems and system models; energy and matter-flows, cycles, and conservation; structure and function; and stability and change
- Knowing that science and engineering, technology, and mathematics are interdependent human enterprises and, as such, have implied strengths and limitations
- Ability to reason scientifically
- Using scientific knowledge and scientific and engineering practices for personal and social purposes
Finally, CPCS middle school students participated in extracurricular science programs that enhance science content knowledge. Extracurricular programming included the STEM \& Social Justice Program at Bucknell University and natural history programming at Shenandoah National Park.in Luray, Virginia.


## 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

## Goal 3: Absolute Measure

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

## METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in $4^{\text {th }}$ and $8^{\text {th }}$ grade in spring 2019. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS science students did not achieve this science measure. Grade 4 students had 100 percent scoring at performance levels 3 and 4, however just 27 percent of eighth grade scholars scored at proficient levels.

Charter School Performance on 2018-19 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Students |  | Charter School Students <br> In At Least 2 |  |
|  | Percent <br> Yearicient |  |  |  |
| 4 | $95 \%$ | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
| 8 | $29 \%$ | 39 | $100 \%$ | 31 |
| All | $70 \%$ | 63 | $27 \%$ | 22 |

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## Performance on a Regents Science Exam Of $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade All Students by Year

| Grade | Year | Regents Exam | Percent <br> Passing with <br> a 65 | Number <br> Tested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | $2016-17$ | Regents Physical <br> Setting/Earth Science | $50 \%$ | 2 |
| 8 | $2017-18$ | NA |  |  |
| 8 | $2018-19$ | Regents Physical <br> Setting/Earth Science | $45 \%$ | 11 |

Eleven students took the Science Regents in Earth Science in 2018-19 with 45\% scoring above 65.

## 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Percent of Students } \\$\end{array} |  |  |  |  | $2016-17$ |  | $2017-18$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |$]$

## Goal 3: Comparative Measure

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

## METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the school district of comparison. Given the timing of the state's release of district science data, the 2018-19 comparative data may not yet be available. If not, schools should report comparison to the district's $\underline{\text { 2017-18 }}$ data.

## RESULTS AND EVALUATION

CPCS consistently performs better on the NYS Science exams in grade 4 and often grade 8.

> 2018-19 State Science Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students <br> In At Least 2 |  |  |  |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
|  | $100 \%$ | 31 |  |  |
| 8 | $27 \%$ | 22 |  |  |
| All | $70 \%$ | 53 |  |  |

[^8]
## 2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

| Science Performance of Charter School and Local District by Grade Level and School Year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2016-17 |  | 2017-18 |  | 2018-19 |  |
|  | Charter <br> School | District | Charter School | District | Charter School | District |
| 4 | 85\% | 83\% | 85\% | 86\% | 100\% |  |
| 8 | 73\% | 36\% | 74\% | 41\% | 27\% |  |
| All | 79\% | 67\% | 79\% | 70\% | 70\% |  |

## SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Overall, CPCS science proficiency fell short of 75 percent at 70. Based on district 2017-18 science scores, CPCS matched the local district, our 2018-19 to their 2017-18.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at <br> least their second year will perform at or above proficiency <br> on the New York State examination. | Did Not Achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at <br> least their second year and performing at proficiency on the <br> state exam will be greater than that of all students in the <br> same tested grades in the school district of comparison. | Achieved in 2017-18 |

## ACTION PLAN

Lower School:

- Continue science instruction in all grade levels utilizing a full-time science teacher
- Provide on-going professional development opportunities with Science Dimensions
- Formalize hands-on learning opportunities for scholars
- Continue implementation of Saturday Science Academy and additional science class sessions and teacher-support in May for fourth grade scholars


## Middle School:

- Continuing implementation of small class sizes of 12-15 students, increasing the opportunity for individualized small group instruction. In ICT and 12:1:1 classes, there will be a 1:6 ratio of teachers to students.
- All Middle School science teachers will implement the FOSS curriculum in grades 6-8.
- Science teachers will work to create better alignment between all three scope and sequence.
- Science teachers will continue to develop an inquiry-based approach to science instruction.
- Eliminating the Earth Science Regents class and focusing 8th grade students on demonstrating mastery on standards assessed on the NYSTP 8th Grade Science Assessment.


## GOAL 4: ESSA

## Goal 4: ESSA

The school will remain in good standing according to the state's ESSA accountability system.

## Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state's ESSA accountability system, the school is in good standing: the state has not identified the school for comprehensive or targeted improvement.

## METHOD

Because all students are expected to meet the state's performance standards, the federal statute 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. As New York State, like all states, is required to establish a specific system for making these determinations for its public schools, charter schools do not have latitude in establishing their own performance levels or criteria of success for meeting the ESSA accountability requirements. Each year, the state issues School Report Cards that indicate a school's status under the state accountability system.

RESULTS AND EVALUATION
CPCS continues to be in Good Standing and achieved this measure.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

CPCS Has been in Good Standing since opening.
Accountability Status by Year

| Year | Status |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2016-17$ | Good Standing |
| $2017-18$ | Good Standing |
| $2018-19$ | Good Standing |


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

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

[^4]:    ${ }^{5}$ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

[^5]:    ${ }^{6}$ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

[^6]:    ${ }^{7}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

[^7]:    ${ }^{8}$ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

[^8]:    ${ }^{9}$ This table uses the prior year's results as 2018-19 district science scores are not yet available.

