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Citizens of the World New York 1 Williamsburg (CWC Williamsburg) opened its doors in the fall of 2013. During the 2016-2017 school year we will serve over 315 students in grades kindergarten through fourth grade. The mission of CWC Williamsburg is to provide a socio-economically, culturally and racially diverse community of students in the heart of Brooklyn with an intellectually challenging, experiential learning environment that develops each individual student's confidence, potential, and individual responsibility as citizens of the world in which we live. In 2016-17, CWC Williamsburg will add one grade level next year.

Under the leadership of a new executive director, CWC CH, along with its partner CWC school in Williamsburg, articulated a set of priorities to guide work through the end of the 2015-2016 school year, and to serve as a foundation for work in the 20162017 school year. These priorities include the development of a robust common ELA curriculum for grades 3 and 4, a focus on students who typically struggle (particularly students with disabilities and English Language Learners), building capacity of our instructional staff, and renewed attention to the CWC Way.

CWC Williamsburg is supported by Citizens of the World Charter Schools (CWCS). CWCS is a nonprofit organization that 1) enables individual Citizens of the World (CWC) schools to access national resources and knowledge to supplement their good work, and 2) ensures that while nearly all decisions affecting students are made at the local regional and school-level, all schools adhere to fundamental CWC values: all students performing at high levels, children of all backgrounds learning together, and community building.

CWCS collaborates with CWC New York, to ensure that the schools that make-up CWC New York, align with the CWC philosophical foundations, and reflect their community, parents, students and teachers. Significant decision-making occurs at the regional and school level, such as curriculum, staffing, budgeting, school and classroom materials, and professional development.

Aided by exceptional local leadership and strong involvement from our parents, our student-centered learning model has been demonstrated to boost critical thinking and cognitive skills for young people from every background. We focus on providing interactive learning experiences for our students in a warm, joyful community with peers from all backgrounds; this approach helps prepare students not only to survive but also to thrive in college, in a diverse society, and in a global economy. We are preparing our students to emerge as a new generation of leaders - as trailblazers who are ready to tackle the future challenges in our world and surpass the conceived limitations of what students, communities, parents, and schools can achieve.

## PHILOSPHICAL FOUNDATIONS

CWC's work is undergirded by three philosophical foundations - Understanding, Connection, and Diversity - described below.

Understanding. Learning best occurs when students construct their own understandings, under the guidance of a teacher who offers varying levels of support, which are reflective of students' current abilities and needs. Our theory of learning is comprised of three building blocks: constructivism, gradual release of responsibility, and data-driven instruction.

Connection. CWC's academic model supports and depends upon connections with self, one's community, and the world. Our model supports this development through social emotional learning (SEL), which we believe to be as integral to an excellent education as traditional academic subjects and, moreover, is necessary for the world that we live in.

Diversity. We believe that the diversity of our communities, and of the world at large, is a great strength. Through targeted outreach and recruitment, our schools are intentionally designed to reflect their surrounding communities and the larger society in terms of race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status. By learning, interacting, and growing in a diverse setting, our students are preparing to thrive in the pluralistic society they will soon join.

## OUR SCHOOLS

- Prepare students to become citizens of the world in an ever-changing future
- Promote academic rigor and experiential learning to support and develop children's natural intellectual curiosity
- Embrace a constructivist, project-based learning approach
- Develop each child's potential to live as a learner, both in school and out
- Reflect, welcome and celebrate the community's diversity
- Strengthen the bonds among members of the school community and beyond


## OUR CORE VALUES

Excellence We demand lasting quality.
Diversity We are better and stronger because of our differences.
Authenticity We are our true selves in this work, and we are candid.
Community We care deeply about people. We share and build partnerships. We celebrate, laugh, and seek joy, even in the tough times.

Change We welcome the unknown, embracing the unexpected and new. We adapt to meet the ever-changing times. We find new ways.

## GUIDING FUNDAMENTALS

Recent events in our world have demonstrated why schools like Citizens of the World are necessary. The heartbreaking violence we saw in Nice, Baton Rouge, Dallas, Berlin, Istanbul, Orlando and elsewhere is largely the result of our world's long and difficult struggle with difference. All citizens need to engage in cooperation, dialogue and debate across lines of difference. This approach will require familiarity with, and respect for, people of all races and economic backgrounds. In order to build our students' capacity to become these leaders, we provide a rigorous and student-centered academic program composed of dynamic classrooms that prize critical thinking, creativity and community building. We do not shy away from the complexities of ethnic, racial or socio-economic relations, but face them head-on to prepare our students to engage positively and respectfully with others from all backgrounds and philosophies.

## KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS

## ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE

Our approach recognizes the importance of standardized tests, while acknowledging that they reveal only a part of the overall picture of what a student knows and is able to do.

We believe that children must be assessed and educated well beyond the traditional "core" intelligences of reading, writing and computing. Art, music, dance, physical education, social-emotional development and other disciplines all have an important place in our schools and in the development of our children. Extending our focus to these pursuits will help develop a lifelong passion for learning and will give students a well-rounded education.

CWC NY's learning model is based on Constructivism, a theory in which knowledge is built (or constructed) on earlier knowledge. We structure learning to build on what students already know and support them in revising and refining their understanding as they work toward mastery. In addition to content knowledge, our students will engage in learning processes that develop conceptual understanding as well as self-knowledge.

The following components help us bring this theory to life in each classroom:

- Project-based learning: Project-based learning integrates skills and knowledge through meaningful projects that make abstract learning concepts concrete. As reflective learners, children connect what they learn to their own lives. Teachers strive to teach for understanding, ensuring that
students internalize deeply what they learn and are, in turn, able to apply what they learn to new and different circumstances and contexts.
- Low student-to-teacher ratios: In order to meet each child's learning needs and to allow for a variety of instructional methods, CWC NY's staffing structure ensures a low student-to-teacher ratio. This allows for small-group instructional support from a teacher; while a co-teacher or assistant teacher may monitor independent work, lead partner games, or direct activities throughout the classroom.
- Talent and leadership: Our students benefit from excellent educators at all levels. Our talented teaching faculty and school leaders enjoy regular professional development and tap into the shared resources and knowledge of sister schools throughout the CWC Schools network. Visiting schools around the country and speaking with other school leaders allow us to draw from and build upon best practices no matter where they originate.


## DIVERSITY

We believe that the diversity of our communities, and of the world at large, is a great strength. Through targeted outreach and recruitment, our schools are intentionally designed to reflect their surrounding communities and the larger society in terms of race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status. By learning, interacting and growing in a diverse setting, our students are preparing to thrive in the pluralistic society they will soon join. We continue to strive to create a school environment that mirrors the diversity of our communities.

This model allows our students to form meaningful relationships with individuals of other races, cultures, and backgrounds. Studies have shown that students with these experiences are better able to live and work in diverse settings than those from more homogenous schools.

Recognition and appreciation of diverse cultures, perspectives and backgrounds are important themes in our curriculum, as well. A strategic selection of books, materials and lessons helps foster a continued curiosity about other cultures across the globe. Finally, integral to our diverse classrooms is our social-emotional learning (SEL) curriculum, which helps build the competencies we seek to develop in our diverse student population. We believe nurturing compassionate, adaptable, and innovative thinking begins with learning how to identify, self-regulate, and express a range of emotions. Throughout our core curriculum we integrate social-emotional learning to prepare our students for the tensions that exist in the larger world. Rooting our educational model in the development of social-emotional skills provides our students with a strategic academic advantage as they engage effectively in academic inquiry both individually and with their classmates who possess a rich diversity of perspectives.

## COMMUNITY

We believe that it is essential to partner with families to help children succeed, and we maintain steady and open communication between school and home. All CWC NY families are urged to participate actively in the school community as volunteers, valued stakeholders and participants in regular family education workshops and school community activities.

At CWC NY, we cultivate leadership, independence, self-knowledge, appreciation for different perspectives and respect, both within and beyond school walls. Just as we ask the community to support our school, so too will the school support the community.

## STUDENT OUTCOMES

Together, our academic program, diversity, social emotional learning program and our strong community support students' development of "dispositions" in three general domains:

- Self - readiness that CWC graduates will possess internally, including being self-aware, response-able, confident, efficacious, agile and courageous
- Together - tendencies that our graduates will possess in relationship with others (one-on-one and within communities), including being culturally competent, curious, empathetic and compassionate
- World - tendencies that CWC graduates will display as they orient towards the world at large, including being systems thinkers, global and scholarly

In closing, we respectfully submit this progress report that reflects our work in the academic year 2014-15 including grade three student achievement on the New York State Test. We know that we have more work to do, and are confident that organizational priorities in the areas of talent, program design improvements are the right immediate actions in a multi-year strategy for improving overall results at CWC Williamsburg.

## School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

| School <br> Year | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2013-14$ | 50 | 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 103 |
| $2014-15$ | 66 | 78 | 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 200 |
| $2015-16$ | 75 | 75 | 71 | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 268 |

## Demographic Characteristics of Students

|  |  | Racial \& Et | nic Diversity |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | American Indian or Alaskan Native | Asian, Pacific Islander, or Hawaiian Native | Black or African American | Hispanic or Latino | Multiracial | Not Specified | White or Caucasian |
|  | K | 0 | 3 | 8 | 48 | 13 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 01 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 32 | 16 | 0 | 11 |
|  | 02 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 46 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 03 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 31 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| Totals |  | 0 | 4 | 54 | 157 | 38 | 0 | 15 |
| Percent of Total students |  | 0\% | 1\% | 20\% | 59\% | 14\% | 0\% | 6\% |
| Goal from Charter |  | N/A | 5\% | 8\% | 30\% | N/A | N/A | 55\% |

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

```
Goal 1: English Language Arts
CWC Williamsburg students will become proficient readers and writers of the English
language.
```


## BACKGROUND

In order to increase student performance level at each grade level, our program improvements addressed serving the needs of all learners, implementation of state test-aligned interim assessment tools, and increased support and training from both school and regional leadership.

Integrated co-teaching (ICT) classes were added at each grade level, increasing the number of ICT classrooms across the school from 3 to 8 . This included two ICT classrooms at the $3^{\text {rd }}$ grade level to support students with disabilities. Additionally, targeted support for students with disabilities and English language learners was increased by creating additional Learning Support Specialist positions across the school. A Director of Instruction was added to the leadership team in order to increase the amount of instructional support and teacher coaching within the building.
In order to prepare for the NYS assessment, grades 2 and 3 took a NYSA-aligned benchmark assessment from the Achievement Network (ANet). Professional development for both content and implementation was provided for leaders and teachers by ANet. Data disaggregation, collaborative scoring, and reteach planning, led by the regional Associate Executive Director of Program were conducted following each of the test administration periods.
Based on data from the Fountas \& Pinnell (F\&P) Benchmark Assessment System, Fundations and Recipe for Reading baseline phonics assessments, students identified as exceeding grade-level expectations participated in guided and/or close reading instruction within the classroom. This reading structure allowed students time to explore more challenging texts beyond the current grade level standards. Students also received leveled phonics and word work instruction through Fundations ( $\mathrm{K}-1$ ) or Recipe for Reading (2-3).
This reading structure allowed students time to explore more challenging texts beyond the current grade level standards. Students also received leveled phonics and word work instruction through Fundations (K-1) or Recipe for Reading (2-3).
Students meeting grade level expectations participated in guided or close reading instruction in a small group within the classroom. This reading instruction was tailored to grade level standards based on a student's current reading level. Students
continued to receive leveled phonics and word work instruction whole class and in small groups using Fundations (K-1) or Recipe for Reading (2-3).

Students performing below grade level received small group guided or close reading instruction within the classroom, and a double dose of either guided/close reading or phonics instruction from a Learning Support Teacher or second classroom teacher. When a student needed further intervention, they received more individualized support from a Learning Support Teacher or second classroom teacher, using our Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) program.

All three levels had access to grade level instructional text and independent leveled text, both in school and at home. Students were assessed using F\&P Benchmark Assessment System throughout the year, and moved within the different reading levels based on their progress at each assessment period.

## READING \& PHONICS

Students took part in an extended balanced literacy block every day. Balanced literacy instruction includes Guided Reading, Reading Workshop, and Phonics, which provide students with Common Core aligned instruction that incorporates one-on-one, small group, and whole group instruction. Through Balanced Literacy, students engage in read alouds, shared reading, guided reading, and independent reading, and have opportunities to read text at both their independent reading level as well as their grade level.

## READERS' WORKSHOP

■ Curriculum: Core Ready from Lit Life; Engage NY Expeditionary Learning

- Purpose: Common Core aligned literacy instruction. Text-based mini lessons that include direct instruction, guided practice, and independent practice
- Components: Mini-Lesson, guided practice, independent reading and practice, share
■ Time Allocation: 40-50 minutes, 4-5 days/wk
- Classroom Set-Up: Whole class mini-lesson and guided practice at student meeting area (rug), independent or partner practice at seats, whole group share.


## GUIDED/CLOSE READING

■ Curriculum: Teacher-created guided and close reading (with support from the Continuum of Literacy Learning \& Scholastic Leveled Reading Books, and Close Reading Texts)
■ Purpose: Guided literacy instruction and independent practice. Opportunity to practice with teacher, with peers and independently (comprehension, phonics, word study, etc.).

- Components: Small group teacher-led instruction and small group centers
(computer-based literacy programs, listening center, independent reading, phonics work)
■ Time Allocation: 30-40 minutes, 5 days/wk
- Classroom Set-Up: 2-3 teacher led instructional groups, 2-3 student centers within the room, (iPads, leveled reading library, phonics instructional activities, headphones with cd players and/or listening center)


## PHONICS

■ Curriculum: Wilson Fundations (K-1); Recipe for Reading (2-3)

- Purpose: Explicit phonics instruction and opportunity for guided practice and independent application.
■ Time Allocation: 20-30 minutes, 4-5 days/wk
■ Classroom Set-Up: 2-3 Differentiated, teacher-led groups per class


## WRITING

Writing instruction takes place during a structured Writing Workshop. Students learn to observe the world in and around them, and write drafts, revise, edit, and present polished and well-crafted pieces of writing. Writing instruction focuses students on the three different genres of writing: narrative, persuasive, informational, and on the craft of writing. Students write every day, as part of the on-going process of creating authentic, meaningful writing. We encourage students to continue developing writing skills at home through the use of a writer's notebook or journal.

## WRITERS' WORKSHOP

■ Curriculum: Core Ready from Lit Life (K-2); Engage NY Expeditionary Learning (3rd Grade only)
■ Purpose: Explicit modeling of writing across genres. Guided and independent practice. Reflection and feedback.
■ Components: Mini-lesson, guided practice, independent practice, reflection/share
■ Time Allocation: 30-45 minutes, 4-5 days/wk

- Classroom Set-Up: Space for modeling and shared writing (whole group or parallel groups), space for independent writing, designated place for writing visuals and materials

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 3rd grade in April 2016. 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).

| 2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total |  |  | ested ${ }^{1}$ |  | Total |
| Grade | Tested | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | Enrolled |
| 3 | 44 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 47 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## RESULTS

## Performance on 2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam <br> By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grad <br> es | All Students |  | Enrolled in at least their <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
|  | $20.5 \%$ | 44 | 20.5 | 39 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |

[^0]
## EVALUATION

The school did not meet the goal. Students with two years of enrollment had a proficiency rate equal to that of that of all students. Note only five students were not enrolled for two years.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2013-14$ |  | $2014-15$ |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
|  |  |  |  |  | 20.5 | 39 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") 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 enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 English language arts AMO of 104. The PLI 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 PLI is $200 .{ }^{2}$

## RESULTS

## English Language Arts 2015-16 Performance Level Index

| Number in | Percent of Students at Each Performance Level |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cohort | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |

[^1]| 38.6 |  | 40.9 |  | 18.2 |  | 2.3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PI | $=$ | 40.9 | + | 18.2 | + | 2.3 | $=$ |
|  |  |  |  | 18.2 | + | 2.3 | $=$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | PLI | = |

## EVALUATION

The school's PLI was 23 points lower that the state AMO. The PLI for African American/black students at $110 \%$ was 6 points higher than the state AMO.

## 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 local school district.

## METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district. ${ }^{3}$

## RESULTS

2015-16 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grad <br> e | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  | Charter School <br> Students In At Least <br> 2nd Year | All District Students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |  |
|  | 20.5 | 39 | 41.5 | 480 |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |

[^2]| All |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | 2015-16 English Language Arts Performance of

Charter School and Comparison Schools by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent of Charter School Students Enrolled in Comparison Schools Scoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

(*Note data was unavailable at data.nysed.gov)

## EVALUATION

The school fell short of the surrounding schools in District 14 with half as many students scoring proficient at level 3 or 4 . The school equaled the district (39\%) with $40 \%$ of Black students scoring proficient.
When looking at schools with similar demographics for students with disabilities, economically disadvantages, Hispanic, ELL, and black students in the surrounding districts (14 and 32) similar trends of proficiency can be seen. CWC Williamsburg had equal to or better proficiency rates for economically disadvantaged and all students.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local Distric†

by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year <br> Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to Local District <br> Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013 -14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2014 -15 |  |


| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## RESULTS

Provide a brief narrative highlighting 2014-15 results in the data table that directly addresses the critical data: overall Effect Size. In addition, the discussion may also include highlighting individual grade levels and their respective Effect Sizes.
The school did not have students in grade 3-8 in 2014-15.

## 2014-15 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| GradePercent <br> Economically <br> Disadvantag <br> ed | Number <br> Tested | Percent of Students <br> at Levels 3\&4 | Difference <br> between <br> Actual and <br> Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |


| All |
| :---: |
| School's Overall Comparative Performance: |
| Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here |

## EVALUATION

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent Eligible <br> for Free Lunch/ <br> Economically <br> Disadvantaged | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2012-13$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2013-14$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2014-15$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Goal 1: Growth Measure ${ }^{4}$

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 state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

## 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 2014-15 and also have a state exam score from 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 score are ranked by their 2014-15 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 school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50 .

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available. ${ }^{5}$

[^3]
## RESULTS

The school did not have students in grade 3-8 in 2014-15, or students in $4^{\text {th }}$ grade in 2015-16.

## 2014-15 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth <br> Percentile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | Statewide <br> Median |
|  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  | 50.0 |
| 8 |  | 50.0 |
| All |  | 50.0 |

## EVALUATION

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2012-13 | 2013 -14 | $2014-15$ | Statewide <br> Median |
| 4 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 8 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| All |  |  |  | 50.0 |

## Optional ELA Measures

## Goal 1: Optional ELA Measure 1: F\&P Absolute

Each year, 75 percent of all students in grades kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above grade level as measured by a benchmark, final assessment e.g.
Fountas \& Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (see attachment A)

## Method

CWC Williamsburg assessed students' reading levels using the Fountas \& Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (F\&P). This assessment was given four times a year,
starting with a beginning of the year baseline assessment, followed by three additional assessments in November, March, and a final assessment in June. Each assessment given throughout the year was used to track ongoing student progress as well as determine a student's grade level equivalent in reading. The Fountas \& Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System is based on a text level gradient, starting from level A (beginning kindergarten) all the way through level Z (grades 7/8+). The Assessment was administered one-on-one, student to teacher for approximately twenty to thirty minutes. There are two equivalent benchmark texts for each reading level, one fiction and one non-fiction. Once the student was assessed the teacher determined a student's independent and instructional reading level. This assessment information guided instruction and growth target creation for each individual student.

## Results

Percent of students at/above OR below grade level in Reading based on Fountas \& Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System

| Grade Level | Grade K | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | ALL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| At or Above | $69 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $65 \%$ |
| Below | $31 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $35 \%$ |

## Evaluation

In 2015-16, CWC students in kindergarten, first, and second grade came within 7 percentage points of the target, ending the year at $69 \%, 70 \%$ and $68 \%$ respectively. For grades kindergarten and first, this was particularly important as these are the years in which the greatest number of levels of growth are expected (see attachment A). 55\% of second graders performed on grade level at the end of 2015-16, representing a difference of 20 percentage points from the targeted goal.

Goal 2: Optional ELA Measure 2: NWEA Norm
Each year, 75 percent of students K-3 will perform at the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile or higher on the NWEA MAP exam.

## Method

The NWEA Measures of Academic Progress Assessment (MAP) is a nationally normed, standardized achievement test in reading and math aligned with New York State Standards and administered in all grades. The early assessment measures the extent to which a child is cognitively prepared to begin academic work as well
as core subject tests for those students who have beginning literacy skills. Skill assessment expands in breadth and depth with each grade level. The MAP provides dependable information about each student, information that the teacher can then use to modify lessons by targeting specific skills. This test was chosen because of the depth of information provided by the results, allowing teachers to address the needs of individual students and entire classes by identifying problem areas within the curriculum itself. Further, the MAP provides national percentiles that can be tracked over time. MAP reading is given in all grade levels and MAP language was given in grades 2 and 3 .

## Results

The table below shows the results of the MAP reading and language assessments in the spring of 2016, and provides a summary of performance.
NWEA: ELA (Reading and Language) Achievement: Percent of students above the 50\% percentile

| Grade Level | Grade K | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | ALL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reading | $35 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
| Language | NA | NA | $22 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $24 \%$ |

## Evaluation

The MAP scores fell short of the goal for student performance, though third grade was within 11 percent of the goal.

## Goal 3: Optional ELA Measure 3

Each year, 85 percent of all students in grades kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above grade level as measured by NWEA MAP (Proficient or Advanced levels).

## Method

The NWEA Measures of Academic Progress Assessment (MAP) is a nationally normed, standardized achievement test in reading and math aligned with New York State Standards and administered in all grades. The early assessment measures the extent to which a child is cognitively prepared to begin academic work as well as core subject tests for those students who have beginning literacy skills. Skill assessment expands in breadth and depth with each grade level. The MAP provides dependable information about each student, information that the teacher can then use to modify lessons by targeting specific skills. This test was chosen because of the depth of information provided by the results, allowing teachers to address the needs of individual students and entire classes by identifying problem areas within the curriculum itself. Further, the MAP provides national percentiles that
can be tracked over time. MAP reading is given in all grade levels and MAP language was given in grades 2 and 3 .

## Results

The table below shows the results of the MAP reading assessments in the spring of 2016, and provides a summary of growth performance.

NWEA: ELA (Reading and Language) Growth: Percent of students who met growth targets

| Grade Level | Grade K | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | ALL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Reading | $39 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Language | NA | NA | $26 \%$ | $37 \%$ | $31 \%$ |

## Evaluation

All grade levels fell well below the goal of $85 \%$ of students reaching their growth targets.

## SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are <br> enrolled in at least their second year will perform at <br> proficiency on the New York State English language arts <br> exam for grades 3-8. | Did not <br> achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level <br> Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will <br> meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) <br> set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. | Did not <br> achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are <br> enrolled in at least their second year and performing at <br> proficiency on the state English language arts exam will <br> be greater than that of students in the same tested <br> grades in the local school district. | Did not <br> achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of <br> performance on the state English language arts exam <br> by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher <br> than expected to a small degree) according to a <br> regression analysis controlling for economically <br> disadvantaged students among all public schools in <br> New York State. (Using 2013-14 school district results.) | Did not <br> achieve |
| Growth | Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's | Did not |


|  | mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language <br> arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above <br> the state's unadjusted median growth percentile. | achieve |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students performing <br> at proficiency on the state English language arts exam <br> will be greater than that of students in the same tested <br> grades in the schools with similar demographics in the <br> district and a neighboring district. | Partially <br> achieved |
| Absolute | Each year, 85 percent of all students in grades <br> kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above <br> grade level as measured by NWEA MAP <br> (Proficient or Advanced levels). | Did not <br> achieve |
| Growth | Each year, 50 percent of all students in grades <br> kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above <br> the 50th percentile of all students tested as <br> measured by NWEA MAP (Proficient or <br> Advanced levels). | Did not <br> achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all students in grades <br> Kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above grade <br> level as measured by a benchmark, final assessment <br> e.g. Fountas \& Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System <br> (see attachment | Did not <br> achieve |

## ACTION PLAN

The principal has chosen to implement a regular cycle of classroom observation and coaching with school-based directors of instruction, directors of student support and directors of culture, to ensure every teacher is receiving regular feedback and support. Initial cycles will be the same for all teachers. After the first several rounds in trimester 1 (or if needed sooner), support will be differentiated based on teachers' needs. The school has also invested in an additional Director of Instruction, such that grade levels are split K-2 and 3-4 to allow for a greater level of targeted teacher support and coaching. The number of ICT classes has been increased to 12 of 14 sections devoted to ICT and 2 special education coordinators added to the staff to work specifically with small groups of students (4-8) with disabilities in each grade level.
We have also put in place additional monitoring and support at the regional level. The executive director meets regularly with the principal and conducts coobservations. The associate executive director of program convenes schoolbased instructional directors for monthly collaborative professional learning, including looking at student work and visits to high-performing schools throughout the city.

CWC Williamsburg has partnered with the Inclusive Classroom Project at Columbia University Teachers College to provide professional development and coaching to both the teachers and administrative team members to build capacity. Teaching staff will participate in PD 3-4 afternoons a week for 45 minutes inclusive of grade team meetings, coaching, and inquiry groups. Additionally, a day a month has been set aside for teacher collaborative professional learning across the school and/or region.
The school is implementing a new ELA curriculum for reader's workshop and writer's workshop The Teachers College Reading and Writing Project Units of Study by Lucy Calkins. This brings the school into closer alignment with the key design elements of the charter and CWCS' core academic model, and increases the rigor of our ELA curriculum.

Writing has become a clear area of focus given data from 2015-16. A dedicated daily period of time and a robust common core aligned curriculum are part of the school's efforts improve student achievement in this area. Additionally, social studies has been aligned to the units of study in reading and writing, providing another opportunity for students to build core ELA skills, knowledge and understanding. Teachers and teaching assistants participated in two days of training, prior to the start of the school year, in new curriculum materials by consultants from Teachers College.
The 2014-15 focus on guided reading will be continued and enhanced by increasing the classroom library size with special attention to multi-cultural literature and books aligned to social-emotional, science, and social studies content.

A summer curriculum development team of teachers and leaders from both CWC schools, worked to unpack and map the new materials with careful attention to NYS assessment contents and timing. Test readiness was built into each unit, in addition to a testing genre mini-unit. This work represented an early focus on two of the regional priorities: ELA curriculum development, and building capacity of our instructional staff to plan and implement effectively. Groups of teachers from both schools will continue to collaborate throughout the year to continue to revise the curriculum.
The internal assessment system has been revamped with particular focus on grades 3 and 4. In addition to the use of ongoing classroom assessment, teachers will be using pre and post test assessments from the new curricular materials and the end of unit assessments in social studies will be an open response question aligned to those on the NYS ELA assessment. The end of unit assessments for writing will align with the essay portion of the NYS assessment based on the Writing Pathways assessments. The reading end of unit assessments will include both the curricular essay questions and multiple-choice questions, aligned to the same standards. These will be drawn from previous NYS assessments along with Certica and Inspect databases within our new

PowerSchool Assessment and Analytics. These NYS assessment aligned postassessments will happen four times a year. Thus they will both prepare students for the content and process of the NYS assessments, while providing specific information about learning of the content taught. Collaborative scoring, data disaggregation and follow up planning will occur with each administration within grade teams. Additionally there will be region-wide collaborative learning days each quarter that include looking at student work, planning based on data, and reflection on curricular implementation.

## MATHEMATICS

## Goal 2: Mathematics

CWC Williamsburg students will become proficient mathematicians.

## BACKGROUND

In order to increase the performance level at each grade level, ICT classes were added at each grade level, increasing the number of ICT classrooms across the school from 3 to 8 classrooms. This included two ICT classrooms at the 3rd grade level to support students with disabilities. Additionally, targeted support for students with disabilities and English language learners was increased by creating additional Learning Support Specialist positions across the school. A Director of Instruction was added to the leadership team in order to increase the amount of instructional support and teacher coaching within the building.
Students participated in an extended math block that incorporates Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) and Math Workshop. CGI focuses on problem solving and the application of learning in new situations. Students were given a problem of the day, work creatively to determine an approach to the problem, and then meet as a class to discuss their solutions. Math workshop incorporated core content, aligned to the Common Core Standards, using Engage NY as the primary curriculum resource and Developing Number Concepts from Kathy Richardson for extended, hands-on practice building conceptual understandings. Within this format, students worked to develop number sense and number reasoning skills as a central part of the core math content.

CWC Williamsburg used baseline and interim assessments to provide targeted instruction to students who fall into the following three categories in terms of Math comprehension level (exceeding, meeting and performing below grade-level expectations).

The scope and sequence for the math workshop was paced to ensure mastery of grade level standards and to allow time for regular review of standards. The format of the math workshop supported grade level instruction, as well as targeted, small group instruction for students who worked on a similar math concept or skill. The structure of CGI was designed to allow students to grapple with mathematical concepts as they learned to apply mathematical understandings to solve realworld problems. The materials used for instruction were a combination of Developing Number Concepts by Kathy Richardson, Engage NY, CGI, and Ready NY (for grade 3).

For students below grade-level expectations as identified by the NWEA MAP assessment and standards based assessments, teachers differentiated their instruction by assigning students to a small teacher-directed station. Students
performing below grade-level expectations also received for additional push-in or pullout small group interventions provided by Learning Support Specialists.

## Math

## MATH WORKSHOP

■ Curriculum: Engage NY and Developing Number Concepts by Kathy Richardson

- Purpose: Provides a structure for students to learn mathematical content through direct instruction, as well as small group and individual math activities and experiences.
■ Time Allocations: 40-70 minute block daily


## COGNITIVELY GUIDED INSTRUCTION

■ Curriculum: CGI Problem Sets from Stephanie Smith

- Purpose: Develops problem solving skills and the ability to apply mathematical understandings and learned concepts to new situations
■ Time Allocations: 30 minutes, 3-4 days/wk

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 rd grade in April 2016. 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.

2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

| Grade | Total <br> Tested | Not Tested $^{6}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | IEP | ELL | Absent | Refused | Enrolled |  |

[^4]| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## RESULTS

Performance on 2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
By Al Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grad <br> es | All Students |  | Enrolled in at least their <br> Second Year |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
| 3 | 28.9 | 45 | 30.8 | 39 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |

## EVALUATION

The students in their second year or more with CWC Williamsburg scored in the same proficiency range as all students in third grade. There were only six students new to CWC Williamsburg within the cohort.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the school's instructional program.

## Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year <br> Achieving Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013 |  | 2014 -15 |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested | Percent | Number <br> Tested |
|  |  |  |  |  | 30.8 | 39 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") 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 enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 101. The PLI 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 PLI is $200 .{ }^{7}$

## RESULTS



## EVALUATION

CWC Williamsburg had a PLI of 93.3, eight points below the state AMO. General Education (105.9 for 34 students), and not LEP (102.5 for 40 students), both large portions of the 3 rd grade class, had PLIs higher than the state AMO.

## 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 local school district.

## METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the surrounding public school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had

[^5]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. ${ }^{8}$

## RESULTS

> 2015-16 State Mathematics Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grad <br> $e$ | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students <br> In At Least 2nd Year | All District <br> Students |  |  |
|  | Percent | Numbe <br> r Tested | Perce <br> nt | Numbe <br> r Tested |
| 3 | 30.8 | 39 | 40 | 1155 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |



Note * means data was unavailable at data.nysed.gov

## EVALUATION

The school fell short of the proficiency rate of the schools in District 14 with $10 \%$ less students scoring proficient at level 3 or 4 . The school equaled the district with $40 \%$ of African American/black students scoring proficient.
When looking at schools with similar demographics for students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged, Hispanic, ELL, and black students in the districts 14 and 32 (an adjoining district), CWC Williamsburg had at least twice the proficiency rate for all, students with disabilities, Hispanic, and economically disadvantaged students.

[^6]
## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Also, additional evidence may include demographic differences between the school and the district as well as compelling reasons for comparing the school to a subset of schools within the district.

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

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013-14 |  | 2014-15 |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 3 |  |  |  |  | 30.8 | 40 |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## RESULTS

2014-15 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

| Grade | Percent Economicall y Disadvanta ged | Number Tested | Percent of Students at Levels $3 \& 4$ |  | Difference between Actual and Predicted | Effect Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Actual | Predicted |  |  |
| 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| School's Overall Comparative Performance: |
| :---: |
| Write in Comparative Performance Analysis from report here |

## EVALUATION

The school did not have students in grade $3-8$ in 2014-15, or students in $4^{\text {th }}$ grade in 2015-16.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

| School <br> Year | Grades | Percent Eligible <br> for Free Lunch/ <br> Economically <br> Disadvantaged | Number <br> Tested | Actual | Predicted | Effect <br> Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2012-13$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2013-14$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $2014-15$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Goal 2: Growth Measure9

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 state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

[^7]
## 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 2014-15 and also have a state exam score in 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 scores are ranked by their 2014-15 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 for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available. ${ }^{10}$

## 2014-15 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

| Grade | Mean Growth <br> Percentile |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | School | Statewide <br> Median |
|  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  | 50.0 |
| 8 |  | 50.0 |
| All |  | 50.0 |

## EVALUATION

The school did not have students in grade $3-8$ in 2014-15, or students in $4^{\text {th }}$ grade in 2015-16.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

| Grade | Mean Growth Percentile |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2012-13 | 2013-14 | $2014-15$ | Statewide <br> Median |
| 4 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 5 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 6 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| 7 |  |  |  | 50.0 |

[^8]| 8 |  |  |  | 50.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All |  |  |  | 50.0 |

## Goal 1: Optional Math Measure 1: NWEA Norm

Each year, 75 percent of students K-3 will perform at the $50^{\text {th }}$ percentile or higher on the NWEA MAP exam.

## Method

The NWEA Measures of Academic Progress Assessment (MAP) is a nationally normed, standardized achievement test in reading and math aligned with New York State Standards and administered in all grades. The early assessment measures the extent to which a child is cognitively prepared to begin academic work as well as core subject tests for those students who have beginning mathematical skills. Skill assessment expands in breadth and depth with each grade level. The MAP provides dependable information about each student, information that the teacher can then use to modify lessons by targeting specific skills. This test was chosen because of the depth of information provided by the results, allowing teachers to address the needs of individual students and entire classes by identifying problem areas within the curriculum itself. Further, the MAP provides national percentiles that can be tracked over time.

## Results

The table below shows the results of the MAP math assessment in the spring of 2016, and provides a summary of performance.

NWEA: Math Achievement: Percent of students above the $50 \%$ percentile

| Grade Level | Grade K | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | ALL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Math | $30 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $33 \%$ | $26 \%$ |

## Evaluation

The MAP scores fell short of our goal for student performance by 25 percent.

## Goal 2: Optional Math Measure 2

Each year, 85 percent of all students in grades kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above grade level as measured by NWEA MAP (Proficient or Advanced levels).

## Method

The NWEA Measures of Academic Progress Assessment (MAP) is a nationally normed, standardized achievement test in reading and math aligned with New

York State Standards and administered in all grades. The early assessment measures the extent to which a child is cognitively prepared to begin academic work as well as core subject tests for those students who have beginning mathematical skills. Skill assessment expands in breadth and depth with each grade level. The MAP provides dependable information about each student, information that the teacher can then use to modify lessons by targeting specific skills. This test was chosen because of the depth of information provided by the results, allowing teachers to address the needs of individual students and entire classes by identifying problem areas within the curriculum itself. Further, the MAP provides national percentiles that can be tracked over time.

## Results

The table below shows the results of the MAP reading assessments in the spring of 2016, and provides a summary of growth performance.

NWEA: Math Growth: Percent of students who met growth targets

| Grade Level | Grade K | Grade 1 | Grade 2 | Grade 3 | ALL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Met Growth Target | $51 \%$ | $53 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $54 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| Did not meet Growth Target | $49 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $72 \%$ | $46 \%$ | $54 \%$ |

## Evaluation

The MAP scores fell short of our goal for student growth by over 30\% in each grade level.

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are <br> enrolled in at least their second year will perform at <br> proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam <br> for grades 3-8. | Did not <br> achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level <br> Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet <br> that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set <br> forth in the state's NCLB accountability system. | Did not <br> achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students who are <br> enrolled in at least their second year and performing at <br> proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be <br> greater than that of students in the same tested grades <br> in the local school district. | Did not <br> achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of <br> performance on the state mathematics exam by an <br> Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than <br> expected to a small degree) according to a regression | Did not <br> achieve |


|  | analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged <br> students among all public schools in New York State. <br> (Using 2013-14 school district results.) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Growth | Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's <br> mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for <br> all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's <br> unadjusted median growth percentile. | Did not <br> achieve |
| Absolute | Each year, 85 percent of all students in grades <br> kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above grade <br> level as measured by NWEA MAP (Proficient or <br> Advanced levels). | Did not <br> achieve |
| Growth | Each year, 50 percent of all students in grades <br> kindergarten-3rd grade will perform at or above the <br> 50th percentile of all students tested as measured by <br> NWEA MAP (Proficient or Advanced levels). | Did not <br> achieve |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students performing <br> at proficiency on the state Math exam will be greater <br> than that of students in the same tested grades in the <br> schools with similar demographics in the district and a <br> neighboring district. | Partially <br> achieved |

## ACTION PLAN

The principal will implement the same observation and coaching cycle for instructional staff for math instruction as described above for ELA. The region will also provide increased monitoring and support for math instruction.
The school has also invested in an additional Director of Instruction, such that grade levels are split K-2 and 3-4 to allow for a greater level of teacher support and coaching. The number of ICT classes has been increased to 12 of 14 sections devoted to ICT and 2 special education coordinators added to the staff to work specifically with small groups of students (4-8) with disabilities in each grade level.

The school has partnered with the Inclusive Classroom Project at Columbia University Teacher's College to provide professional development and coaching to both the teachers and administrative team members to build capacity. Teaching staff will participate in PD 3-4 afternoons a week for 45 minutes inclusive of grade team meetings, coaching, and inquiry groups. Additionally, a day a month has been set aside for teacher collaborative professional learning across the school and/or region.

This year, the school is implementing a new math curriculum across all grade levels. The school will be using Bridges in Mathematics from the Math Learning Center, which has received the highest ratings from EdReports for common core alignment and aligns with the CWC academic model's focus on constructivism and project-based learning. This will increase the rigor of material students and
teachers are working from and increase differentiation through the use of work places and the intervention curriculum. The time for math instruction has been increased in the schedule. Classroom teachers and assistant teachers received two days of training in the Bridges curriculum materials by consultants from the Math Learning Center prior to the start of the 2016-2017 school year.
During the summer a team of teachers from grades 3 and 4 from both CWC NY schools, worked to unpack and map the new materials with careful attention to NYS assessment contents and timing. Test readiness was built into each unit.
The internal assessment system has been revamped with particular focus on grades 3 and 4. In addition to the use of ongoing classroom assessment, teachers will be using baseline and quarterly assessments and an end of year project/exhibition will be implemented. For grades 3 and 4, quarterly check-up assessments will include both the open-response and multiple-choice questions, aligned to the same standards. These will be drawn from previous NYS assessments along with Certica and Inspect databases within our new PowerSchool Assessment and Analytics. These NYS assessment aligned postassessments will happen 4 times a year, including 3 times prior to the state assessment. Thus they will both prepare students for the content and process (testing conditions will be in place for each post assessment) of the NYS assessments, while providing specific information about learning of the content taught. Collaborative scoring, data disaggregation and follow up planning will occur with each administration within grade teams. Additionally quarterly there will be region-wide collaborative learning days that include looking at student work, planning based on data, and reflection on curricular implementation.

## SCIENCE

## Goal 3: Science

CWC Williamsburg students will use technology, scientific concepts, principles, and theories to conduct and analyze investigations.

## BACKGROUND

## INTEGRATED SCIENCE

Using New York State Standards as the basis for Science curriculum, CWC teachers created project based learning units that integrate core content areas, including reading, writing, math, art, and music. Students used an inquiry-based approach to explore core science and social studies content and demonstrate their mastery of the content through structured performances of understanding and culminating projects.

## SCIENCE

- Curriculum: Teacher created project-based learning units that can include resources from other CWC schools, FOSS, and SEL curricula materials
- Purpose: Science and Social Studies content is taught during this time through project-based and inquiry-based learning. Students engage with other students and develop/practice awareness of self and others and
■ Time Allocation: 30-55 minutes, 4-5 days/wk


## Goal 3: 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 science examination.

## METHOD

CWC Williamsburg did not have $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students 2015-16.

## RESULTS

CWC Williamsburg did not have $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students 2015-16.
Charter School Performance on 2015-16 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

| Grad <br> $e$ | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School <br> Students In At Least <br> 2nd Year | All District Students |


|  | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested | Percent <br> Proficient | Number <br> Tested |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |

## EVALUATION

CWC Williamsburg did not have $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students 2015-16.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Also, additional evidence may include other valid and reliable assessment results that demonstrate the effectiveness of the science program.
CWC Williamsburg did not have $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students 2015-16.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

| Grade | Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013-14 |  | 2014-15 |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## 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 local school district.

## METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year 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 in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the local school district.

## RESULTS

CWC Williamsburg did not have $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students 2015-16.

2015-16 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

| Grad e | Percent of Students at Proficiency |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year |  | All District Students |  |
|  | Percent Proficient | Number Tested | Percent Proficient | Number Tested |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |

## EVALUATION

CWC Williamsburg did not have $4^{\text {th }}$ grade students 2015-16.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## Science Performance of Charter School and Local District <br> 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 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2013-14 |  | 2014-15 |  | 2015-16 |  |
|  | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District | Charter School | Local District |
| 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Goal 3: Optional Measure
Include additional measures that are part of the Accountability Plan.

## METHOD

RESULTS
EVALUATION
ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

## SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

| Type | Measure | Outcome |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Absolute | Each year, 75 percent of all tested students <br> enrolled in at least their second year will perform <br> at proficiency on the New York State examination. | Choose an item. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Comparative | Each year, the percent of all tested students <br> enrolled in at least their second year and <br> performing at proficiency on the state exam will <br> be greater than that of all students in the same <br> tested grades in the local school district. | Choose an item. |
|  | Write in optional measure here | Choose an item. |

## ACTION PLAN

CWC Williamsburg will expand the use of FOSS in all grade levels by completing three units in each grade level. FOSS kits are fully aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards and thus the proposed new NYS Science Standards. This curriculum emphasizes hands-on experimentation and inquiry, which aligns well with the CWC academic model. A newly hired science teacher in a newly created science classroom will deliver Science. There will be an increased focus on experimentation and scientific thinking.

During the summer, a team of teachers from grades 3 and 4 from both CWC NY schools, worked to unpack and map the new materials with careful attention to NYS assessment contents and timing. Test readiness was built into each unit.

In addition to the use of ongoing classroom assessment, teachers will be using baseline and quarterly assessments and an end of year project/exhibition will be implemented. For grades 3 and 4, assessments will include both the curricular essay questions and multiple-choice questions and a performance assessment, aligned to the same standards. These will be drawn from previous NYS assessments along with Certica and Inspect databases within our new PowerSchool Assessment and Analytics. These NYS assessment aligned postassessments will happen 4 times a year, including 3 times prior to the state assessment. Thus they will both prepare students for the content and process (testing conditions will be in place for each post assessment) of the NYS assessments, while providing specific information about learning of the content taught. Collaborative scoring, data disaggregation and follow up planning will occur with each administration within grade teams. Additionally quarterly there will be region-wide collaborative learning days that include looking at student work, planning based on data, and reflection on curricular implementation.

## NCLB

## Goal 4: NCLB

CWC Williamsburg will make adequate yearly progress.
Goal 4: Absolute Measure
Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

## METHOD

Because 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 state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school's status under the state's No Child Left Behind ("NCLB") accountability system.

## RESULTS

State the school's NCLB status this year.
CWC Williamsburg has only one year of testing data in 2014-15.

## EVALUATION

Provide a narrative explicitly stating whether or not the school met the measure and any changes over time.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Provide a narrative reviewing the school's NCLB status during each year of the current Accountability Period.

## APPENDIX B: OPTIONAL GOALS

## Goal S: Parent Satisfaction

CWC Williamsburg's parents will be satisfied with the school's program.

## Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year two-thirds of parents will demonstrate satisfaction with the school's program based on positive responses to a parent satisfaction survey.

## METHOD

CWC Williamsburg participated in the annual NYC Department of Education School Survey for 2015-2016. CWC Williamsburg deeply values the opinion and partnership of the parents within our school-community.

## RESULTS

Forty seven percent (47\%) of our parents participated in this year's survey.

## 2015-16 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

| Number of <br> Families | Response <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: |
| 130 | $47 \%$ |

2015-16 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

| Item | Percent of <br> Respondents <br> Satisfied |
| :---: | :---: |
| How satisfied are you with the education your child has |  |
| received this year? |  |$\quad 98 \%$

## EVALUATION

Of the $47 \%$ of parents surveyed, $94 \%$ of the responses by each parent participant were positive. While parents were deemed satisfied based on positive responses, CWC Williamsburg did not meet this goal due to a low response rate. CWC Williamsburg has prioritized bolstering family engagement in the 2016-17 school year. To lead this work, CWC Williamsburg hired a bilingual Director of Family \& Community engagement who has experience as both a special education teacher and school counselor.

## Goal S: Absolute Measure

Each year, 90 percent of all students enrolled during the course of the year return the following September.

## METHOD

Student retention is tracked for all students from BEDS day of the previous school year through BEDS day of the reporting year. All students are included in this number except those who have aged out of the school's highest grade, completed the terminal grade or been expelled.

RESULTS
2015-16 Student Retention

| CWC Williamsburg |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Enrollment ${ }^{[1]}$ |  | Retention ${ }^{[2]}$ |  |  |  |
| Total Enrollment | 277 | Total Number of Students Eligible to Return from Previous Year ${ }^{[3]}$ | 200 | Number of English Language Learners Eligible to Return from Previous Year ${ }^{[5]}$ | 40 |
| Number of Students with Disabilities | 72 | Total Number of Eligible Students Who Returned from Previous Year | 176 | Number of English Language Learners Who Returned from Previous Year | 39 |
| Number of English Language Learners | 39 | Number of Students with Disabilities Eligible to Return from Previous Year ${ }^{[4]}$ | 50 | Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Eligible to Return from Previous Year | 173 |
| Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students | 189 | Number of Students with Disabilities Who Returned from Previous Year | 42 | Number of Economically Disadvantaged Students Who Returned from Previous Year | 156 |

*Data is reported as total number of students

## APPENDIX B

## EVALUATION

Eighty eight percent (88\%) of eligible students returned to CWC Williamsburg in 2015-2016. CWC Williamsburg fell slightly short of its targeted goal of retaining $90 \%$ of its students from the previous school year until now.

## ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

| Year | Student Retention <br> Rate |
| :---: | :---: |
| $2013-14$ | N/A |
| $2014-15$ | $93 \%$ |
| $2015-16$ | $88 \%$ |


[^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]:    ${ }^{2}$ In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ 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.

[^3]:    ${ }^{4}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.
    ${ }^{5}$ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

[^4]:    ${ }^{6}$ 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]:    ${ }^{7}$ In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

[^6]:    ${ }^{8}$ 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 distris statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its News Release webpage.

[^7]:    ${ }^{9}$ See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

[^8]:    10 Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

