



# Community Partnership

## **COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL**

### **2014-15 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2015

By Beginning with Children, Jubilee Mosley, and Rose Anne Gonzalez

**Lower School:** 241 Emerson Pl, Brooklyn, NY 11205  
**Phone:** (718) 399-3824 **Email:** [info@cpcsschool.org](mailto:info@cpcsschool.org)

**Middle School:** 114 Kosciuszko St, Brooklyn, NY  
**Phone:** (718) 636-3904 **Email:** [info@cpcsschool.org](mailto:info@cpcsschool.org)

**Beginning with Children, Jubilee Mosley (CPCS LS Principal) and Rose Anne Gonzalez (CPCS MS Principal)** prepared this 2014-15 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Martin Ragde	Chair/President Executive Committee
Katie Cunningham	Office, Vice Chair, Academic Excellence/Principal Review Committee Chair Executive Committee
Rubens Amedee	School Committee Nominating Committee
Sonia Gulardo	Academic Excellence/Principal Review School Committee
David Stutt	Office, Treasurer Finance / Audit Committee Chair
Rebecca Baneman	Legal Committee School Committee
Peter Bordonaro	Nominating School Committee
Clare Cusack	Executive Committee Academic Excellence/Principal Review Legal Committee
Amy Kolz	Finance/Audit Committee Academic Excellence/Principal Review Co-Secretary
Kiisha Morrow	Co-Secretary School Committee Nominating Committee
Oma Holloway	Finance /Audit Committee School Committee
Jubilee Mosley	Member Ex-Officio/ Lower School Principal School Committee
Rose Anne Gonzalez	Member Ex-Officio/ Middle School Principal School Committee
Esosa Ogbahon	Member Ex-Officio/Principal School Committee

**Jubilee Mosley has served as the CPCS Lower School leader since June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015.**

**Rose Anne Gonzalez has served as the CPCS Middle School leader since June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2015.**

## INTRODUCTION

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 strong academic base in which students learn to read, write, and perform mathematically at levels that exceed citywide averages. Students are expected to achieve high levels in an environment that values kindness and respect.

There were three significant shifts at Community Partnership Charter School this year. Firstly, almost forty-five percent of the teaching staff were either not renewed because of lack of performance or certification or chose to resign to seek other opportunities. Secondly, we completed a year-long search process to identify the permanent replacement for our former school director Melanie Bryon. Ms. Bryon resigned in June of 2014 and we named Adjowah Scott as interim director by August of that year. It was important to us that the entire school community participate in the process to identify the next permanent leader, so we launched a national search in October 2014. The search process featured opportunities for representatives of all stakeholders to engage the three finalists before the Board rendered its final decision. In March, 2015, the Board named Jubilee Mosley as the new permanent director of CPCS lower school. Finally, in the midst of the search for a new lower school director, Keisha Rattray (middle school director) informed the Board of her intention not to continue her tenure after June 24, 2015. At that point the Board weighed the strengths of the finalists for the lower school director role and contemplated whether the strengths of one particular finalist meshed well with its view of requisite leadership in a simultaneous transition at the middle school. We found that with her extensive middle school experience, Rose Anne Gonzalez would be the best candidate to assume leadership at CPCS middle school. Rose Anne accepted the Board's offer and both she and Jubilee began working at CPCS on June 1, 2015.

With the installation of two new leaders and an influx of new teaching staff, we have launched/re-launched efforts to continuously strengthen the school's implementation of *Journeys* by Houghton Mifflin(K-4), *Math in Focus*(K-8) and Singapore Math, revise report cards including parent portal and executive systemic school-wide and grade/subject based data meetings. We will also continue efforts to consistently coach and develop teachers and leaders throughout the school year as well as monitor student progress in mastering of grade level standards. We have engaged new partners in efforts to deepen our professional development opportunities for leaders and teacher. Both Bronx Charter School for Excellence and Uncommon have begun sets of collaboration with us as we continue efforts to reshape our teaching of reading.

Last summer, we welcomed new and returning families back to Community Partnership Charter Middle School for the 2014-15 school year. There was an increased focus on building a positive school culture characterized by events that celebrated scholar successes while educating families about how the shifts in the common core impact teaching and learning.

Complementary to the academic engagement of families, we also provided opportunities for socialization. Families were encouraged to join us for family visiting days, which were hosted in the fall and spring. Family visiting was an opportunity for parents to experience a portion of the day with their children. Additionally, we hosted our first culture night. In partnership with an organization, International Youth Fellowship, parents were invited to celebrate the cultural diversity that exists within our school community. Many families attired in traditional garb, brought food, drinks and dessert to share. Our gymnasium transformed into a cultural museum with several artifacts from countries around the globe. Through these events, we hoped that families would gain a better understanding of the changes in our academic environment as well as gain a better awareness of the day-to-day culture in our school.

Academic opportunities were afforded to many of our high performing scholars. Programs such as TEAK Fellowship, Breakthrough NY, Harlem Educational Activities Fund (HEAF), Oliver Scholars and Prep for Prep engaged our scholars in their rigorous admissions screening. In collaboration with Beginning with Children and Bronx Charter School of Excellence, several of our alum and rising 8<sup>th</sup> graders attended the Science Institute at Colgate University this past summer. There, scholars were able to gain an understanding of what it means to be a college student studying on campus and explore areas of science and math under the tutelage of Colgate's esteemed faculty.

We were proud to bid farewell to our 3<sup>rd</sup> graduating class of 32 scholars. 87%, were accepted to their first or second choice school and 94% were matched with a HS that offered advanced placement classes, thus increasing their chances of graduating from high school and attending and graduating from a 4 –year university.

As we look ahead to the 2015-16 school year, we are hopeful that Community Partnership Charter Middle School will continue to be a school that fosters academic achievement that provides opportunities to our scholars and families.

#### **School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year**

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
2011-12	48	51	48	50	53	49	50	29	-	-	-	-	-	378
2012-13	50	49	49	51	52	52	49	42	26	-	-	-	-	420
2013-14	46	46	52	48	51	46	52	38	36	-	-	-	-	415
2014-15	45	43	52	45	44	46	39	55	33	-	-	-	-	402

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

### Goal 1: English Language Arts

CPCS students will become proficient readers and writers of the English language.

#### Background

CPCS has traditionally developed lifelong readers who enjoy reading a wide range of literature and factual material to make sense of the world and influence its direction. Literacy is integrated throughout the day in a print-rich environment that fosters a love of reading. Students select their own independent reading books and are encouraged to read at different times throughout the day. In addition to the language arts block, morning meetings are rich opportunities for teachers to model reading strategies to students. Non-fiction content-area reading is also included in the social studies and science curriculum.

CPCS offers a wide range of books for students, through extensive classroom libraries, which include meaningful, culturally relevant texts, as well as classic stories and engaging books on a variety of topics, themes and levels, and a book room that supplements classroom materials with multiple copies of texts for targeted guided reading groups. With guidance, each student is able to freely select books from the classroom library for his or her independent reading. In grades 3-5, classes are departmentalized, with a dedicated ELA teacher in each grade who teaches the Literacy Block.

In 2014 -2015, CPCS began its second year of the process to fully overhaul its approach to teaching reading. CPCS selected the Journeys Common Core literacy program developed by Houghton Mifflin in grades K-4. Journeys embeds Common Core based instruction into every unit and lesson and is a comprehensive program that provides the resources needed to plan, teach and engage, as well as, assess our students.

All lower school teachers prepared for Journeys Common Core instruction during our 2014 Summer Institute where they participated in hands on professional development conducted by Journeys consultants. Teachers were able to delve into the curriculum unit by unit and review all components of the program. Teachers worked in grade groups to prepare grade specific planning and were able to review the texts and all support materials in advance. Teachers were able to take a deep dive into the intervention components and plan for differentiated instruction for below, on and above grade level students.

CPCS also continued to implement the STEP assessment program K-4 to monitor students' progress in reading. The STEP assessment is similar to a running record in that students read leveled passages to the tester/ instructor while s/he tracks errors. However, the post-read-aloud comprehension questions in STEP are highly calibrated to students' use of specific reading strategies and help teachers to modify instruction in ways that running record data is not able to. STEP assessment data was collected quarterly at CPCS in the school assessment database to monitor student progress. Staff continued to focus their expertise in analyzing the reasoning behind students' wrong answers, or the miscue analysis, and the comprehension analysis, with support

from the STEP staff developers. Through a Dissemination Grant Awarded to CPCS, CPCS LS teachers also collaborated with the shared space Public School to train their teaching staff in the use and analysis of STEP as an assessment tool.

In the middle school, literacy teachers continued to work in collaboration with literacy consultant Isoke Nia and blended Journeys Common Core into the 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grade Common Core curriculum mapping that began two years ago and further concretized the common core planning for grades 7 and 8. With the Journeys Common Core Response to Intervention materials CPCS also began to enhance its intervention program for at risk students. Journeys includes a multi-tiered system of support for struggling students. CPCS teachers were called to address three levels of intervention; Tier I supplements the core curriculum with small group support using leveled readers and guided instruction, Tier II combines the core curriculum and small group instruction for students who are at least one year behind with a Write-In Reader that scaffolds the development of vocabulary, phonics and decoding, and Tier III provides supplemental instruction for students who need intensive intervention. On Tier III teachers utilize a Literacy Tool kit that supports instruction in phonics and word study, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. The kit assesses and prescribes instruction and offers practice and application to ensure mastery. This three tiered intervention system was an addition to the CPCS intervention system and will be refined to provide targeted and intensive support to bridge learning gaps for struggling students and improve learning in 2015 -2016.

This year the ELA department experienced increased coaching. There was a heightened emphasis on weekly observation and feedback; Friday midday content meetings, some after-school work sessions, and one-on-one class data analysis coaching meetings. With that we continue to refine our analysis of data, there was an introduction of the CPCMS data analysis recipe. It was deemed that we needed to increase the opportunities to collectively analyze our students writing across the school in order to make informed decisions as a team about the most pressing scholar needs per grade. Thus, the same data analysis steps will be utilized to ensure that we view our scholars with the same lens. The QWA, an on demand Quarterly Writing Assessment, remains as a formal assessment of student writing. This continues to be designed by the ELA team. The teachers and dean evaluated the performance of the scholars according to the New York State Writing rubric. During the grading, we noted the strengths and deficits of the individual scholars, by class, by grade, and committed to targeted teaching for our students' learning. Similarly we used the RALLY mock assessment to create small groups and Saturday Academy groups to meet the needs of the approaching scholars. Small group and Saturday Academy instruction while promising, was not executed as anticipated. Saturday Academy effectiveness can increase if there is a singular focus on staffing. Moving forward, small group instruction needs to be owned by the teachers and scheduled as a part of the instructional day.

The 2014-2015 academic school year saw the growth of our students with IEPs despite the departure of our special education coordinator who resigned from her position in April. We maintained the use of our established ELA curriculum without any additional supplements. While there were no overt changes to the ELA curriculum, the 5<sup>th</sup> grade did see an addition of a Langston Hughes author study. A whole school vocabulary focus was added to the existing components. Book Club/Reading Strategies small groups were introduced and led by our reading interventionist for our most struggling 5<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, and 8<sup>th</sup> graders.

Our Reading and Writing curriculum was completed with fidelity until the final day of our school year. Although the ELA team experienced a resignation mid-year directly before the NYS exam, our veteran teacher assumed the 8<sup>th</sup> grade instructional reins. Our scholars did not miss an instructional beat, as evidenced by the successful defense of their respective exit portfolios. The last and arguably most consequential, portion of their 8<sup>th</sup> grade year culminated in strong, reflective presentations during their exit portfolio defense.

In addition our 5<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> grades were replete with Writing publishing celebrations as well as the introduction of the Socratic seminar in 7<sup>th</sup> grade, mock trials during the *To Kill A Mockingbird* and *Twelve Angry Men* in the 6<sup>th</sup> grade (which included the teachers acting along with their scholars) units. Langston Hughes author study was a great success in the 5<sup>th</sup> grade. During the spring, all of our scholars could be found reading a minimum of 30 minutes daily in each grade. Furthermore, there was a sharp increase in our book review submission rate.

The 2014-2015 ELA instruction continues the paradigm shift in teacher thinking—teaching the seven metacognitive strategies for reading; moreover, teaching students how to use writing and reading strategies in different genres to garner meaning *and* to think about how they use the reading and/or writing strategy to ensure the students’ automaticity.

This year, while met with individual personal and team challenges, Team ELA persevered and presented as a united front as was evidenced by another successful team produced, directed, led, and hosted ELA Oscars where scholars were formally celebrated for their ELA skills growth. This year the ELA Oscars culminated with a whole school dance party in the gym. BwC donated prizes as well as beverages and other light fare to the celebration.

#### **Goal 1: 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 English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

#### **Method**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in third through 8th grade in April 2015. 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).

**2014-15 State English Language Arts Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>1</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	44				44
4	40			2	42
5	44				44
6	34			1	35
7	51				51
8	32				32
All	245	41	3	3	248

**Results**

Overall, 24.6 percent of 3-8 students scored at standards 3 and 4 on the NYS ELA exam.

**Performance on 2014-15 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 Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	18.18	44	21.62	37
4	17.5	40	17.14	35
5	15.91	44	14.29	35
6	26.47	34	36	25
7	17.65	51	19.15	47
8	46.88	32	46.88	32
All	22.5	245	24.6	211

**Evaluation**

This goal was not met. The overall percent of students in at least their second year achieving proficiency fell short of the absolute measure goal. Grade 8 scored significantly higher than the average at 46.88 percent proficient. Grades 4, 5, and 7, however, scored significantly lower than the average at 17.14 percent proficient for grade 4, 14.29 percent proficient for grade 5, and 19.15 percent proficient for grade 7.

The school did not meet the measure. There are particular areas of concerns for performance in grades 4, 5, and 7. We looked closely at curriculum and instruction and continue to make significant changes both in personnel and program for the next school year. Common Core

<sup>1</sup> 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.



instruction was a challenge for both teachers and students in 2014 -2015. New and Returning ELA teachers will receive targeted support in implementing the Common Core curriculum this year.

### Additional Evidence

In 2011-12, CPCS demonstrated progress towards charter goals over the previous year. A new baseline for student performance, relative to common core standards, was established with the NYS testing in 2013. As a result, CPCS performed well below its charter goals in 2012-13. After a year of reshaping our approach to literacy instruction, we saw some growth in 2013-14 but decline in 2014-15.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	19.1	47	42.86	42	21.62	37
4	25.6	43	17.02	47	17.14	35
5	24.5	49	30.00	40	14.29	35
6	25.6	39	19.51	41	36	25
7	32.4	37	35.29	34	19.15	47
8	30.8	26	36.11	36	46.88	32
All	25.7	241	29.58	240	24.6	211

### 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 Performance Level Index ("PLI") value that equals or exceeds the 2014-15 English language arts AMO of 97. 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.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> In contrast to SED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

## Results

The overall PLI for all grades was 84.2. All tested students have a PLI value that falls short of the 2014-15 English language arts AMO of 97.

### English Language Arts 2014-15 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	38.4	39.2	18.4	4.1

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl} \text{PI} & = & 39.2 & + & 18.4 & + & 4.1 & = & 61.7 \\ & & & & 18.4 & + & 4.1 & = & \underline{22.5} \\ & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 84.2 \end{array}$$

## Evaluation

This goal was not met. CPCS's overall PLI fell short of the 2014-15 English language arts AMO by 12.8 points. In 2014-15, a larger percentage of students performed at Level 1 than in previous years. In 2014 -2015 there was continued resistance to curriculum changes and overall expectations. We expect to see improved proficiency levels with a staff and school leadership more committed to the expectations of common core standards and the accompanying exams.

### 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.<sup>3</sup>

## Results

The overall percent of students in at least their second year achieving proficiency fell just under the aggregate district proficiency by less than 1 percentage point (0.07).

<sup>3</sup> Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its Access 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](#).

**2014-15 State English Language Arts Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	21.62	37	30.3	322
4	17.14	35	32.6	315
5	14.29	35	29.8	270
6	36	25	17.6	125
7	19.15	47	16.6	123
8	46.88	32	19.6	154
All	24.6	211	25.3	1309

**Evaluation**

This measure was not met. The average proficiency of CPCS students was 24.6 percent compared to 25.3 percent of the district. While the overall proficiency fell short of the district, this was only seen in grades three through five. Grades 6, 7, and 8, however, far exceeded the aggregate performance of their peers in the district.

**Additional Evidence**

Historically, CPCS outperforms the district as evidenced by the table below.

**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 Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	19.1	28.8	42.86	30.0	21.62	30.3
4	25.6	26.1	17.02	30.5	17.14	32.6
5	24.5	27.6	30.00	32.5	14.29	29.8
6	25.6	17.9	19.51	17.2	36	17.6
7	32.4	17.9	35.29	17.2	19.15	16.6
8	30.8	19.5	36.11	20.4	46.88	19.6
All	25.7	23.2	29.58	25.0	24.6	25.3

**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 Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. 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 economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' 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 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

## Results

The analysis using last year's data shows an effect size of 0.48 for the six grades combined.

### **2013-14 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	82.22	47	40.43	22.59	17.8449	1.25
4	79.59	51	15.69	23.84	-8.15194	-0.57
5	69.77	44	29.55	23.68	5.871732	0.45
6	88	52	21.15	15.21	5.940115	0.50
7	75	36	33.33	20.13	13.19515	0.85
8	69.44	36	36.11	26.73	9.37555	0.57
All	<b>77.99</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>28.57</b>	<b>21.80</b>	6.777252	<b>0.48</b>

### **School's Overall Comparative Performance:**

***Higher than expected to a meaningful degree***

## Evaluation

This measure was met. It was exceeded in grades 3, 5, 6, 7, and 8 as well as in the whole school. It was not, however, exceeded in grade 4 which trailed the goal of 0.30 significantly. The effect size of 0.48 indicates growth that is higher than expected to a meaningful degree when comparing performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide.

### Additional Evidence

The chart below shows comparative data for ELA for CPCS students during the past three years. 2013-14 results show comparative growth that is higher than expected to a meaningful degree, which shows growth compared to 2011-12 and 2012-13.

**English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2011-12	3-7	46	225	56.5	55.3	0.07
2012-13	3-8	74	271	23.6	22.3	0.08
2013-14	3-8	77.99	266	28.57	21.80	0.48

### Goal 1: Growth Measure<sup>4</sup>

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 2013-14 and also have a state exam score from 2012-13 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2012-13 score are ranked by their 2013-14 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 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

## Results

The analysis using last year's data shows a mean growth percentile of 54.9 for the six grades combined.

### **2013-14 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level**

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	58.5	50.0
5	54	50.0
6	53	50.0
7	61	50.0
8	48	50.0
All	<b><u>54.9</u></b>	50.0

## Evaluation

This measure was met. CPCS's mean growth percentile exceeded the statewide median by 4.9 percentage points. CPCS exceeded the statewide median in all grades. This is especially so with grade 7, which exceeded the statewide median by 11 percentage points.

## Additional Evidence

The aggregate mean growth percentile of grades 4-6 grew from 51 in 2012-13 to 54.9 in 2013-14.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2011-12 <sup>6</sup>	2012-13	2013-14	Statewide Median
4	51	55	58.5	50.0
5	51	40	54	50.0
6	63	54	53	50.0
7	57	54	61	50.0
8		54	48	50.0
All	<b><u>61</u></b>	<b><u>51</u></b>	<b><u>54.9</u></b>	50.0

### **Goal 1: Growth Measure (G1.5B)**

<sup>5</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

<sup>6</sup> Grade level results not available.

Each year, the proficiency rates of grade-level cohorts on the NYS ELA exams will reduce by one-half the difference between 75 and the proficiency rates on the previous year's NYS ELA exams. If 75 percent or more of the grade-level cohorts obtained proficient scores the previous year, their results will increase in the current year.

## Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2014-15 and also have a state exam score in 2013-14. It includes all current students in grades 4-8 who repeated the grade. These students are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students taking a state exam in both years. CPCS used 2013-14 and 2014-15 scale scores to conduct this analysis.

## Results

2014-15 Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Goal Achieved?
		2013-14	Target	2014-15	
4	32	40.63	57.81	15.63	NO
5	30	23.33	49.17	16.67	NO
6	24	33.33	54.17	37.50	NO
7	44	22.73	48.86	20.45	NO
8	31	38.71	56.85	48.39	NO
All	161	31.06	53.03	26.71	NO

## Evaluation

CPCS did not meet the measure for any of the five cohorts. The collapsed proficiency rate for all five cohorts combined decreased by 4.35.

### Goal 1: Growth Measure (G1.5C)

Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced reading assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

## Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same cohort of students from one year to the next on the TerraNova norm-referenced reading test. Each cohort consists of those students who have norm-referenced reading test results for two consecutive years at the school. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in the first year and the 50th NCE in the second. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. For the 2014-15 school year CPCS administered the TerraNova reading exam to students in grades K-3 in June 2015.

## Results

2013-14 Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Goal Achieved?
		2013-14 Avg NCE	Target	2014-15 Avg NCE	
K	45	n/a	n/a	49.66	n/a
1	38	64.83	$\geq 64.84$	47.97	NO
2	42	55.28	$\geq 55.29$	51.12	NO
3	37	55.36	$\geq 55.37$	49.16	NO
All	162	<b>57.04</b>	$\geq 57.05$	<b>48.78</b>	NO

## Evaluation

CPCS did not meet this goal. Third grade students performed below their target, moving from an average NCE of 55.36 in the second grade to an average of 49.16 in the third grade. Second grade students showed a decline from an average NCE of 55.28 in the first grade to 51.12 in the second grade. First grade students showed the most average decline with a decrease from an average NCE of 64.83 in kindergarten to 47.97 in the first grade. Overall, all three cohorts showed significant decline.

## Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

CPCS did not achieve the absolute measure of 75% proficiency for all grades. It also did not meet the absolute measure for this year's Annual Measurable Objective set by NYS's NCLB accountability system. The overall PLI for all grades was 84.2.

CPCS did not meet the comparative measure for students in the same tested grades in District 13 as it fell less than 1 percentage point (0.07) under district proficiency levels. However, CPCS 2013-14 effect size comparison did exceed district comparisons in all but 4<sup>th</sup> grade with an effect size of 0.48.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least	Did Not Achieve



	their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Did Not Achieve
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Did Not Achieve
Comparative	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 small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	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.	Achieved
Growth	Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced reading assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.	Did Not Achieve

### Action Plan

Data from our performance on the state ELA exam continues to inform our strategic planning for ELA curriculum, instruction and professional development. We have already contracted ongoing PD for the 2015-2016 school year with HMH Journeys Common Core and a STEP consultant.

We will have heightened engagement, development and monitoring of:

- Tight Tier 1 Instruction: Solid Implementation of Journey's Curriculum
- Guided Reading: Targeted Small Group Reading Instruction to help scholars successfully navigate through texts with accuracy, fluency and increased comprehension
- Close Reading PD: Teaching scholars how to strategize, comprehend, and write complete written responses to complex grade level text with the use of the RACE strategy.
  - R= Restates all parts of the question before including the answer
  - A= Accurately answers the question by drawing the right conclusions
  - C=Cites relevant evidence from the text to support conclusions
  - E=Explains evidence by adding some type of revelation or connection to larger themes of the story.
- Data Driven Instruction: Frequent and Ongoing Assessment via STEP benchmarks, RALLY and Reading Assessments, reflection, reteach.

### MATHEMATICS

**Goal 2: Mathematics**

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

**Background**

This school year marked our official 2<sup>nd</sup> year using the Math in Focus, Singaporean math curriculum. This curriculum highlights problem solving as a focus of mathematical learning. The program teaches concepts using a concrete-pictorial abstract learning progression and anchors learning in real-world experiences.

Fifty percent of this year's math team were 1<sup>st</sup> year teachers and seventy one percent of the team were new to teaching the "Math in Focus" way. Therefore, our goals for the year circulated around these five major components:

- Unit & Lesson Planning
- Chapter (Unit) Pacing
- Mathematics Workshop Model
- Professional Development
- Lesson Execution

**Unit & Lesson Planning:**

Modified from a lesson plan format shared with us by Carrie Treusch, our primary Math in Focus consultant, we adopted a format that pushes our use of the text with greater fidelity, details student misconceptions, teacher anticipated responses, progression of questioning (developing our questioning techniques), student-centered work, and further emphasis on the Math in Focus idea of teaching with "Gradual Release".

The format is easily adjustable to accommodate the progression of learning day-to-day and using this format reduced the amount of time teachers spent planning significantly (Lesson plans could be planned effectively in 22 minutes). The Math in Focus resource material supplied us with outlines for every chapter (unit) taught this year, coupled with in-house developed scope & sequence paved the way for greater teacher investment in making sure lesson plans were submitted to the Academic Dean on time and feedback could be given back to them in a timely manner.

**Chapter Unit Pacing:**

The math department had to balance teaching with more fidelity to the M.I.F program, attending to the need of our scholars academically, and getting through all the required material faster knowing that the NYS Math Common Core Assessment was happening earlier this school year (cutting our teaching time back by three weeks). Therefore, the pacing calendars developed made the following adjustments:

- Tuesday, March 31, 2015 was the deadline for all major & supporting cluster common core standard content to be taught.

- The amount of days given to teach each chapter (unit) was shortened to closely resemble the time-allotted by Math in Focus.
- Weekly adjustments were made if necessary to pacing calendar only after careful analysis of student progress and agreed upon by the teacher and the academic dean.

### **Mathematics Workshop Model:**

Mirroring the Reading & Writing Workshop Model that was being used in the ELA department, the Math department created a similar Math & Math Foundations Workshop. Model. Four days a week, scholars would have a 60-minute math foundations class that addresses any prerequisite mathematics skills that they would need in order to be more successful in their 60-minute math in focus class. Math foundations classes were also ideal classes for scholars to spend more time completing tasks assigned during their math in focus block, teachers to complete individual student check-ins, and teachers to improve their differentiation techniques (i.e. station teaching and parallel teaching). Math in focus lessons are planned for 45-minutes. However, in order to accommodate student learning and teacher comfort with the material, Math in Focus classes were given an extra 15-minutes this school year.

### **Professional Development:**

In addition to scheduled check-ins, the 8<sup>th</sup> grade math (taught by the academic dean) classroom became an observation room for the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, & 7<sup>th</sup> grade math teachers. The observational focus for teachers was created during their check-ins, prior to them observing the class. This process helped to identify areas of growth and reinforce goals previously set.

Math-in-Focus centered development has been strategically placed throughout school year to assist teachers with lesson planning, lesson plan execution, questioning techniques, and resource management. It was also important to that we worked with the same consultant, Carrie Treusch, each time to preserve continuity, teacher investment (the team reacted well to her), and it was easier to track teacher progress. Professional Development days were/are:

- 10/29/14 – 10/30/14 – Lesson Planning & Lesson Execution
- 12/9/14 – Lesson Execution Part 2
- 02/10/15 – 02/11/15 – Lesson Pacing (Questioning) & Gradual Release
- 06/16/15 – 06/17/15 – End of the year wrap up / Summer planning.

### **Lesson Execution:**

For our second year using the Math in Focus program, lessons focused on four major areas of Math in Focus:

- Consistently teaching to the concrete, pictorial, and abstract components (C.P.A.) – addresses the “how” and “why” of math, includes, bar models, & real world applications.
- Visualization – helps scholars show & prove their work.
- Math is Thinking – Answering the questions “how do you know what you know?” & “how did you come up with that?”, pushing math conversations and accountable talk in class.
- Gradual Release – Teacher moves fluidly from facilitator to support to observer and back again.

Centering lessons around these four components reinforces scholars doing the “heavy-lifting” as quickly as possible; giving them more “at-bats” at the material, and ensuring a higher level of scholar-preparedness for summative assessments.

### **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 3rd through 8th grade in April 2015. 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.

**2014-15 State Mathematics Exam  
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested <sup>7</sup>			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	44				44
4	40			2	40
5	44				44
6	34			1	35
7	51				51
8	32				32
All	245			3	248

### **Results**

Overall, 36 percent of students in at least their second year performed at levels 3 and 4 on the NYS math exam.

---

<sup>7</sup> 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.

**Performance on 2014-15 State Mathematics Exam  
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year**

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	33.9	44	48.65	37
4	43.18	40	57.14	35
5	52.5	44	34.29	35
6	38.24	34	48	25
7	17.65	51	17.02	47
8	18.76	32	18.76	32
All	<b>33.9</b>	245	<b>36</b>	211

**Evaluation**

This goal was not met. Grades 3, 4, and 6 scored significantly higher than the average at 48.65 percent proficient for grade 3, 57.14 percent proficient for grade 4, and 48 percent proficient for grade 6. Grade 7 and 8, however, scored significantly lower than the average at 17.02 percent proficient for grade 7 and 18.76 percent proficient for grade 8.

**Additional Evidence**

In 2011-12, CPCS demonstrated progress towards charter goals over the previous year. A new baseline for student performance, relative to common core standards, was established with the NYS testing in 2013. As a result, CPCS performed well below its charter goals in 2012-13. After a year of reshaping our approach to math instruction, we saw some small growth in 2013-14. Unfortunately, however, CPCS saw decline in 2014-15.

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	38.3	47	65.85	41	48.65	37
4	44.2	43	48.94	47	57.14	35
5	32.7	49	20.00	40	34.29	35
6	23.1	39	39.02	41	48	25
7	32.4	37	11.76	34	17.02	47
8	7.7	26	33.33	36	18.76	32
All	31.5	241	37.66	239	36	211

**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 Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the 2014-15 mathematics AMO of 94. 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.<sup>8</sup>

**Results**

The overall PLI for all grades was 108.2. All tested students have a PLI value that exceeds the 2014-15 Mathematics AMO of 94.

**Mathematics 2014-15 Performance Level Index (PLI)**

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
	25.7	40.4	24.5	9.4

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 40.4 & + & 24.5 & + & 9.4 & = & 74.3 \\
 & & & & 24.5 & + & 9.4 & = & \underline{33.9} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 108.2
 \end{array}$$

**Evaluation**

This goal was met. CPCS's overall PLI exceeded the 2014-15 Mathematics AMO by 14.2 points.

**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

<sup>8</sup> In contrast to NYSED's Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

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.<sup>9</sup>

## Results

The overall percent of students in at least their second year achieving proficiency exceeded aggregate district proficiency by 10.5 percentage points.

**2014-15 State Mathematics Exam  
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	48.65	37	36.8	391
4	57.14	35	31.0	302
5	34.29	35	35.8	325
6	48	25	15.8	110
7	17.02	47	16.0	120
8	18.76	32	6.6	45
All	36	211	25.5	1293

## Evaluation

This measure was met. The average proficiency of CPCS students was 36 percent compared to 25.5 percent of the district. Furthermore, students in all grades performed significantly higher than the aggregate performance of their peers in the district.

## Additional Evidence

As evidenced in the table below, CPCS has outperformed the district in math year to year.

---

<sup>9</sup> 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](#).

### 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 Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	38.3	30.3	65.85	34.3	48.65	36.8
4	44.2	29.7	48.94	33.0	57.14	31.0
5	32.7	24.0	20.00	32.5	34.29	35.8
6	23.1	14.0	39.02	20.0	48	15.8
7	32.4	10.1	11.76	12.0	17.02	16.0
8	7.7	11.9	33.33	8.9	18.76	6.6
All	31.5	20.3	37.66	24.2	36	25.5

#### **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 Charter Schools Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide. 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 economically disadvantaged percentage. The difference between the schools' 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 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

#### **Results**

The analysis using last year's data shows an effect size of 0.48 for the six grades combined.



### **2013-14 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	82.22	47	60.87	31.74003	29.12997	1.58
4	79.59	51	47.06	31.83539	15.22461	0.77
5	69.77	44	20.45	33.1304	-12.6804	-0.67
6	88	52	35.29	22.23991	13.05009	0.70
7	75	36	11.11	22.47258	-11.3626	-0.59
8	69.44	36	33.33	17.6368	15.6932	0.76
All	<b>77.99</b>	266	36.07395	26.96818	9.105763	<b>0.48</b>

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

#### **Evaluation**

This measure was met. It was exceeded in grades 3, 4, 6, and 8 as well as in the whole school. It was not, however, exceeded in grades 5 and 7 which trailed the goal of 0.30 significantly. The effect size of 0.40 indicates growth that is higher than expected to a small degree when comparing performance to demographically similar public schools state-wide.

#### **Additional Evidence**

The chart below shows comparative data for ELA for CPCS students during the past three years. 2013-14 results show comparative growth that is higher than expected to a meaningful degree, which shows growth from 2012-13.

### **Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year**

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2011-12	3 - 7	46	225	76.9	12.5	0.77
2012-13	3 -8	74	271	30.3	23.5	0.40
2013-14	3-8	77.99	266	36.07	26.9	0.48

## Goal 2: Growth Measure<sup>10</sup>

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.

### 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 2013-14 and also have a state exam score in 2012-13 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2012-13 scores are ranked by their 2013-14 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 2014-15 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2013-14 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.<sup>11</sup>

### Results

The analysis using last year's data shows a mean growth percentile of 42 for the six grades combined.

#### 2013-14 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	54.5	50.0
5	30.5	50.0
6	47	50.0
7	44.5	50.0
8	42	50.0
All	<u>43.7</u>	50.0

### Evaluation

This measure was not met. CPCS's mean growth percentile trailed the statewide median by 6.3 percentage points. CPCS exceeded the statewide median by 4.5 points in grade 4. Unfortunately, the other grades trailed the statewide median significantly. This is especially so with grade 5, which

<sup>10</sup> See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

<sup>11</sup> Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: [portal.nysed.gov](http://portal.nysed.gov).

trailed the statewide median by 19.5 percentage points. We anticipate a higher growth percentile for the 2015 scores.

### Additional Evidence

The aggregate mean growth percentile of grades 4-6 grew slightly from 42 in 2012-13 to 43.7 in 2013-14.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2011-12 <sup>12</sup>	2012-13	2013-14	Statewide Median
4	55	47	54.5	50.0
5	63	46	30.5	50.0
6	60	39	47	50.0
7	67	51	44.5	50.0
8		18	42	50.0
All	<u>58</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>43.7</u>	50.0

#### Goal 2: Growth Measure (G2.5B)

Each year, the proficiency rates of grade-level cohorts on the NYS Math exams will reduce by one-half the difference between 75 and the proficiency rates on the previous year's NYS Math exams. If 75 percent or more of the grade-level cohorts obtained proficient scores the previous year, their results will increase in the current year.

#### Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2014-15 and also have a state exam score in 2013-14. It includes all current students in grades 4-8 who repeated the grade. These students are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students taking a state exam in both years. CPCS used 2013-14 and 2014-15 scale scores to conduct this analysis.

<sup>12</sup> Grade level results not available.

## Results

2014-15 Grades	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Goal Achieved?
		2013-14	Target	2014-15	
4	32	59.38	67.19	56.25	NO
5	30	53.33	64.17	40.00	NO
6	24	20.83	47.92	50.00	YES
7	44	38.64	56.82	18.18	NO
8	31	12.90	43.95	19.35	NO
All	161	37.89	56.44	34.78	NO

## Evaluation

CPCS only met the measure for one of the five cohorts. The collapsed proficiency rate for all five cohorts combined decreased by 3.11. This new proficiency rate represents the new benchmark for proficiency based on NYS common core assessments.

### Goal 2: Growth Measure (G2.5C)

Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced math assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

## Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same cohort of students from one year to the next on the TerraNova norm-referenced math test. Each cohort consists of those students who have norm-referenced reading test results for two consecutive years the school. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in the first year and the 50<sup>th</sup> NCE in the second. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. For the 2014-15 school year CPCS administered the TerraNova math exam to students in grades K-3 in June 2015.

## Results

2014-15 Grades	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Goal Achieved?
		2013-14	Target	2014-15	
K	45	n/a	n/a	60.07	n/a
1	38	71.20	>= 71.21	48.68	NO
2	42	62.85	>= 62.86	57.12	NO

3	37	58.28	>= 58.29	57.73	NO
All	162	64.12	>= 64.13	54.65	NO

## Evaluation

None of the three cohorts met the goal. Third grade students showed decline, moving from an average NCE of 58.28 in the second grade to an average of 54.65 in the third grade. Second grade students showed similar decline from an average NCE of 62.85 in the first grade to 57.12 in the second grade. First grade students showed the most declination with a decrease from an average NCE of 71.20 in kindergarten to 48.68 in first grade. Overall all three cohorts showed significant decline.

## Summary of the Mathematics Goal

The overall percent of students in at least their second year achieving proficiency, in each grade, fell short of the absolute measure goal.

CPCS's overall PLI exceeded the 2014-15 Mathematics AMO by 14.2 points. While the majority of students were not proficient, a larger percentage of those students performed at Level 2 than Level 1, indicating a larger percentage of partially proficient students than below proficient students.

One of the five cohorts improved the score to meet the year to year target. The collapsed proficiency rate for all five cohorts combined decreased by 3.11. This new proficiency rate represents the new benchmark for proficiency based on NYS common core assessments.

CPCS's mean growth percentile trailed the statewide median by 6.3 percentage points. CPCS exceeded the statewide median by 4.5 points in grade 4. Unfortunately, the other grades trailed the statewide median significantly. This is especially so with grade 5, which trailed the statewide median by 19.5 percentage points.

None of the three cohorts met the goal based on the TerraNova administration. Third grade students showed decline, moving from an average NCE of 58.28 in the second grade to an average of 54.65 in the third grade. Second grade students showed similar decline from an average NCE of 62.85 in the first grade to 57.12 in the second grade. First grade students showed the most declination with a decrease from an average NCE of 71.20 in kindergarten to 48.68 in first grade. Overall all three cohorts showed significant decline.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the	Achieved

	local school district.	
Comparative	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 small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2013-14 school district results.)	Achieved
Growth	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.	Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced reading assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.	Did Not Achieve

### Action Plan

Data from our performance on the state Math exam and TerraNova continues to inform our strategic planning for mathematics curriculum and instruction and professional development. We have already contracted ongoing *Math in Focus* PD for the 2015-2016 school year.

We will have heightened engagement, development and monitoring of:

- Tight Tier 1 Instruction: Solid Implementation of Math in Focus Curriculum
- Explain Your Thinking/Show What You Know Fridays
  - Constructed Response/Word Problems
  - Use of Problem Solving Graphic Organizer to solve one step and multi-step word problems
    1. Read to Understand the problem
    2. Plan
    3. Solve
    4. Check
- Data Driven Instruction: Frequent and Ongoing Assessment via STEP benchmarks, RALLY and Reading Assessments, reflection, reteach

## SCIENCE

### **Goal 3: Science**

CPCS students will become proficient in Science.

#### **Background**

In 2014 – 2015 CPCS continued to support a rich experiential science curriculum provided by science specialists in a variety of programmatic delivery models. Kindergarten teachers taught science in the classroom. In grades 1 and 2 science instruction was provided to students in the science classroom setting, by a science specialist for two hours weekly. In grades 3-4 science was taught by the math classroom teacher in three 60 minute blocks per week. Middle school science was taught by science specialists in grades 5-8.

The lower school science specialist coordinated an annual science fair for students in grades 3-4. This science fair was a huge success this year as it allowed students to demonstrate their capacity for original scientific inquiry. The school also hosted a Science and Technology night during which families came to learn about science and technology and participated in fun and educational activities.

In middle school, through Beginning with Children (BwC), a select group of scholars were able to study and explore the various branches of medicine in the Doctors for a Day program with Doctors at the University of California Irvine. BwC also afforded some of our scholars the opportunity to study at Colgate University. The week long Science Institute at Colgate exposed our scholars to the rigors of college level science and the preparation required to tackle the rigorous curriculum. An explicit goal of the program was to build an awareness of what it takes to be accepted, enrolled and succeed in a college environment. These annual events, alongside our rigorous science instruction, have created a school culture in which students see themselves as scientists and technology enthusiasts.

### **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**

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2015. 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

The CPCS overall cohort proficiency rate in grade 4 and 8 is 84%, which significantly outpaces the 75% absolute measure goal.

### Charter School Performance on 2014-15 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100	32	100	37
8	68.76	32	68.76	32
All	<b>85.5</b>	64	<b>84.4</b>	64

## Evaluation

This measure was met. CPCS outpaced the 75% absolute measure goal by 9.4 percentage points. Grade 4 performed significantly well at 100 percent proficient.

## Additional Evidence

Grade 4 saw an increase from 97.87 percent in 2013-14 to 100 percent in 2014-15. The proficiency rate among 8<sup>th</sup> grade students fell short of the 75% goal we have established for each grade level, however, the aggregated proficiency rate of the school is 84.4%.

### Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100	43	97.87	47	100	32
8	73.1	26	71.43	35	68.76	32
All	89.9	69	86.59	82	84.4	64

#### 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

Over eighty-four percent of CPCS students were proficient on the 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade science exams in 2015. We are unable to compare that level of proficiency to District 13 as district-level data are no longer released.

### 2014-15 State Science Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100	32	N/A	N/A
8	68.76	32	N/A	N/A
All	85.5	64	N/A	N/A

## Evaluation

The school met the 75 percent expectation for its student's performance. The 2014-15 district results have not been released.

## Additional Evidence

CPCS consistently outperforms the local district in science.

### 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					
	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	100	84	97.87	82	100	N/A
8	73.1	44	71.43	40	68.76	N/A
All	89.9	64	86.59	62	84.4	N/A

### **Summary of the Science Goal**

CPCS achieved the absolute goal in science and generally outperforms the local district based on most recent results available.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State examination.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.	Results Pending

### **Action Plan**

CPCS science specialists will continue to implement science in grades 5-8 and strengthen our core science instruction in seventh and eighth grades. In the lower school, science has been transferred to the K-4 teachers to be taught in the classroom supplemented by the science lab. K-4 teachers will utilize the FOSS science units of study to ensure that all grade level science standards and content are met. We will continue to develop our project-based approach to science and demonstrate student learning via the Science Fair and Science & Technology nights. Students will continue to participate in extracurricular science programs that enhance the science content including but not limited to the Doctors for a Day program and the Colgate Science Institute.

### **NCLB**

#### **Goal 4: NCLB**

Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the CPCS's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

#### **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

CPCS meets all NCLB criteria and continues to maintain its “Good Standing” accountability status under the NCLB Accountability System.

## Evaluation

CPCS met this measure.

## Additional Evidence

CPCS has met the NCLB accountability measures outlined by New York State Education Department each year of this charter period.

**NCLB Status by Year**

Year	Status
2011-12	Good Standing
2012-13	Good Standing
2013-14	Good Standing
2014-15	Good Standing

## Art, Music, Physical Education, and Technology

### Goal 5:

CPCS Students will participate in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education and Technology

### Goal 5: Absolute Measure (G5.1)

Every CPCS student will participate in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education, and Technology classes as part of their weekly class schedule.

## Results

Students in grades K-4 participated in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education and Technology classes at least once a week. In grades 5-8, specialty teachers taught their subject twice a week on a trimester basis. Specialty teachers are responsible for ensuring 100 percent participation in class.

## Evaluation

CPCS met this measure.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	CPCS Students will Participate in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education and Technology	Achieved

## Action Plan

CPCS will continue to create additional opportunities to enhance our students' studies in these subjects next year. Particular emphasis will continue to be placed on improving technology integration in the classroom and also on providing opportunities for students to learn about potential professions in the arts.