



Charter Schools Institute  
*The State University of New York*

# **External Evaluation Report of Girls Preparatory Charter School of New York**

---

**2007 – 2008**

February 27, 2009

Charter Schools Institute  
State University of New York  
41 State Street, Suite 700  
Albany, New York 12207  
518/433-8277, 518/427-6510 (fax)  
<http://www.newyorkcharters.org>

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.	CONDUCT OF THE VISIT .....	3
III.	SCHOOL DESCRIPTION .....	5
IV.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	9
V.	SCHOOL PROGRESS REPORT .....	10
	Part I: Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School's Academic Success .....	10
	A. "School Performance Review" .....	10
	B. "School Educational Program Review" .....	11
	Part 2. Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School's Organizational Viability .....	20
	A. Are the school's mission and vision clear to all stakeholders? .....	20
	B. Are students and parents satisfied with the work of the school? .....	20
	C. Are systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and to modify it as needed? .....	21
VI.	OVERALL TRENDS REGARDING THE SCHOOL .....	23
	APPENDIX A: Framework for Report Discussion .....	24

## **Girls Preparatory Charter School of New York External Evaluation Report**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The external inspection is part of a comprehensive oversight and evaluation system for those charter schools authorized by the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (the “State University Trustees”). The external inspection during the second or third year of a school’s initial five-year charter cycle and periodically thereafter provides an independent assessment of the school’s progress toward meeting the academic and, on a more limited basis, organizational Qualitative Educational Benchmarks (QEBs), a component of the State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks (“State University Charter Renewal Benchmarks”).<sup>1</sup>

The external inspection complements the regular reviews conducted by the Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) by incorporating the Institute’s documentation of the school’s previous record of performance. This report provides an analysis of the data reviewed before and during the inspection visit and reflects any trends evident therein. In addition, this assessment provides insights which may contribute to the school’s ongoing improvement efforts and support the school’s case when it applies for initial or subsequent charter renewal. Finally, the Institute uses external inspection reports in discussions with school boards about the quality of their schools’ educational programs and the schools’ prospects for charter renewal.

This report is organized in the following sections:

- I. Introduction**
- II. Conduct of the Visit**
- III. School Description**
- IV. Executive Summary**
- V. School Progress Report**
- VI. Overall Trends Regarding the School**

Section I - the “Introduction” provides an overview of the external inspection process, as well as an overview of the organization of this report. Section II - the “Conduct of the Visit” includes a list of the members of the site visit team and their biographical sketches, along with a synopsis of the documents reviewed in preparation for the visit. Section III - the “School Description,” as the title indicates, briefly describes the charter school in terms of its establishment and history. Section IV - the “Executive Summary” provides a summary of the major conclusions reflected in the report.

Section V, entitled the “School Progress Report,” is divided into two parts: Part I, the “Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School’s Academic Success” and Part II, the “Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School’s Organizational Viability.” Both parts of the School Progress Report reflect evidence and analysis of the school’s effectiveness in meeting the standards set out in selected QEBs of the State University Charter Renewal Benchmarks.

---

<sup>1</sup> A full description of the State University Trustees’ Renewal Benchmarks and *Practices, Policies, and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools* authorized by the State University Board of Trustees can be found at <http://www.newyorkcharters.org>.

The “Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School’s Academic Success” is further divided into two components: the “School Performance Review,” which provides an analysis of student academic performance for the most recent two or three years as an indication of the school’s academic success (Renewal Benchmark 1A), and the “School Educational Program Review,” which reflects the visit team’s analysis of the qualitative aspects of the school’s educational program based upon the guiding questions provided by the Institute and aligned with Renewal Benchmarks 1B - 1F.

“Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School’s Organizational Viability,” focuses on three components: clarity of the school’s mission and vision to its stakeholders; parent and student satisfaction; and the establishment of systems to monitor the effectiveness of the school’s instructional program. Renewal Benchmarks 2B, 2D.1, and 2C.1 provide the underpinnings for this part of the report.

In the final section of the External Visit report, Section VI - “Overall Trends Regarding the School,” the visit team offers its insights about any patterns that have emerged across the full spectrum of the school. Here the team offers its judgments about the school’s effectiveness at meeting the broad goals defined in the New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 as amended (Education Law §2850(2) (a-f)):

- improving student learning and achievement;
- increasing learning opportunities for all students (particularly students at risk of academic failure);
- encouraging the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- creating new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- expanding parental choice in public schools; and
- moving from a rule-based to performance-based accountability system by holding schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

The judgments of the team are organized into two categories: academic program and organizational viability. The framework for the progress report discussion is shown in Appendix A. For your reference, the State University Charter Renewal Benchmarks, in their entirety, may be found on the Institute’s website at <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/schoolsRenewOverview.htm>.

## II. CONDUCT OF THE VISIT

The inspection of the Girls Preparatory Charter School of New York was conducted on March 24 and 25, 2008 by an independent team of experienced educators from RMC Research, New York, New York. The team included:

- **Sandra Kase, Ed.D.** (Team Leader) is an educational consultant currently providing services for RMC Research. Dr. Kase began her career in the New York City public schools as a teacher, staff developer and district administrator. She served as principal of the Claremont Community School for 14 years before moving to the New York City Board of Education as an Assistant to the Chancellor for School Improvement and Supervising Superintendent of the Chancellor's District. During that time, Dr. Kase focused on improving the lowest performing schools in the city and creating high quality new schools designed to provide rigorous educational opportunities for traditionally underperforming students. During 2003, Dr. Kase worked with the incoming Chancellor and his staff to support the transition to the newly created Department of Education. In March, 2004 she began to work in Peekskill, New York to support the efforts of the superintendent to raise the academic achievement of the students in that community. Dr. Kase has developed a wide array of programs, including: gifted and talented programs designed to provide opportunities for students who would normally be underserved; courses at museums such as the American Museum of Natural History; university based programs for K-12 students; and extended day and year programs which blended cultural experiences with demanding learning standards to raise the academic levels of all participants. Dr. Kase is currently a member of the Institutional Review Board of Touro College. She holds a Doctor of Education Degree in Educational Leadership, Administration and Policy from Fordham University.
- **Adam Tanney** is a Research Associate at RMC Research. He taught 11<sup>th</sup> and 12 grade history in New Hampshire. Mr. Tanney has conducted research for the U.S. Education Department (USED) and currently provides technical assistance to districts and state departments of education on comprehensive local assessment systems, advises state departments of education on statewide systems of support for school improvement, and has conducted numerous school reviews in a variety of accountability contexts. Mr. Tanney holds a Masters Degree in School Leadership.
- **Ellen Rosenbaum** is a Research Associate for RMC Research. With over 33 years of experience in the New York City schools, Ms. Rosenbaum has served as an elementary school teacher, teacher trainer and district administrator. As the Director of School Improvement for Community School District 8 in the New York City Board of Education, she worked with school leaders to use data to inform instruction and develop school reform initiatives. Ms. Rosenbaum holds a Masters Degree in Education and Professional Diploma in School District Administration.
- **Janice M. Imundi** is a Research Associate for RMC Research. She also serves as a member of the Adolescent Literacy Team for the New York Comprehensive Center (NYCC), a USED contracted project of RMC Research. She is additionally working with the New York State Education Department to review the English Language Arts

Standards. Her career of over 30 years in education was spent working with students in the New York City Public schools. Ms. Imundi was a teacher in junior high school, an assistant principal in both an elementary school and middle school and a principal in a middle school. During her career, Ms. Imundi also served as an Adjunct Professor in the School of Education at Mercy College and at Long Island University. Prior to joining RMC, she worked with aspiring principals and first year principals as a principal mentor with *New Visions for Public Schools* and the *New York City Leadership Academy*. Ms. Imundi holds a Masters Degree in Secondary Education and a Professional Diploma in Administration and Supervision.

As noted above, the team used the QEBs, a subset of the State University Charter Renewal Benchmarks, as the guides for its evaluation. In addition, the team relied on a set of framework questions to structure the “School Progress Report” section of this document. Prior to the two-day visit, the team reviewed the school’s documents, including its annual *Accountability Plan Progress Report*, reports from previous site visits by the Charter Schools Institute or other entities, such as the New York State Education Department, and relevant sections of the school’s charter agreement. During the visit, the team observed classes, reviewed student work, interviewed school administrators, school board members, staff, parents and students, and reviewed curriculum and other documents to understand the efforts the school is making to achieve its academic and organizational goals.

### III. SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

The Board of Trustees of the State University of New York approved the application for the Girls Preparatory Charter School of New York (“Girls Prep”) on January 27, 2004, and it was subsequently approved by the Board of Regents on March 23, 2004. After taking a planning year in 2004-05, the school opened in August of 2005 at 333 East Fourth Street, Fifth Floor, New York, New York, with an enrollment of 90 students in Kindergarten and first grades. Girls Prep then added one grade in each of the next two years, enrolling 179 students in Kindergarten through third grade in 2007-08. The school plans to continue to grow one grade each year and to make up for the planning year taken in 2003-04 by hopefully being approved for a Short-Term Planning Renewal. The school submitted an Application for Short Term Planning Year Renewal on January 15, 2008,. The founders of the school eventually hope to expand the program to include middle and high school grades.

At the time of the 2008 school inspection, the Board of Trustees of the Girls Preparatory Charter School was comprised of the following individuals:

- Mr. Bryan Lawrence, Chairperson
- Mr. R. Boykin Curry IV, Vice Chairperson
- Mr. Eric Grannis
- Ms. Miriam Lewis Raccah, Secretary
- Ms. Mary Mitchell
- Ms. Nicole Pullen Ross
- Ms. Kim Richardson
- Ms. Sarah Robertson
- Ms. Mary Claire Ryan
- Mr. Paul Vermynen
- Ms. Tajuana Rivera

The mission statement for Girls Prep is as follows:

*Our mission is to provide a nurturing single-sex environment and a rigorous education that will enable the girls of Girls Prep to learn to read, write, think critically and perform mathematically at levels that exceed city-wide averages. Our goal for Girls Prep students is that they achieve academic excellence, learn skills for success in life and in college, acquire confidence in themselves and their abilities, learn healthy lifestyle habits, and develop a sense of personal responsibility and a commitment to making a contribution to society.*

The founders of Girls Prep stated in the original charter that they, “believe that girls and boys have different ways of learning, that single-sex schools give each the ability to grow in an environment that understands their differences, and that all children should have the option to attend a single-sex school.” The charter’s Executive Summary states that Girls Prep will achieve its mission through the following design elements of the school:

- high academic standards in a college preparatory environment;
- a maximum of 22 students per classroom;
- a rigorous educational approach stressing basic skills, literacy, reading comprehension, critical thinking, math, science and social studies;
- a longer school day and year;
- extensive professional development of teachers together with incentives for performance;
- school uniforms for students and a dress code for teachers;
- clearly articulated and consistently upheld behavior standards;
- accountability for academic performance as well as attendance and adherence to the uniform policy;
- not labeling students, but rather allowing their individual learning styles to be understood though not used as an excuse;
- holding students accountable for their behavior and progress and celebrating their individual accomplishments;
- students will be taught good habits regarding nutrition and physical exercise; and
- a focus on ethics and personal responsibility;
- the school is committed to encouraging parental involvement, including classroom volunteers and board representation.

### **School Year (2007-08)**

200 Instructional Days

### **School Day (2007-08)**

8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> According to the school’s original Charter, 8:00 – 8:30 a.m. is used as a time for student arrival, breakfast, and welcoming, while 4:00 – 5:00 p.m. is used as a homeroom, study hall, and performing arts.



## Enrollment

	<b>Original Chartered Enrollment</b>	<b>Revised Chartered Enrollment</b>	<b>Actual Enrollment<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Original Chartered Grades</b>	<b>Revised Grades Served</b>	<b>Actual Grades Served</b>	<b>Complying</b>
<b>2004-05</b>	Planning Year	Planning Year	Planning Year	Planning Year	Planning Year	Planning year	YES
<b>2005-06</b>	80	90	<b>90</b>	K-1	K-1	<b>K-1</b>	YES
<b>2006-07</b>	140	155	<b>139</b>	K-2	K-2	<b>K-2</b>	YES
<b>2007-08</b>	200	177	<b>179</b>	K-3	K-3	<b>K-3</b>	YES
<b>2008-09</b>	260	214		K-4	K-4		

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>2005-2006</b>		<b>2006-2007</b>	
	<b>% of Enroll. Girls Prep Charter</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Community District #1</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Girls Prep Charter</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Community District #1</b>
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0 %	1.0 %	NA	NA
Black or African American	56.0 %	19.0 %	NA	NA
Hispanic	43.0 %	52.0 %	NA	NA
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	0.0 %	16.0 %	NA	NA
White	1.0 %	12.0 %	NA	NA

Source: 2005-06: New York State Education Department School Report Card.  
2006-07: New York State Education Department Database.

<sup>3</sup> Actual enrollment per the Institute's Official Enrollment Table. Note that the NYSED School Report Card and database, upon which the Free and Reduced lunch figures are calculated, may represent slightly different enrollment levels depending on the date in which this data was collected.

	2005-2006		2006-2007	
<b>Special Populations</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Girls Prep Charter</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Community District #1</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Girls Prep Charter</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Community District #1</b>
Students with Disabilities	NA	NA	4.4 %	17.4 %
Limited English Proficient	0.0 %	13.0 %	0.0 %	9.8 %

Source: Students with Disabilities: New York State Education Department Database.  
 Limited English Proficient: 2005-06: New York State Education Department School Report Card; 2006-07: New York State Education Department Database.

	2005-2006		2006-2007	
<b>Free/Reduced Lunch</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Girls Prep Charter</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Community District #1</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Girls Prep Charter</b>	<b>% of Enroll. Community District #1</b>
Eligible for Free Lunch	61.0 %	63.0 %	42.6 %	53.3 %
Eligible for Reduced Lunch	11.0 %	8.0 %	29.4 %	6.8 %

Source: 2005-06: New York State Education Department School Report Card  
 2006-07: New York State Education Department Database

### School Charter History

<b>Charter Year</b>	<b>School Year</b>	<b>Year of Operation</b>	<b>Evaluation Visit</b>	<b>Feedback to School</b>	<b>Other Actions Taken</b>
Original Charter – 1 <sup>st</sup> Year	2004-05	Planning Year	NO		School received authorization to change enrollment levels and school calendar.
Original Charter – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Year	2005-06	1 <sup>st</sup>	YES	Prior Action Letter, End-of-Year Evaluation Letter	None
Original Charter – 3 <sup>rd</sup> Year	2006-07	2 <sup>nd</sup>	YES	End-of-Year Evaluation Report	None
Original Charter – 4 <sup>th</sup> Year	2007-08	3 <sup>rd</sup>	YES	External School Evaluation Report	Submitted application for Short Term Planning Year Renewal

#### **IV. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Girls Preparatory Charter School of New York (Girls Prep) was visited by an external school inspection team from RMC Research on behalf of the Charter Schools Institute on March 24 and 25, 2008. In 2007-08, the school served students in kindergarten through 3<sup>rd</sup> grades. This was the first year that the New York State Testing Program (NYSTP) assessments were administered by the school. Results from these assessments had not been returned to the school at the time of the visit. Based on evidence gathered, school inspectors concluded that Girls Prep had benefited in the 2007-08 school year from new strong, stabilizing leadership. However, more time may be needed for institutionalization of new programs and procedures for the school to reach full academic goals.

A new principal was hired during the summer of 2007 who brought strong instructional leadership to Girls Prep, resulting in a focus on the development of a cohesive curriculum and comprehensive staff training. The executive director served as the overall administrator. The principal conveyed high expectations and supported teachers in curriculum, pedagogy and assessment. Although the principal conducted walkthroughs in each classroom regularly, a formalized process for observing teachers and providing feedback had not yet been established at the time of the visit.

During 2007-08, two new positions, literacy and mathematics curriculum specialists, were added to provide a greater level of support for teachers. The Teaching Fellows model had been improved, and the name changed to Girls Prep Fellows. The roles and responsibilities of the fellows were clearly articulated. The model was also used as a training program for potential new teachers for Girls Prep.

Curricula were based on scope and sequence documents in literacy and mathematics which were refined in 2007-08 to align across grades and to New York State learning standards. They were clearly defined and well utilized by teachers. The scope and sequence for social studies, science and writing were under development. Other areas not yet addressed included the alignment of rubrics in all curriculum areas across grades and the creation of a comprehensive grading policy and writing program.

The quality of instruction and the degree of student engagement observed varied in each classroom. Teachers in each grade developed common instructional plans, which did not include sufficient detail to provide a roadmap for rigorous pedagogy. No formal feedback mechanism for lesson plans had yet been established. The development of a protocol for planning across grades was identified as an area for continued growth.

The Girls Prep assessment design had been refined in 2007-08 to reflect a coherent plan. Areas of focus included continuous assessment and skill in utilizing data. Teachers had access to assessment data and were heavily supported in the effective use of the data to inform their instruction.

Professional development activities were focused on instruction and assessment and were designed to improve teachers' knowledge and practices. With the addition of curriculum specialists, Girls Prep was building its own capacity to provide school based training and support.

The Girls Prep board of trustees remained committed to the development of the school. They understood their roles and responsibilities and had established protocols for oversight and support.

## **V. SCHOOL PROGRESS REPORT**

### **Part I: Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School's Academic Success**

#### **A. School Performance Review through 2006-07**

Performance Summary: In 2006-07 Girls' Prep served students in kindergarten through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade, and had not yet administered any state exams. As a result, none of the required measures in the school's Accountability Plan applied. Based on results from the TerraNova standardized assessment, students were performing above the national norm in both English language arts and mathematics. While these results are encouraging, it remains to be seen whether student performance on internal assessments is predictive of performance on state exams.

English language arts: Girls' Prep has replaced the Early Childhood Language Assessment System (ECLAS) with the Rigby PM Ultra Benchmark Kit and Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) assessments. In 2006-07 on the Rigby assessments the school reported 95 percent of kindergarten students, 87 percent of 1<sup>st</sup> grade and 82 percent of 2<sup>nd</sup> grade were at or above the grade level benchmark. Although it is not indicated in the report, it is assumed these results were obtained at the end of the school year. On the spring TerraNova, all three grades' performance was well above the national norm. The average kindergarten performance was 63 Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE). 1<sup>st</sup> grade was also 63 NCE, up from 58 in the fall, and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade was 64 NCE, up from 57 in the fall.

Mathematics: All three grades finished the year above the national norm based on results from the spring TerraNova exams, and both 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade made demonstrated growth during the school year. The average spring NCE for kindergarten was 55. 1<sup>st</sup> grade had an average NCE of 57, up from 43 in the fall. 2<sup>nd</sup> grade had an average NCE of 69, up from 43 in the fall.

Science: Not applicable in 2006-07; the school did not have a 4<sup>th</sup> grade.

Social Studies: Not applicable in 2006-07; the school did not have a 5<sup>th</sup> grade.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB): The school is deemed to be in Good Standing under the state's NCLB Accountability system.

Additional Goals (optional): The parent satisfaction measure requires a parent survey response rate of 67 percent. In 2006-07, just under two-thirds of parents provided survey responses. Of those, 89 percent gave the overall education their daughter is receiving a grade of A or A+.

## **B. “School Educational Program Review”**

### Instructional Leadership

While the instructional leadership at Girls Prep was found to be lacking during the prior year’s visit, the 2008 school inspection team found that, with the addition of the new principal in July, 2007, a new focus on instruction had permeated the school. The new principal came with a strong understanding of what needed to be put in place. She knew that her role was “to focus on instruction, assessment, teacher development and the development of curriculum.” The strong focus on instruction brought to the school by the new principal was confirmed by all teachers, support staff, board members and parents interviewed.

The founding principal had been terminated at the end of January, 2007 and a process was initiated to select a new principal. The executive director served as the instructional leader from January through July, 2007 when the current principal was selected. The executive director reported that her role was now that of providing support to the current principal. She also indicated that she keeps abreast of all of the “issues with students academically and socially.” The executive director was referred to as the “one-school superintendent.” She continues to “hold the mission of the school” and conveys it to all staff, parents and students. Through daily meetings with the principal, the executive director is knowledgeable and current about the results of all assessments administered. This information is then reported by her to the school’s board of trustees. There was a sense of pride expressed, by both the executive director and members of the board of trustees, in having selected the current principal. The executive director reported that the current administrative model distributed responsibilities among other members of the administrative team so that “the principal is only focused on instruction and professional development.” The school inspectors confirmed that role with the principal and staff. They reported that the principal is in the classrooms daily and that, under her leadership, a greater sense of instructional cohesion in the classrooms has been created.

As 2007-08 is the school’s third year of operation and the first in which 3<sup>rd</sup> grade was offered, students participated in the New York State assessments in English language arts and mathematics for the first time. The staff were fully aware of the school’s Accountability Plan goals and agreed with the administrative priorities set to achieve these goals, such as the integration of progress monitoring assessment data to plan and implement more effective instruction. At the time of the inspection, test results had not been returned to the school. The administrative team, teachers and school board members were hopeful that the results would reflect all of the focused instructional improvements they had put in place during the past year, including the expanded scope and sequence in English language arts and mathematics aligned to state standards and across grades. The new principal led the staff to align the scope and sequence documents to state standards during July and August, 2007.

Teachers reported that the principal was very focused in the areas of curriculum development and teacher supervision and evaluation. They were consistent in reporting that the principal “visited classrooms all the time,” set priorities for instruction throughout the school and developed a strong team with the curriculum specialists to provide support for teachers and students. They also indicated that grade level teams met weekly with the curriculum specialists and, although the principal did not attend all meetings, she met with the teams as needed and with individual teachers regularly. The principal met with the curriculum specialists weekly. There was a “feedback loop”

created among the teachers, the curriculum specialists and the principal. Expectations were clear and unified.

The addition of the curriculum specialist positions in literacy and mathematics in 2007-08 increased the leadership team and provided a greater level of support to the teachers. The curriculum specialists' roles and responsibilities included: creating the scope and sequence documents and their alignment to state standards; developing interim assessments and concomitant data sheets to analyze and assess the results of those and all assessments; meeting with grade level teams to develop monthly instructional plans; observing teachers during literacy and mathematics blocks to provide ongoing coaching, feedback and suggestions; and teaching small groups of struggling students. They met regularly with the principal to compare notes, discuss issues and develop a plan for next steps. The curriculum specialists also participated in walkthroughs with the principal. Staff consistently reported that they relied on the mathematics and literacy specialists as their first line of support.

The special education coordinator continued to: coordinate services with related service providers; meet with teachers to review and analyze data as they completed progress reports and report cards; write IEP's with consultation from the teachers; coordinate meetings with parents, the Committee on Special Education and service providers; lead the Child Study Teams every other week; and coordinate special education data with the public school district. Under the leadership of the new principal, Girls Prep had instituted a new writing program which was in its initial stages of development, in response to needs expressed by the staff development. The special education coordinator served as the primary staff member to work with the consultant from LitLife, an external professional development organization hired to help Girls Prep design a schoolwide writing program, on creating a writing curriculum and a scope and sequence.

Under the leadership of the new principal a process was created for evaluating overall staff performance, however, the process for observing teachers and providing feedback had not been formalized. Teachers did report that the principal conducted walkthroughs often, took notes and e-mailed feedback of observed teaching practices to the teachers.

Teachers had been evaluated twice a year, in December/January and May/June. A seven page rubric was used to evaluate the teachers. Each teacher had the rubric and was familiar with it. Although teachers were expected to have lesson plans, they were not collected or commented on by the principal. As a result, systematic guidance to the teaching staff was not being provided in this area on issues such as alignment of questions to lesson objectives and the sequence of instruction. Most of the staff has been teaching for five years or less. Administrators and teachers reported on the value of their monthly plans, which were jointly developed with the curriculum specialists. However, school inspectors concluded that these plans were not specific enough to provide a blueprint for rigorous sequential, developmental instruction.

In the Institute's 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Inspection Report, the teaching fellows model had been the subject of concern given the lack of specificity of their roles and to the considerable turnover of fellows. At the time of the current visit, inspectors found that the Girls Prep Fellows model had become an area of strength for Girls Prep. The principal and executive director had provided a stronger program for the fellows, including: participation in all professional development designed for the teachers; a separate professional development sequence for the fellows; weekly meetings; opportunities for visitation to other classrooms; and assignment of mentors for each fellow and inclusion of fellows in curriculum meetings. The administrative team had begun to view the Girls Prep Fellows model as a training

program for lead teacher positions in the school. This initiative now provided a pool of potential teachers for recruitment who were already trained, understood the curriculum of the school and were part of the school culture. During the 2007-08 school year, several fellows had been selected to fill lead teacher vacancies and one was projected to become a lead teacher in 2008-09. As classrooms were being observed, it was often unclear who was the lead teacher and who was the Girls Prep Fellow since they were each working with groups of students. The fellows consistently supported instruction in each classroom. It was reported that they were also responsible for teaching science in their classes. Each fellow was required to complete lesson plans for their work with the students. Expectations for the teaching fellows and for their work in the classrooms were clear.

It had been reported that, last year, when the executive director was overseeing the instructional program, she had worked with members of the school board of trustees' Academic Advisory Committee to identify new initiatives, such as Recipe for Reading and Stern mathematics, to complement existing instructional programs. This committee did not continue during the 2007-08 school year due. The executive director and members of the school's board of trustees expressed confidence in the principal's ability to provide strong instructional leadership. Board members indicated that, based on the progress of the school during the 2007-08 school year, "we feel like Girls Prep is coming into its own. It had good bones, but now things are tightening." Board members expressed that "moving to the current principal was the best decision. Her command of the data is strong. She knows exactly where each kid is with all available data attached to it."

### Curriculum

During the summer of 2007 the new principal and staff worked to refine the literacy and mathematics scope and sequence documents previously created under the direction of the former principal. Girls Prep modified the scope and sequence documents to reflect the new programs adopted in the 2006-07 school year (e.g. Saxon mathematics, Stern mathematics, Exemplars, Recipe for Reading, Urban Education Exchange resources) and aligned them to state standards. The documents were reviewed for gaps and were aligned across grades **and were** updated throughout the year by the curriculum specialists. The school inspectors found that the literacy and mathematics scope and sequence documents were in place in every classroom and were being utilized by teachers and other staff. At the time of the visit, work on developing scope and sequence documents for social studies, science and writing was in progress. Girls Prep Fellows continued to work on developing science units of study and to take the lead for the development of a scope and sequence document for science.

The Institute's 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Inspection report noted concerns about the variety of components that comprised the reading and mathematics programs. During the current visit, inspectors noted that the scope and sequence documents for English language arts and mathematics examined addressed all components and created a cohesion of these elements for the staff. Similarly, in mathematics, the aligned scope and sequence document made each component easy to utilize in a holistic approach for teachers.

Girls Prep staff had expressed a need to develop a writing program. During 2007-08 school year the school put a writing block of time in place and hired Lit Life to support the development of a plan for writing instruction which focused on the process of writing and conventions. At the time of this visit, school inspectors found that the intent of a holistic and consistent writing program throughout the school had not yet been fully implemented, though a foundation had been laid for future development. There were varying degrees of writing evident in classrooms. Some rooms contained

moderate amounts of student writing and some contained very little. Writing rubrics were not consistent from classroom to classroom and there was no evidence of any alignment of a writing curriculum throughout the grades, or to state requirements for proficiency in writing as evidenced in the state standards and on the third and fourth grade New York State English language arts assessment. Writing instruction was different in each classroom, with some common elements in classes on each grade level. Further, teachers reported the writing curriculum to be “loose,” in contrast to the literacy and mathematics curriculum/scope and sequence, which were more cohesive.

During the 2007-08 school year, the process of creating rubrics for grading student work had begun in various curriculum areas. These rubrics were developed by each grade level team for various activities. However, the rubrics developed were not coordinated or articulated across grades. They were not based on state standards nor were they sequential, leading to an exit outcome for each skill or task. Consequently, these rubrics could not assist teachers or students in determining where they placed in relationship to the proficiency on the standards and what they had to do next to make progress toward meeting the intended standards. Feedback to students was not evident using the system of rubrics currently in place.

### Instruction

During this visit, the inspection team observed a number of gaps in the consistency of high quality instruction across classes within and across grades. The tasks observed were often potentially rigorous. The organization of the Girls Prep classrooms, which included a lead teacher and teaching fellow (except in third grade where there were no teaching fellows), served to provide rich opportunities for more personalized instruction to meet the needs of all students. Many teachers demonstrated academic rigor in their teaching but some did not foster higher order thinking in the activities developed or in their questioning strategies. In some classrooms, questions posed to students were not uniformly purposeful or of the type that would elicit higher order thinking (i.e. perfunctory questions focused on recall). Checking for understanding was not always evident, but when it occurred, incorrect answers were accepted from students without correction in some classes. While teachers were required to develop lesson plans which would include well prepared questions to lead students toward achieving instructional objectives, inspectors found that they did not have sufficient detail to promote rigorous pedagogy.

The degree of student engagement varied from class to class. In some classes, learning activities were differentiated to meet the needs of individual students and teachers circulated regularly throughout the class to monitor and assess students’ learning during lessons observed. This personal attention kept the students engaged and on task. In some classes observed, teachers attempted to instruct students in a large group. These teachers spent more time admonishing students who were restless than they did on providing instruction. The inspectors noted that, in these classes, there was very little teaching and learning for all students during the time of the observations. The principal indicated that there was “stronger teaching going on across the school” this year and that the newly created specialist positions were designed to provide more direct classroom support. Specifically, she reported that they were modeling lessons and supporting teachers in grouping students more effectively. The stated focus for support was on “transitions and lesson pacing.”

The role of the Girls Prep Fellows was observed to be clear and consistent throughout all classrooms. They focused on delivering instruction to students in small groups while the teacher worked with other students in the class. Fellows provided instruction to either a group needing review or to a



group of students who could move ahead more quickly. The only exception observed was when teachers introduced the mathematics concept to be taught to the whole group. During that time the fellows sat with the class until the introduction of the concept was completed and students were divided into groups. At that point, the fellow worked with an assigned group of students in mathematics.

Grade level team meetings continued to occur weekly and were used for common planning time and specific professional development and support activities led by the curriculum specialists. These included monthly development of planning calendars which were reported to be very helpful in guiding the scope of instruction. Grade level teams subsequently met to make any modifications needed, to add questions and to add resources that would be appropriate.

### Use of Assessment Data

During the 2007-08 school year, Girls Prep continued to refine their schoolwide assessment program. They continued to administer the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) three times a year, the Rigby Benchmark assessments (including running records) four to five times a year and Terra Nova assessments (in mathematics and English language arts) two times a year. The Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) had recently been eliminated and interim assessments were now created by the curriculum specialists and were designed to mirror the format of the Terra Nova items and of the state assessments. It was reported that Girls Prep had used Acuity to create interim assessments early in the year but realized that they were not reflective of the school's assessment goals and, as a result, moved away from using Acuity. The curriculum specialists, who are responsible for providing support of English language arts and mathematics curriculum, instruction and professional development, assumed the task of creating the interim assessments in their respective areas of expertise. In addition, unit tests associated with Saxon math were also administered. Portions of Early Childhood Language Assessment System were administered by the special education coordinator to gather more information about students and to help create strategies for students at risk of academic failure and those requiring special education services. Third grade teachers also administered a Kaplan examination in preparation for the state assessments. At the time of the visit, the academic support specialist was in the process of leading curriculum development and assessment in the area of writing.

Information about the results of these assessments was presented to teachers in various ways. Data were entered on a spreadsheet by the curriculum specialists. Classroom teachers input data from the teacher administered and scored interim assessments. The spreadsheet for the Rigby Benchmark assessments was still created by the school's director of business and operations. The curriculum specialists also developed item analyses for the interim assessments which teachers reported "help them to know which skills to teach and helps them to create small groups to remediate." In contrast to what was reflected in the Institute's 2<sup>nd</sup> Year Inspection Report, teachers all felt supported this year in terms of both the administration of the assessments and the interpretation of the data. Teachers were provided with increased professional development to ensure that classroom-based assessments were being administered properly and reliably across the school. This feeling of support arose despite the fact that teachers did not value each assessment equally. For example, some teachers felt that the DIBELS data had limited use for them while most teachers praised the Rigby Benchmark assessment for its value for progress monitoring and in planning for instruction.

During the 2007-08 school year, continuous assessment and purposeful use of assessment results became a focus for Girls Prep. The new direction of the principal and the addition of the curriculum specialist positions made the administration, interpretation and application of the data “more sophisticated.” In addition to the spreadsheets, the teachers reported that they have regular data meetings by grade in conjunction with the curriculum specialists to review the class data and develop instructional strategies to move forward. Teachers were required to create data action plans in response to the interim assessments. These action plans describe the objectives each teacher plans to re-address and the different instructional strategies they plan to implement based on data review. Each teacher has a data meeting with the principal, the curriculum specialists and the teaching fellow to review the information about each student four times a year. These meetings with grade level colleagues, curriculum specialists and administrators provided necessary support for the teachers to understand and appropriately utilize the information received from the wide array of assessments administered.

Teachers felt that instruction was being appropriately adjusted on a continuous basis because of the availability of new information. One teacher echoed the sentiments of most by indicating, “In the past there wasn’t a clear reason for why we were doing assessments and what the follow up was. Now it feels very productive.”

At the time of the visit, Girls Prep had not developed a schoolwide grading policy, although all teachers used the New York State’s four point scale for describing performance (i.e., performance levels 1-4) on report cards issued three times per year. Teachers consistently reported that the grading policy varied by class and by grade. Teachers meet with the curriculum specialists to discuss the weight of each assessment, the value of class assignments and projects in the grade on both report cards and on progress reports sent home between report card periods. Some grades were described as based on converting percentages of correct answers to performance levels and other grades are based on the average of the performance levels of daily assignments. No vertical alignment of grading decisions was evident. However, the leadership team understood that the development of a consistent policy for assessment of student work was an important next step in their journey to develop a cohesive school-wide instructional program.

The school’s board of trustees understood that the assessments administered by the school were not aligned with the state assessments. Nonetheless they were optimistic that, based on the school’s indications of improvement demonstrated by the results of the school’s assessment design, their girls would do well on the state assessments.

When the results of the state assessments are returned, Girls Prep will re-examine its assessment program to ensure that there are no gaps. Although there is still some uncertainty as to the net effect of all of the current assessments conducted, administrators, teachers, parents and members of the board of trustees were all optimistic about the results of the state assessments. While there is work to do at Girls Prep to refine the school assessment program, for example to create better vertical alignment of assessments across grades, school inspectors found this area to be one of great improvement from the prior school year.

### At-Risk Students

At the time of this visit, there were ten students with identified disabilities. In addition, there were five students involved in the referral process. During the 2007-08 school year, the special education coordinator continued to provide direct services to each identified student five times a week pursuant to the students’ Individualized Education Programs (IEP’s), primarily using a push-in model.

The teachers reported that the special education coordinator worked with them to identify at-risk students who may not be referred through the special education referral process through classroom observations, assessment data and direct instruction. At-risk students were reported to be included in the push-in groups for additional instructional support.

In addition to the special education coordinator's direct work with students in classrooms, students' special needs were addressed through the emphasis on small group classroom instruction (primarily through the use of the Girls Prep Fellows), re-teaching, individual and small group tutoring in reading and mathematics, differentiated instruction, suggestions from the Child StudyTeam (CST), counseling by staff from the Institute for Psychoanalytical Training and Research (IPTAR), and professional development from the special education coordinator and staff from a consultant from the Cook Center who observed all at-risk students in classrooms and made recommendations to teachers for instruction to meet students' needs. Evidence of grouping and the administration of differentiated instructional tasks by ability were evident in a number of classrooms. Teachers reported being well supported in the development of classroom based strategies for using data to identify students at-risk and in the creation of tiered instruction to meet the needs of the at-risk learners in their classes. A comprehensive tutoring program was in place for students at-risk in reading and in mathematics in kindergarten through third grade. Also, students at-risk in the third grade received extra tutoring after school. Classroom based interventions included push-in support from the special education coordinator. These interventions were extended or modified to meet the needs of students based on the progress monitoring data collected throughout the year.

Girls Prep continues to offer an after school program, but the administration and board of trustees expressed concern about the quality and effectiveness of this initiative. A board member told school inspectors that "initially, we didn't want to go above DOE funding and build up an after school program. It's been increasingly clear that we need to do this....to have a program where the girls would be enriched, where we would use it as tutoring, and nailing down a program that could be repeated year after year." The executive director was in the process of examining other options for 2008-09.

To monitor the effectiveness of interventions for struggling students, the principal and director of student and family affairs attended all grade level child-study team meetings during which interventions were discussed, tracked and reported. The principal also attended data meetings with all teacher teams to check the effectiveness of interventions. Administrators reported that they chiefly used walkthroughs (usually with specialists) to look for and provide feedback to teachers on the implementation of the classroom interventions. Additionally, they relied on meetings with grade teams to discuss the progress of individual students. The executive director expressed some concern about the speed at which students were identified as having learning issues and would consequently require additional support.

The school reported that there were no formally identified English language learners (ELLs) at the time of the visit. They reported that procedures for identifying ELLs had been followed and that no students qualified. However, they did indicate that there were students who may not have qualified for a formal program who exhibit English language challenges and need additional support in the classroom through differentiated instructional strategies.

### Student Order and Discipline

Girls Prep continued to have a safe and orderly climate conducive to learning. Teachers reported that they had Responsive Classroom training which was designed as a social curriculum. Some teachers participated in a week-long training and became turnkey trainers for the other teachers in the school. Although there was no direct observation of this curriculum being taught during the visit, teachers reported that the Responsive Classroom curriculum is working for them.

Additionally, teachers reported and school inspectors observed the use of a color system in the classrooms which had a clear procedure for student misbehavior, including moving to a “thinking spot” and stepping out to another classroom, going to the office and conferencing with parents. The teacher is supposed to document the reasons for sending the student out and the director of student and family affairs enters the data, with explanations, into a data base for use in speaking to parents and planning interventions. Teachers reported that this system is very concrete for students and effective. However, school inspectors observed students being sent out of classrooms during lessons without discussion or without preliminary steps being taken in some classes. It should also be noted that there was off-task behavior observed in several classrooms which diverted teachers from instruction and required them to spend more time on classroom management issues.

Girls Prep has a clear behavior policy included in its parent handbook. There is also a home-school compact that is developed between the school and each parent and child with specific requirements for students and parents to support learning. The behavior policy delineated both specifically required behaviors for students and consequences for making wrong choices. School personnel and parents interviewed reported that behavioral reports are sent home to parents daily.

Although classroom observations did not include instruction using the Heartwood curriculum to teach ethics and values, staff informed school inspectors that the program was still in use. There was some evidence in the classrooms to support this assertion.

### Professional Development

During 2007-08, the role of the principal was modified from previous years to focus solely on instruction, assessment and professional development. Administrators and staff detailed the professional development opportunities provided by the school, which continued to focus on instruction and assessment. The addition of the curriculum specialist positions was regarded as very positive by all staff and enabled each teacher to receive more support in individual classrooms and at grade level meetings. In contrast to the findings in the last report, there was some evidence that professional development activities were being targeted to increase teachers’ knowledge, improve their instructional practices and support the academic improvement of students.

Girls Prep has developed a comprehensive program of professional development. The school had increased its internal capacity to provide on-going training and used consultants representing instructional initiatives being implemented to supplement the professional development as well. This indicated to inspectors that Girls Prep had and used sufficient resources to provide continuous professional development effectively. The variety of professional development models included summer pre-service meetings for the entire faculty, weekly meetings after school for the whole staff, weekly grade level meetings, in class coaching and support and professional development from Aussie, Lit Life and Cook Center consultants in mathematics, writing and meeting the needs of all

students respectively. The content of the sessions encompassed monthly planning in all curriculum areas, training in Responsive Classroom strategies, formation of inquiry groups to examine same sex education issues, curriculum development (currently focused on science, social studies and writing), assessment administration, interpretation and application of testing results for instruction, implementing and integrating the components of the mathematics curriculum, designing and implementing intervention strategies for struggling students and developing skills for implementing components of a balanced literacy program. These opportunities dovetailed with the curriculum being implemented at Girls Prep and the instructional models in use in the classrooms. Additionally, each teacher received a budget to pursue professional development outside the school.

While school inspectors could not document a strictly diagnostic-prescriptive approach to professional development, the evidence indicated that it was more consistent and targeted during the 2007-08 school year and that teachers felt strongly supported. Some teachers did feel that the professional development program could be improved by intensifying a separate strand for new teachers that involved more time to network with veteran teachers to share best practices.

## **Part 2. Benchmark Analysis and Evidence of the School's Organizational Viability**

### **A. Are the school's mission and vision clear to all stakeholders?**

#### Mission and Key Design Elements

The executive director was reported to "hold the mission of the school." Girls Prep was conceived by her vision to educate her own child in a school comprised of only girls. The executive director's vision was the impetus for the development of Girls Prep. This vision was shared by the school's board of trustees, school staff and parents. Teachers were recruited based on their commitment to the mission and vision of the school. When given an opportunity to select areas for professional development, teachers requested more time to study the current research, new trends and issues in same-sex schools. Parents interviewed indicated that the mission of the school was the chief reason that many families chose to enroll their daughters in Girls Prep. The inspection team spoke with parents who had to travel a great distance to bring their children to school each day but did so because they were committed to the vision and mission of Girls Prep.

Although there had been some minor deviations from the design elements in the original charter for Girls Prep, such as: reducing the length of the school day from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. to the current 8:00 a.m. to either 3:00 p.m. or 3:45 p.m.; initiating the teaching of Spanish in third grade instead of in kindergarten; increasing class size from 22 to 25 students; reducing the intended number of classes on each grade from three to two, the administration and board of trustees expressed that the school had been true to the mission and key design elements in its charter. The school board members cited high academic standards, increasing student performance, the establishment of a culture that encouraged achievement and the development of an effective leadership team of adults as being integral to the mission of Girls Prep. They felt that the school had "hit its stride" in the attainment of these objectives. The inspection team found that the fulfillment of the original mission of Girls Prep was consistent with school practices and culture and that the key design elements were fully integrated within the school.

### **B. Are students and parents satisfied with the work of the school?**

Parents interviewed by the school inspection team expressed high satisfaction with the school. They indicated that the school is living up to the expectations they had when they enrolled their children. One parent said, "the all girls environment helps them focus." Another parent added, "they work on their strengths and their weaknesses. They make them [children] stronger." All of the parents interviewed commented on the family environment they experienced at Girls Prep. They were pleased that the principal knew the names of all of the students. All parents interviewed indicated that they were kept abreast of the academic progress of their children on a continuous basis through daily reading logs, regular e-mail communication, weekly outlines that explain what will be taught during the week, and parent teacher conferences. A parent survey had been designed and administered in December, 2007. The results of the survey demonstrated parents' overall satisfaction with: the communication about student progress; the responsiveness of the staff to expressed concerns; the concern of the teachers for the children; and the high expectations held by Girls Prep for all of the students. Students interviewed expressed their satisfaction with Girls Prep. They liked the same sex environment and expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to participate in music, yoga, art and gym. One student indicated that what she liked best about the school was, "we show respect to others, we stand up for each other and help each other."

**C. Are systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and to modify it as needed?**

Governance

The Girls Prep board of trustees continued to demonstrate its strong knowledge about and commitment to the development of the school. The board provided oversight and was clear about its roles and responsibilities. Moreover, the board understood the appropriate role of the executive director and principal. The board felt the need to meet with the executive director more frequently during the time that the dismissal of the former principal was being considered through the time the new principal was hired, to provide support and to exercise some control. The members of the board of trustees interviewed stated that now “the culture is good and things are calm.” They expressed confidence in the executive director and in the leadership of the new principal by saying, “classrooms are well organized. Kids are focused. Things are smooth enough that they (the leadership) can think about where they can go deeper. It’s not all about putting out fires.” The school’s board of trustees reported that it now meets every other month.

The board of trustees continues to be kept abreast of all issues, such as: assessment results; staffing issues; enrollment, including special education and English language learners; student attendance and tardiness; class size changes; parent satisfaction survey results; applications for teaching positions; and, other issues as they arise. The board receives a summary sheet, the Dashboard, which provides current information every six weeks. Additionally, they are provided with a principal’s report and presentations from the administration on the results of assessments administered and other issues.

School inspectors concluded that the school’s board of trustees keeps a vigilant eye over the operation of the school. Short of micromanaging, the board of trustees stays abreast of all issues and holds the executive director accountable for the efficient functioning of the school. The executive director is evaluated yearly based on such factors as teacher turnover, percentage of students on or above grade level, fundraising levels, success of recruitment efforts, financial management and legal issues. In turn, the executive director evaluates the principal, the director of financial operations and the director of student and family affairs.

During this visit, the two most pressing concerns expressed by the board of trustees were about moving to another facility, and the results of the recently administered state assessments. The limitations of the current school facility and the perceived unwelcome attitude of the host school had created difficulties for Girls Prep, as indicated in the Institute’s prior report. School inspectors learned that Girls Prep had been invited to be housed at another public school which is located within two blocks of the current site. School board members expressed relief that they would be moving during the summer of 2008 to a school where their presence would not be resented and where Girls Prep would be welcomed by the staff of the host school.

The issue of the state test results loomed large in the minds of the members of the school board of trustees. They expressed deep understanding of the limitations of the current assessments administered school-wide. The results of the school based assessments provided information about achievement trends that held promise for high student achievement. Members of the school’s board

of trustees were very encouraged by the new emphasis on assessment throughout Girls Prep. One board member said:

“We as a board have a vision of a data driven school. We have the vision of a small school that uses data to constantly address and adjust instruction. We feel confident that moving to the new principal was the best decision. Her command of the data is strong. She knows exactly where each kid is with every available data attached to it.”

However, school board members were reflective about what their course of action would be if the results were not what they would want. The trustees stated that they would question the appropriateness of the length of the school day, the quality of the teachers, the efficacy of the after school program, the alignment of professional development being offered and the assessment design being implemented by the school. The trustees reiterated their goal to have 85% of the students perform at Levels 3 and 4 on the state assessments.

Other concerns expressed were the ability of Girls Prep to continue to recruit high quality teachers, ways to enrich the current program and how to make the after school program work better for the students.

The board of trustees shared its plans for the future of Girls Prep, to expand through eighth grade and ultimately create a family of schools. The board indicated its awareness of the challenges of expansion.



## **VI. OVERALL TRENDS REGARDING THE SCHOOL**

### **Academic Program**

The inspection team found that the development of a cohesive academic program was having a positive effect on student achievement. The development and use of scope and sequence documents aligned to both state standards and throughout the grades in literacy and mathematics brought a new cohesion to the various components of the instructional program that was not evident to school inspectors in the prior year. There was evidence of clear communication and general agreement among the staff about next steps to take, including the continued development and alignment of curriculum documents in social studies, science and writing. The school-based assessment data demonstrated student progress, including increases in mathematics achievement which had previously been a source of concern. After having evaluated the efficacy of current afterschool opportunities for the students, all school constituencies were eager to develop a “quality after school program” that would address the needs of all participants, especially at-risk students. This would further enhance the academic program for the school. The inspection team found that much of the professional development offered to teachers was targeted to support improved teaching practices and, ultimately, student performance. Moreover, the professional development program encompassed both instruction and assessment. Designing a formal observation and feedback protocol are works in progress for Girls Prep and will further enhance the emerging professional development program. Overall, evidence indicates a movement toward increased academic rigor and continued improvement of instruction for students. Girls Prep continues to refine its academic programs and place more emphasis on supporting teachers to understand and apply the assessment data they receive to monitor and adjust classroom instruction.

### **Organizational Viability**

Under the strong leadership of a new principal, the culture of Girls Prep is developing into one of a thriving learning community. Inspectors found compelling evidence that the teachers felt supported by the principal and the newly hired instructional specialists. There was unambiguous communication among staff and high expectations were understood by all. The school’s board of trustees, with the executive director, set a clear direction for Girls Prep which was being operationalized by the new principal and staff. They were in the process of creating systems to support the operation of Girls Prep, such as the systematic collection, recording and application of assessment data. The evolution of the Teaching Fellows model to become a training vehicle for recruitment of teachers is another system that will support the continued growth and development of Girls Prep.

## APPENDIX A:

### Framework for Report Discussion

Category	Report Section (Relevant Benchmark(s))	Evidence Sources
Academic Program	School Performance Review (Renewal Benchmark 1.A)	Developed by Institute
	School Educational Program Review (Renewal Benchmarks 1.B – 1.F)	Classroom observations; Interviews; Review of documents and student work
Organizational Viability	School's Mission and Vision (Renewal Benchmark 2.B)	Review of documents; Interviews; Classroom observations
	Student and Parent Satisfaction (Renewal Benchmark 2.D.1)	Interviews; Review of school documents, including the Accountability Plan Progress Report
	Board of Trustees' Systems (Renewal Benchmark 2.C.1)	Review of documents; Interviews; Classroom observations