



## **CARL C. ICHAN CHARTER SCHOOL THIRD YEAR INSPECTION REPORT**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

The third year inspection is part of a comprehensive accountability system for charter schools authorized by the State University of New York Charter Schools Institute (CSI). The inspection during the school's third year of its charter provides an independent assessment of the school's progress toward its academic and organizational goals.

The third year inspection complements the yearly reviews conducted by CSI staff and corroborates the school's own annual reports of progress toward the targets defined in its accountability plan. The visit provides an independent assessment of the school's progress and provides recommendations for gathering and presenting valid and reliable evidence to the authorizer as the school prepares to apply for charter renewal in its fifth year of operation. The recommendations represent the experienced opinions of the inspection team and are intended to offer the school guidance for enhancing the evidence base for its renewal application.

### **II. CONDUCT OF THE VISIT**

The inspection of the Carl C. Ichan Charter School was conducted on February 24-25, 2004 by an independent team of experienced educators from SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA.

William Wibel, Project Manager, SchoolWorks: Bill was a public school administrator for over twenty-five years, has supervised practice teachers and administrators for both Lesley and Harvard Universities, and has authored a number of articles on educational topics.

Aretha Miller, Project Manager, SchoolWorks: Aretha is an eight year veteran special education teacher in the Boston Public Schools, developed and supported implementation of programs for at risk students through traditional and alternative settings.

Brent Stephens, School Quality Review Consultant, SchoolWorks: Brent is a National Board certified bilingual educator with more than ten years teaching experience in urban communities. He has worked as an administrator in the Lowell, MA Public Schools, and is completing his doctorate in the Urban Superintendents Program at Harvard University.

Emilys Peña, School Quality Review Consultant, SchoolWorks: Emilys worked for Boston Public Schools for 10 years as a bilingual special needs teacher for grades K-6, a literacy specialist at the middle school level, and at the high school level as Assistant Headmaster

in charge of Teaching and Learning. Mrs. Peña has been involved as a teacher and principal of numerous summer programs targeting students who wish to gain entrance into Boston Exam Schools. She has worked as a consultant for SchoolWorks for over 3 years conducting charter school inspections in Massachusetts and New York, as well as reviews of under performing and exemplary district schools.

The team used the school's accountability plan goals as the guide for their examination along with the set of framework questions included in the inspection protocol to assess the school's academic and organizational effectiveness. Prior to the one and a half day visit, the team reviewed the school's documents including its annual *Accountability Progress Report*, its original charter application, and reports from previous informal site visits by the Charter Schools Institute. At the school, the team interviewed school administrators, Board representatives, staff, parents, and students, and visited classes to understand the efforts the school is making to achieve its academic and organizational goals.

This report is organized into two parts. *Part I: School Progress Report*, offers the team's judgments about the school's effectiveness at meeting the broad goals defined in the charter school law (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 three categories: academic program, organizational viability, and unique programmatic areas. The framework for the progress report discussion is shown in **Appendix A**.

The second section, *Part II: School Accountability Plan -- Assessment and Recommendations*, reports the team's assessment of the quality of the school's measures of its progress, and offers suggestions for enhancing the evidence base on which renewal decisions will be made at the school's fifth year of operation. A brief rationale for the inspection team's recommendations is presented in narrative form along with a summary table in **Appendix B**.

### III. SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

The Carl C. Icahn Charter School serves 180 K-4 students in the New York City borough of the Bronx. The Carl C. Icahn Charter School was formed to provide students and their families an alternative to neighboring public and private schools by offering a high-quality, rigorous education in an environment of nurturing and care. To do this, the Carl C. Icahn Charter School bases its instructional program on E.D. Hirsch's *Core Knowledge* curriculum and provides students with many extended-time learning opportunities. In its first two years of operation, the

Carl C. Icahn Charter School held classes for 209 days, extended its classes each day from 8am to 4pm, and offered an array of support and extra-time programs for many of its students. During the current school year, the Carl C. Icahn Charter offers instruction to its students for 192 days and has maintained its other extended-time opportunities.

Now in its third year, the Carl C. Icahn Charter School has incorporated an additional grade level with each new school year; it has currently reached its intended capacity. During the 2002-2003 school year, the last year for which records are available, the school maintained an average rate of attendance of 93%.

In addition to the *Core Knowledge* curriculum, teachers at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School use several additional curricula for delivering instruction in reading, writing, and mathematics, including the McGraw-Hill series of work and textbooks, and instructional and assessment software from Waterford. Students with the lowest test scores in reading and mathematics benefit from daily remedial services with the school's Targeted Assistance teacher. Students also receive tutoring from many of the Carl C. Icahn Charter's staff and volunteers; have met in past years with the principal as part of a reading-based "Principal's Club"; attend daily after-school offerings; and participate in a take-home book program administered by each homeroom teacher. To assess student knowledge, teachers at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School make regular use of writing rubrics to score their students' work and provide them with feedback, use the *Fox in the Box* literacy assessment in grades K-2, and give periodic exams as part of their McGraw-Hill and *Core Knowledge* units.

The Carl C. Icahn Charter School employs a part time (0.6 fte) staff developer whose primary responsibilities are to plan and deliver professional development for staff members, support teachers as they use the Waterford and other assessments, distribute assessment data for use in planning instruction, and observe and model effective teaching. Carl C. Icahn Charter School teachers also meet with literacy and mathematics trainers from Lehman College on a regular basis. During the current school year, two of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School's ten classroom teachers are 3-year veterans of the school; the remaining seven teachers are new to the school and are, for the most part, also new to the profession.

The school is administered by a veteran teacher and administrator with many years' experience with the *Core Knowledge* curriculum. The principal reports regularly to the Carl C. Icahn Charter School's Board of Directors, and has been evaluated by the Board during each year of the school's operation.

## PART I: SCHOOL PROGRESS REPORT

### I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

#### QUESTION 1: To what extent have the students attained expected skills and knowledge?

##### 1. Students at the Carl Icahn Charter School attained at or near the national norm (50<sup>th</sup> percentile) on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS).

The scores in the table below show all students in a single grade; they include the scores of students who recently entered the Carl C. Icahn Charter School, as well as students in their second and third year of attendance. ITBS scores describe how students rank when compared to their peers (the “norm” group). With the exception of the 2002 second grade, students at Carl C. Icahn Charter rank near or above the national norm (50<sup>th</sup> percentile) on the reading, language, and mathematics portions of the test. The students enrolled in kindergarten and grade 1 for 2002-2003 are particularly strong, ranking at the 59<sup>th</sup> percentile in mathematics. This indicates that Carl C. Icahn Charter School includes a population of students that mirror the average population in the national norm group.

**Table 1: Carl C. Icahn Charter School ITBS  
(Spring '02-Spring '03 NCEs\*)**

| Grade Level Groups | Spring, 2002 | Spring, 2003 |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>READING</b>     |              |              |
| Kindergarten       |              |              |
| Grade 1            | 52           | 55           |
| Grade 2            | 42           | 46           |
| Grade 3            |              | 47           |
| <b>LANGUAGE</b>    |              |              |
| Kindergarten       | 49           | 56           |
| Grade 1            | 48           | 51           |
| Grade 2            | 39           | 42           |
| Grade 3            |              | 47           |
| <b>MATH</b>        |              |              |
| Kindergarten       | 58           | 59           |
| Grade 1            | 44           | 50           |
| Grade 2            | 38           | 38           |
| Grade 3            |              | 55           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       |              |              |
| Kindergarten       | 52           | 51           |
| Grade 1            | 42           | 49           |
| Grade 2            | 38           | 41           |
| Grade 3            |              | 49           |

\* Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) is a standard score (a score that is expressed as a deviation from a population mean) with the lowest score being 1, the highest being 99 and the mean (arithmetical average) of 50. NCEs may be added, subtracted and averaged and may be used to represent how a student or group of students performed in comparison to the mean. For example, a drop in scores over time means the students are being passed by their peers nationwide and an increase in scores over time means that students are passing their peers nationwide.

The analysis possible with the information available allows only general statements about the students, and does not provide appropriate information to assess whether the school has had an influence on student attainment. Without separate reporting of students enrolled at the school for a period of time and those newly entered, the ITBS data cannot be interpreted to reflect the school's performance.

Attainment of the knowledge and skills defined by the New York State Learning Standards is not yet available for students at Carl C. Icahn Charter School. SY 03-04 will be the first year the Carl C. Icahn Charter School tests 4<sup>th</sup> graders on the New York State Assessments.

**2. The school achieved its Accountability Plan goal of reducing the number of students scoring in the “deficient” category of the *Fox in the Box* literacy assessment; this was true for all grades and assessment areas except for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade scores in the area of phonics.**

As an internal measure of students' reading proficiency, the Carl C. Icahn Charter School uses the *Fox in a Box* literacy assessment. The table below shows that the school has been successful in helping many of its students score above the “Deficient” category on this assessment. Though a sometimes significant fraction of each class continued to score in the “Deficient” category by the end of the school year, the majority of students in each grade achieve at levels above this designation.

**Table 2: Number of students scored as “Deficient”, *Fox in a Box* Literacy Assessment Grades K-2, Fall and Spring of 2002-2003**

|       |    | Phonemic Awareness |      |    | Phonics |      |    | Reading & Oral Expression |      |
|-------|----|--------------------|------|----|---------|------|----|---------------------------|------|
| Grade | N  | Pre                | Post | N  | Pre     | Post | N  | Pre                       | Post |
| KG    | 35 | 25                 | 7    | 35 | 26      | 7    | 35 | 11                        | 1    |
| Gr. 1 | 31 | 10                 | 4    | 31 | 21      | 13   | 30 | 19                        | 8    |
| Gr. 2 | 33 | 3                  | 0    | 31 | 22      | 16   | 33 | 19                        | 8    |

**QUESTION 2: What progress have students made over time in attaining expected skills and knowledge?**

- 1. When the inspection team controlled for student mobility, average ITBS scores for students enrolled at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School for at least two years generally declined.**

The chart below shows the performance of only those students who were enrolled at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School for two or more years. This analysis controls for the effect of student

mobility on test scores by eliminating the scores of students who were newcomers to the school during the 2002-2003 school year.

In contrast to the analysis presented in *Section I, Question 1*, the average performance of students enrolled at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School for at least two years declined. Though additional analyses may be necessary to confirm this finding, it appears that each grade's average test score is helped significantly by students who are new to the school. This statement applies to all grades in the area of reading, and to most grades in the areas of mathematics and language.

**Table 3: Carl C. Icahn Charter School ITBS  
Matched Cohort Data (Spring '02-Spring '03)**

| Grade Level Groups | Spring 2002 | June 2003 | Net Change<br>'02 to '03 |
|--------------------|-------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| <b>READING</b>     |             |           |                          |
| current gr 2       |             | 56        |                          |
| current gr 3       | 53          | 47        | (-6)                     |
| current gr 4       | 27          | 25        | (-2)                     |
| <b>LANGUAGE</b>    |             |           |                          |
| current gr 2       | 49          | 51        | +2                       |
| current gr 3       | 48          | 42        | (-6)                     |
| current gr 4       | 28          | 24        | (-4)                     |
| <b>MATH</b>        |             |           |                          |
| current gr 2       | 58          | 49        | (-9)                     |
| current gr 3       | 45          | 38        | (-7)                     |
| current gr 4       | 28          | 39        | +11                      |
| <b>TOTAL</b>       |             |           |                          |
| current gr 2       | 52          | 48        | (-4)                     |
| current gr 3       | 43          | 42        | (-1)                     |
| current gr 4       | 25          | 28        | +3                       |

As it reviewed the Carl C. Icahn Charter *Accountability Progress Report for the 2002-2003* school year, the inspectors noticed that the school currently gauges student performance on the ITBS by comparing scores from the fall administration to scores from the spring administration of the same school year. The inspectors caution the school that this analysis does not yield reliable results, as it does not control for students' familiarity with the test during the spring sitting\*. For the purpose of understanding student progress over time, test scores from the Spring (or Fall) of one school year should be compared to test scores from the Spring (or Fall) of the next school year.

*Goal A, Measure 4* and *Goal B, Measure 3* of the Carl C. Icahn Charter *Accountability Progress Report* establish a goal of +3 NCEs for each year that students are enrolled in the school. In considering this section of the report, the inspectors noticed that the school currently measures its progress on these goals by examining the average score of each grade level. While valuable as a summary measure, the inspectors felt that average scores may not reveal the variation in each grade's scores, and conducted an individual-level analysis of ITBS scores in Reading and

\* Based on conversation with Riverside Publishing Co., publishers of the ITBS.

Mathematics. The Team recorded scores from the 2002 and 2003 school years for each student in the second and third grades, and then grouped these students according to the change in their test scores from one year to the next. This data is displayed in Table 4.

**Table 4: Number of Students Achieving Goals A and B: +3 NCE gain on the ITBS**

| Grade<br>in<br>2003 | Change in ITBS Reading Scores from 2002 to 2003 |            |          |         |   |         |   |            |            |
|---------------------|---|------------|----------|---------|---|---------|---|------------|------------|
|                     | <i>Students NOT achieving Goal A, Measure 4</i> |            |          |         |   |         | <i>Students achieving Goal A, Measure 4</i> |            |            |
|                     | -15 to -20                                      | -10 to -14 | -5 to -9 | 0 to -4 | 0 | 0 to +2 | +3 to +9                                    | +10 to +14 | +15 to +20 |
| <b>Gr. 2</b>        | 5   | 4          | 8        |         |   | 2       | 5   |            | 2          |
| <b>Gr. 3</b>        | 2   | 2          | 1        |         | 1 |         | 5   | 2          |            |

  

| Grade<br>in<br>2003 | Change in ITBS Mathematics Scores from 2002 to 2003 |            |          |         |   |         |   |            |            |
|---------------------|---|------------|----------|---------|---|---------|---|------------|------------|
|                     | <i>Students NOT achieving Goal B, Measure 3</i>     |            |          |         |   |         | <i>Students achieving Goal B, Measure 3</i> |            |            |
|                     | -15 to -20  | -10 to -14 | -5 to -9 | 0 to -4 | 0 | 0 to +2 | +3 to +9                                    | +10 to +14 | +15 to +20 |
| <b>Gr. 2</b>        | 5   | 2          | 9        |         |   | 3       |   | 3          |            |
| <b>Gr. 3</b>        |   | 1          | 1        |         |   |         | 2   | 7          | 2          |

This presentation of the Carl C. Icahn Charter ITBS data is different from the school's own analysis (see *Carl C. Icahn Charter School Accountability Report*, 2003, p. 12 and 16) in two important ways. First, it considers test data from the spring administration of two consecutive school years, rather than the fall and spring administrations of the same school year. Second, it focuses on the number of students meeting the school's accountability goal for student progress, rather than the aggregate score for each grade. Based on this new analysis, the inspectors draw a substantially different conclusion about student progress than the *Carl C. Icahn Charter School Accountability Report*, namely that large numbers of students enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School for more than one year demonstrate significant decline in NCEs in both reading and math. While a small number of students show dramatic increases, the majority of students are not making sufficient success to demonstrate achievement of the school's accountability plan target.

**2. Based on data from the school's administration of the *Fox in a Box* literacy assessment, students at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School appear to be improving a variety of their reading skills.**

As an individualized diagnostic tool, data from *Fox in the Box* is not designed to be considered in its aggregated form. In this sense, the inspectors had questions about the use of this data for the purpose of understanding whole-school trends in students' understandings of reading. This said, Table 1 shows that students are making progress during each school year. Overall, fewer students were categorized as "deficient" by the end of the year in most of the categories tested. Because the school only reports data from *Fox in the Box* for a single year span, it is not possible to draw conclusions from this source about student growth over multiple years.



**QUESTION 3: Does the school's instructional program meet the needs of diverse students?**

- 1. The centerpieces of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School curriculum are the McGraw-Hill series of texts and workbooks and E.D. Hirsch's Core Knowledge documents. Consistent with the level of experience of its staff, teachers follow the McGraw-Hill series quite closely, and generally develop whole-group lessons for their students.**

Teachers at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School rely primarily on two sources for developing and presenting curriculum to students: the McGraw-Hill series of text and workbooks for English Language Arts and mathematics, and the *Core Knowledge* curriculum for science and social studies. Teachers and administrators at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School described *Core Knowledge* as a type of unifying "glue" that connects content in each subject area. Carl C. Icahn Charter School staff refer to this as "thematic teaching", and develop monthly course syllabi to communicate these themes to parents. At the same time, Carl C. Icahn Charter School staff describes a process of differentiating instruction for students with diverse learning needs as "streaming." This process refers to the creation of flexible, homogenous learning groups that move between classrooms in the same grade level to receive instruction at a more appropriate level. Teachers and administrators also describe additional efforts within each class to group students for differentiated instruction.

In order to come to a general conclusion about the accuracy of these statements and the overall effect of the school's curriculum and its impact on student learning, the inspectors observed each Carl C. Icahn Charter classroom for approximately 45 minutes and reviewed 75 student work samples. In general, the team concluded that students at the school experience each lesson in exactly the same way as their peers. Though most classrooms were arranged to allow students to sit together in small groups, each of the lessons the team observed was delivered to the whole class. During these eight hours of classroom observations, teachers assigned the same activities and lessons to every student in the class, posed questions to the whole class, and did not identify or refer to any small group of students. These practices are not consistent with common methods for differentiating instruction. The team came to a similar conclusion after its review of student work samples.

With respect to the level of support provided to struggling readers and writers, the inspectors observed that current instructional strategies may limit the development of these students' literacy skills. For example, in one first grade classroom, where students were assigned a writing prompt about their career aspirations after reading the book "The Art Lesson", by Tomie DePaola, many students struggled to record their thinking about the topic. After debriefing the observation, the inspectors concluded that the strict instructional emphasis on sounding out words and correct spellings left many struggling students reluctant to write. These students sat for long periods of time with their hands raised, waiting for the teacher to come to their desks to spell out a word for them. These observations raised questions about the effectiveness of this approach, particularly during this developmental stage when all children learn important lessons about the connection between risk-taking, self-expression, and writing.



The inspection team did not see any examples of “streaming” during its time at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School.

**2. The administration of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School provides professional development to school staff on a range of effective instructional practices that are not consistently represented or supported by the school’s curriculum materials. Implementation of these effective practices varies from classroom to classroom.**

Teachers at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School participate in regular professional development led by the school’s Staff developer and trainers from Lehman College. During the current school year, teachers have been exposed to new ideas about lesson structure, writing rubrics, graphic organizers, questioning techniques, performance tasks, and the writing process (See the school’s professional development agendas, August 2003-January, 2004). These topics represent important facets of effective instructional practice and represent, in large measure, instruction that is not required or supported by the school’s curriculum materials. To support teachers in their efforts to bolster these curricula, Carl C. Icahn Charter School administrators emphasize their availability to teachers in the case that any teacher has a question about how to incorporate these ideas into his or her daily practice.

Inspectors discovered a wide range of instructional practices in their observations of classroom teaching. During one upper grade science lesson, team members observed a range of questioning techniques that worked to reinforce content for students, assess student comprehension, encourage analysis and comparison, and foster students’ connections to their own experiences. Though impressed by the quality of questioning in this classroom, observers found only one other instance of rigorous, higher-order thinking skills and questioning in their observations of the nine classrooms at the school. Generally, teachers posed questions to their students that emphasized recall and literal-level understanding.

With respect to the quality and rigor of students’ classroom assignments, the inspection team found a similar range of variation. The student writing assignments submitted to the team for review were heavily skewed towards recalling facts and retelling stories. Based on this sample of 75 items, students at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School are not frequently asked to engage in written work that requires synthesis, analysis, or comparison – thinking skills frequently referred to as “higher order skills” and represented in the New York State standards for ELA and Mathematics as higher numbers. (For example, NY ELA Standard 3: Language for Critical Analysis and Evaluation, or Standard 4: Language for Social Interaction.)

Inspectors also assessed the extent to which these higher order thinking skills are emphasized in formative assessments and teachers’ feedback to students. In general, writing rubrics at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School focus on spelling and grammar – each one an important and basic skill that all student should master – but did little to encourage students to further develop the ideas expressed in their written work, or to become independent “editors” and “critics” of their own work. Written assignments also lacked a consideration of audience and purpose, two now widely-discussed aspects of developing a lifelong interest in literacy. Team members felt that one writing rubric posted on the wall of a first grade classroom was typical of rubrics used throughout the school. This rubric emphasized the following items, in this order: “capitalization,

periods, question marks, exclamation points, neatness, and spelling.” By the same token, teachers’ self-produced posters about the writing process emphasized a similar set of skills, to the exclusion of higher-order writing skills such as the development of a sense of genre, the ability read and critique one’s own work, the development of character and setting, and an ability to adjust writing for different audiences and purposes. One such poster described the writing process in this way:

1. Brainsqueezing
2. Sloppy copy
3. Let’s make it better (Correct spelling, grammar, and writing mistakes)
4. The good stuff (Rewrite and correct with best handwriting)
5. Show time (Share)

Teachers’ feedback to students, as measured by teachers’ comments to students on the work samples provided to the inspection team, were similar in their near-exclusive emphasis on spelling and grammar.

On the subject of assessment, the Carl C. Icahn Charter School employs a range of assessment instruments that can be used to gauge student progress in literacy and mathematics. The *Waterford* computer program can provide teachers with information about specific reading skills, including decoding and comprehension. The *Fox in the Box* reading assessment provides similarly detailed data to teachers, and writing rubrics (though they generally do not measure student skills beyond spelling and grammar) appear to be used with enough frequency and in enough subject areas to gain a sense of school-wide patterns in student understanding. Based on interviews with Carl C. Icahn Charter School teachers, there is considerable variation in the extent to which teachers use this information for the purpose of developing assignments and differentiating instruction. Several first year teachers told the team that they hoped to learn more about using these assessments in the coming school year, but that they were prioritizing other teaching tasks at this stage in their careers. Other teachers rely on Waterford’s summary reports for general information about their students’ progress, but reported not yet having used the software’s item analysis in order to design their reading instruction.

**3. Students at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School benefit from a number of regular support programs, including Targeted Assistance, tutoring, and individualized attention from aides and volunteers. At different points in the last three years, the school has provided additional support in the form of the Principal’s Club, Saturday Academies, after-school programs, and award ceremonies.**

The Carl C. Icahn Charter School has several support programs for students not currently achieving at levels the school considers satisfactory. First, students in grades 2-4 with low ITBS scores are eligible for services from the Targeted Assistance teacher. According to this teacher, the student selection process involves an initial analysis of ITBS scores and a consultation with the classroom teacher, and emphasizes students’ skills in reading comprehension and mathematical computation. Students selected to participate in this intervention work in groups of seven for 45 minutes each day. The school is careful to schedule groups of students into the Targeted Assistance class at times that do not conflict with reading and math instruction in their

homerooms. According the Targeted Assistance teacher, students exit Targeted Assistance when their homeroom teacher feels that they are able to keep pace with their higher-scoring peers. Instruction in the Targeted Assistance classroom is based largely on teaching strategies common to the “Balanced Literacy” approach to literacy development. The Targeted Assistance teacher emphasizes reading strategies that enable struggling readers to decode and understand difficult vocabulary, confirm their comprehension of difficult texts, and gain independence. The inspection team noted that all students – including those who struggle with reading as well as advanced readers – could benefit from the systematic introduction of similar reading strategies in each homeroom. Students in need of additional assistance also benefit from the Carl C. Icahn Charter School’s partnership with the Bronx Lebanon Hospital to provide students with tutors.

**QUESTION 4: Do the school’s standards reflect the implementation of high academic expectations?**

**1. As in other aspects of the school’s instructional program, teachers describe and enact a range of expectations for their students’ learning.**

Similar to other aspects of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School already described in this report, the inspectors encountered variation in teachers’ expectations for their students’ learning. In some classrooms, students were asked to engage in challenging discussions of grade-level content; write for a variety of purposes; and perform mathematical operations not usually covered until they are assigned to a more advanced grade. For example, students in one first grade classroom were learning to multiply and divide, skills that are not normally taught until the second and third grades. Another teacher pressed her students to think more deeply about what they were learning by asking probing questions and linking terms and concepts to the students’ own experience.

In contrast to these two examples, the majority of classroom assignments and discourse at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School are not generally reflective of the full range of New York State Learning Standards. Based on its sample of 75 student work samples, teacher commentary on these work samples, 10 classroom assignments and discussions, and interviews with each classroom teacher, the inspectors concluded that the majority of classroom experiences at the school are designed to test and build students’ mechanical skills. That is, students are routinely asked to focus on literacy and mathematical skills as discrete, isolated units, with little attention to learning these skills as part of performing an important authentic task as defined in the state learning standards. In the classroom, this emphasis on mechanics shows up as rubrics focused only on grammar, spelling, and neatness; math worksheets that only ask students to perform calculations; teacher-student dialogue that focuses only on rules, whether they relate to grammar, spelling, phonics, or operations; and a school-wide writing process that values appearance and correctness at the expense of communication and creativity. Taken together, the inspectors concluded that expectations for students learning at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School - as they are enacted in the creation of lessons, assignments, homework, and feedback to students - are not sufficiently high to ensure that all students are prepared to satisfy the full range of standards as defined by the state of New York.

Drawing from evidence from teacher interviews and its review of curriculum materials, the inspectors surmised that this phenomenon may result at least partially from several of the school's curriculum and staffing decisions. First, interviews with some teachers revealed an incomplete or inaccurate understanding of the New York standards, particularly as they relate to developing higher-order thinking skills. For example, one teacher stated that she believed she had "covered" the "problem-solving" standard when she instructed students how to perform a second mathematical operation to check their computation. In the same vein, several teachers described their own assignments, which asked students to retell a story or define vocabulary terms, as covering standards on analysis and comparison. While only samples, these statements and others like them may indicate that the school's young staff misunderstands or underestimates the rigor required to satisfy the state's standards. Second, based on interviews with teachers and visits to classes on the day of the inspection, Carl C. Icahn Charter School staff appears to rely quite heavily on the McGraw-Hill materials in mathematics and ELA to create their assignments. The team felt that these materials, which approach the development of literacy and math skills largely as a process of mastering a series of rules and operations, do not support teachers in creating assignments that reflect the range of thinking skills in the NY Standards. While the school has sought to build teachers' capacity with a thoughtful sequence of professional development, there appears to be too large a gap between the model of instruction represented by this professional development and the level of daily guidance and support to teachers offered in the McGraw-Hill materials. Given their relative inexperience, many Carl C. Icahn Charter School teachers do not possess the instructional skills required to convert on a daily basis McGraw-Hill's focus on mechanics into more rigorous and demanding lessons for their students.

The team's analysis of the school's "matched cohort" and individual-level ITBS data (presented in this report under Question Two, Section One) showed that (1) the scores of Carl C. Icahn Charter students who have been enrolled for two consecutive years have *declined* over time, and (2) the 'average' score for each grade level is inflated by the high scores of a small number of students. Based on the evidence collected during its visit the team is concerned whether Carl C. Icahn Charter School students continuing into the upper grades will be sufficiently challenged under the existing academic programs and instructional practices to satisfy the increasingly sophisticated set of standards and examinations required of older students.

**2. The staff at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School sets high and reasonable expectations for student behavior, and employs a range of strategies to reward and reinforce good behavior.**

The Carl C. Icahn Charter School is a welcoming and orderly place. The inspectors witnessed many examples of teachers and administrators treating each child with respect, warmth, and patience. Students at the school were very vocal in their appreciation of this climate, and many described the positive difference between their experiences in other public schools and the Carl C. Icahn Charter School.

In classrooms, teachers made use of a variety of effective strategies for building trust among students, reinforcing positive behavior, and correcting behavior problems consistently and firmly. For example, many teachers had constructed their own behavior management tools, such as "discipline wheels" on which students tracked their own behavior by moving clothespins

around a pie chart that described a variety of behaviors, and more conventional “behavior reward posters”. These tools appeared to represent the each teacher’s orientation towards discipline, though they were consistent in focusing primarily on positive behavior. Each classroom had a set of rules displayed in some prominent location, and it appeared that students had been involved in developing these rules with their teacher.

The school’s principal was a consistent model of respect, warmth, and concern throughout the visit. The team saw ample evidence that he communicates regularly with parents and teachers, maintains a visible and supportive presence with teachers and students in the school, and wants each student to succeed at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School.

## **II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY**

### **QUESTION 1: Are students and parents satisfied with the work of the school?**

#### **1. Students at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School express their satisfaction with the climate of support, concern, and order at the school. They are proud of the work they produce and appreciate their teachers’ efforts.**

Students at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School were universal in their praise for the school. In the student focus group conducted by two inspectors, and in conversations during the team’s classroom observations, students offered praise for the caring climate, predictable routine, and “family” feel of the school. For some of the students interviewed by the team, the Carl C. Icahn Charter is a welcome relief from the pressure and disorganization they experienced in other Bronx public schools. They described the school as a “second family” that offered a sense of physical security. When asked, students stated that they appreciated the smaller class sizes, the extended school day, the length of the school year, and the additional opportunities to be tutored by teachers. Many of the students the inspectors interviewed participate in the school’s after-school program.

Students in the focus group were happy to share their work with members of the inspection team. They were able to describe the process for creating their work, told about the encouragement they received from their teachers, and understood the purpose of the rubrics that many of their teachers had used to evaluate and comment on their work. When asked about the difficulty of the assignments the students brought to share, only one of the seven told the interviewer that they felt the work was difficult or challenging.

#### **2. Parents of students at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School expressed their satisfaction with the school’s efforts to create a warm and nurturing environment, provide high-quality instruction, and prepare their children for future success.**

Like their children, parents also expressed their satisfaction with the Carl C. Icahn Charter School. In a focus group with several of the inspectors, parents explained their decision to enroll their children at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School in the following ways: First, they felt that the school was a viable, high-quality alternative to the public and parochial schools in the area.

Second, they were pleased with the level of support and follow-through exhibited by the director and his staff. Finally, they described the “family feeling” of the school and the level of individual attention and care that their students received at the school.

Carl C. Icahn Charter School parents appeared to be familiar with the mission of the school, and emphasized aspects of the mission that were of special meaning to them, including the smaller class sizes, the attention to developing relationships with parents, the attention to preparing students to meet the requirements of *No Child Left Behind*, and the preparation for the NY State Regents Exam.

Parents were appreciative of the level of communication between school and home, citing as especially effective the director’s regular written communication with parents, teachers’ monthly syllabi, and the school’s periodic student progress reports.

Finally, parents from the focus group responded enthusiastically to questions about the appropriateness and quality of the school’s expectations for their children. Parents felt that their children were provided a “decent” education at the Carl C. Icahn Charter, one that would allow their children to “grow academically and socially” and “meet high standards”. Parents also told members of the inspection team that the school was teaching their children “how to learn and study” and to be successful in future educational settings.

**QUESTION 2: Are systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and to modify it as needed?**

**1. The Carl C. Icahn Charter School has a number of data-collection systems for monitoring the effectiveness of its instructional program. The school could take additional steps to refine its professional development, its internal assessments, and the timing of its data collection activities to more closely match its decision-making process.**

During interviews with the principal and staff developer, the inspectors learned about the school’s efforts to monitor, analyze, and refine the school’s instructional program. The administrators described the following processes and their effect on the school’s instructional process:

- Both administrators conduct regular formal and informal classroom visits in order to monitor the quality of instruction and offer teachers feedback about how to improve student achievement
- The principal conducts formal evaluations of the Carl C. Icahn Charter’s instructional staff.
- The principal collects, reviews, and provides feedback on teachers’ weekly lesson plans; these lesson plans are to make explicit the standards of each lesson for the week.
- The principal collects, reviews, and provides feedback on the monthly syllabi prepared by teachers for parents



- Both administrators and the school's Director of Operations regularly distribute data from the *Waterford* software program and the *Fox in the Box* literacy assessment for the purpose of assisting teachers in lesson planning
- The administrators regularly consult with trainers from Lehman College to assess the effect of professional development on classroom teaching.

In addition, the principal and members of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School Board of Directors described the manner in which the principal keeps board members apprised of the most recent data about the school's progress.

In its review of how the Carl C. Icahn Charter School uses data for improving teaching and learning, the inspectors found evidence to verify all of the administrator's descriptions.

**2. The principal and Board of Trustees of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School communicate regularly about the state and progress of the school. The Board uses its annual evaluation of the principal as an opportunity to fully review the school's finances, programs, and outcomes.**

Members of the Board of Trustees who participated in an interview with the inspection team expressed that they felt fully aware of the school's operations as a result of the principal's regular and comprehensive communication. They offered warm compliments to the principal for his dedication to the school and its families, the expertise with which he discharges his duties as the school's executive, and his knowledge of teaching and learning.

Generally, the inspectors concluded that the frequency and focus of the communication between the principal and the trustees constitute an adequate form of program review for the school. The team suggests that these communications might be enriched as the principal, staff, and trustees become more proficient in data use for decision-making.

### **III. UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREAS**

**QUESTION 1: Are the school's mission and vision clear to all stakeholders?**

- 1. Members of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School community described the school's mission in ways that were consistent with their immediate interests. For students and parents, the Carl C. Icahn Charter School's most important contribution centers on its attempt to improve on their past educational experiences by creating a caring community. According to Carl C. Icahn Charter School staff, the school was designed to combine this caring environment with a strong exposure to the *Core Knowledge* curriculum.**

In addition, parents, students, teachers, administrators, and members of the board of trustees each mentioned the importance of the school's efforts to provide extended learning opportunities for students. Though no single group mentioned every aspect of the school's mission during



conversations with the inspectors, each aspect of the mission was mentioned when the interviews were considered as a whole.

**QUESTION 2: Are the school's special programs meeting expected targets?**

- 1. The inspection team concluded there was insufficient evidence to draw reliable conclusions about the overall effectiveness of the Core Knowledge program or any other of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School's unique programs.**

In general, the inspection team found it difficult to assess the effect of the Carl C. Icahn Charter School's special programs. In part this is because the school has made adjustments to its support programs each year based on anecdotal data about the effectiveness of these programs. As well, the school does not currently collect data in a systematic fashion about the outcomes produced by these programs. For example, there is no collected assessment data related to the school's *Core Knowledge* program, nor has the school defined learning objectives for student learning in this program. In the same way, the team was unable to reach any conclusion about other unique programs offered at the Carl C. Icahn Charter School, including the student tutoring and mentoring programs, the Saturday Academy, or the school's partnerships with Lehman College and the Bronx Lebanon Hospital. Data to assess these programs is absent or unsuitable for drawing generalized conclusions.

With respect to the school's ability to measure in concrete terms the student learning associated with the *Core Knowledge* curriculum, the school is strongly encouraged to develop specific learning objectives or benchmarks for student learning, and to identify valid and reliable measures for assessing student progress against these objectives. The *Core Knowledge* curriculum is the centerpiece of the school's unique programs, and it the inspectors conclude that it would benefit the school community to consider more tangible evidence of the effect of *Core Knowledge* on student achievement of expected skills and knowledge.

## **PART II: SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN: ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS**

The Carl C. Icahn Charter School lists three academic program goals:

#### **Goal 1: All Carl C. Icahn Charter School students will become proficient readers of the English Language.**

**Measure 1:** According to the CTB/McGraw-Hill Fox in a Box, a minimum of 50% of the students in grades K-2 identified in the pre-test as “deficient” in the areas of Phonemic Awareness, Phonics, and Reading and Oral Expression will be identified as “proficient” in a post-test for the same categories. The school shall administer the pre-test during the fall of each year. Post-testing shall be conducted during the spring for all relevant cohorts (36 students per grade). Children in Level 2 in 1<sup>st</sup> grade and Level 4 in second grade will receive daily targeted assistance in their area of deficiency.

**Measure 2:** 75% of students who have been enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since the beginning of second grade will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State English Language Arts Assessment (ELA), administered to 4<sup>th</sup> grade students every year beginning in the 2003-2004 school year.

**Measure 3:** Using the New York State ELA grade 4 test, a higher percentage of students who have been enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since the beginning of second grade will score at Level 3 or above than students from within the local school district, specifically students from CS4, CS 42, CS 55.

**Measure 4:** Each cohort of 36 students enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School will improve their reading skills by an average of 3 NCE's per year according to the ITBS-Reading Battery.

#### **Goal B: All Carl C. Icahn Charter School students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts.**

**Measure 1:** 75% of students who have been enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since the beginning of second grade will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics, administered to 4<sup>th</sup> grade students every year beginning in the 2003-2004 school year.

**Measure 2:** Using the New York State Mathematics grade 4 test, a higher percentage of students who have been enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since the beginning of second grade will score at Level 3 or above than students from within the local school district, specifically students from CS4, CS 42, CS 55.

**Measure 3:** Each cohort of 36 students enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School will improve their math skills by an average of 3 NCE's per year according to the ITBS-Math Battery.

**Goal C: All Carl Ichan Charter School students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning.**

**Measure 1:** 75% of students who have been enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since the beginning of second grade will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science Exam, administered to 4<sup>th</sup> grade students every year beginning in the 2003-2004 school year.

**Measure 2:** Using the New York State Program Evaluation Test in Science, a higher percentage of students who have been enrolled at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since the beginning of second grade will score at Level 3 or above than students from the local school district, specifically students from CS4, CS 42, CS 55.

## **ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS**

The accountability progress report includes two additional sections “introduction” and “observation”. The inspection team has a few recommendations for each.

### **Introduction section:**

1. The school should mention what programs are in place for students who are on target, not just programs for students who are not on target.
2. Principal's Club was changed to a student mentoring program, give an explanation as to why the program was changed and consider explaining the key learning's that prompted the change. Also, what does the term “responded” mean? What measures would describe what students' “responses” looked like, and what you would like them to look like?
3. Describe the services Lehman College provides.
4. Consider providing more clarification of the staff development and Lehmann College roles – what will each do with respect to developing teacher skills?
  - a. For example, what roles do the staff developer and college trainers play with respect to evaluating the effects of the professional development they offer?
  - b. Is this process separate from the teacher evaluation process?

### **Observation section:**

1. It is necessary to offer cleaner/clearer language about cohort/longitudinal studies for the reader.
2. Include an explanation of the term “streaming”.

The school might consider the following recommendations to enhance the quality of evidence to be used to assess its progress toward its own goals.

*For Goals A (English language) measure 1:*

1. Present Fox in the Box analysis in a format that is clear to the reader for example, display the data side by side showing fall to spring and explain how the percentage from deficient to proficient were calculated.
2. Describe Fox in the Box levels. Goal A measure 1 mentions children in Level 2 in 1<sup>st</sup> grade and Level 4 in second grade will receive daily targeted assistance. It is not clear to the reader the number of Levels students can score in, and why Levels 2 and 4 are cut off scores for targeting assistance.
3. Consider adding a column to the right of the final column on the Fox in the Box Analysis table to state the number of students who achieved proficiency by the year's end.
4. Goal A measure 1 makes reference under the "method" section to writing as part of the Fox in the Box analysis, if Fox in the Box measures writing, include this data in your presentation, if the school is not using Fox in the Box to analyze writing, consider deleting the reference to writing.
5. Consider adding to the "Discussion" section on page 8 some analysis of the variation of level scores for both the pre- and post-tests. What was the spread of data at each testing?

*For Goals 1 (English language), 2 (mathematical skills), and C (scientific reasoning), measures 2 New York State Regents results and measure 3 comparison of State Regents results with local school district schools (CS4, CS 42, and CS 55):*

1. When data becomes available, consider presenting data on both matched (only 4<sup>th</sup> grade student present since 2<sup>nd</sup> grade) and "unmatched" (all 4<sup>th</sup> grade students, new and continuing) cohorts, possibly as two different columns in a table.

*For Goals 1 (English language), 2 (mathematical skills), and C (scientific reasoning), measure 4 increase ITBS scores by 3 NCE's:*

1. Represent data for each cohort using post-to-post test results only; match discussion to this data. Currently the data is reported fall to spring, this is not reliable given there is no alternate form to the ITBS test; therefore students are taking the same test in the fall and spring.
2. Ensure that the *measure* is aligned with the *goal*. The goal is measuring progress for *all* students which require a presentation of data not based on the mean score for the cohort, but on the raw number of students' meeting/not meeting the school's expectations. That is, the school should present data on how many students improved by 3 NCE's, and how many did not.
3. Consider the issues involved in presenting ITBS data attached to teachers' names.

## II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY GOALS

**Goal D: Carl C. Icahn Charter School will maintain strong organizational viability by maintaining strong parent support and commitment to the school via enrollment approval and attendance rates.**

**Measure 1:** Each year, the average daily attendance rate of all Carl C. Icahn Charter School students will meet or exceed 90%. Attendance will be taken daily and the reported attendance rate will represent the average of each school days rate.

**Measure 2:** Each year, parents of Carl C. Icahn Charter School students will be asked to partake in a Parent Survey. As a result, it will be demonstrated that 80% of our parents rate the school's academic program as good or excellent on a scale ranging from poor to excellent or rank of 1-5.

**ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS**

*For Goal D (parent support) Measure 1 ninety percent yearly attendance:*

1. Consider making the attendance data simpler. The point about student attendance is well made with less data, for example eliminate the table on page 22 (monthly attendance percentage table by grade and room number and teacher names); and make comparisons with fewer schools. Consider creating a chart comparing Ichan attendance rates yearly.
2. Integrate tables on attendance data into the narrative. For example the discussion of Carl C. Icahn Charter School's daily average attendance on page 20 can be matched to the table on page 25. This is true of all the attendance tables and their corresponding narrative.

*For Goal D (parent support) Measure 2 parent surveys:*

1. Be sure to construct your parent survey instrument in a way that is consistent with your measure which states "on a scale of 1-5," or "not satisfied to very satisfied," instead of only "Yes and No".
2. Change the language in parent survey to be more personal and specific to the Carl C. Icahn Charter School community.
3. Consider providing space for parent comments and more space for filling in answers.
4. Consider creating a summary report of parent survey data, and report parent data for each survey question.
5. The school should indicate in its measure what an acceptable rate of return should be for parent surveys. Last year the school had a 71% return as opposed to a 97.8% return this year. It would be informative for the reader to know what is acceptable.

### **III. UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREA GOALS**

Ichan C. Charter School does not list any goals for their unique programs, however some of their unique programs are:

1. After school
2. Saturday Academy
3. 192 day school year
4. Extended school day

### **UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREA GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS**

The school might consider:

1. Creating a chart to present each of the unique programs and their impact on student learning.
2. List the number of students served in each program and frequency of service. This data could be linked to students' academic progress.
3. Consider designing a measure to capture and present the success of the programs; the mission statement might be helpful in considering what success for these special programs will look like.

**APPENDIX A: Framework for the Analysis of School Progress**

| <b>Category</b>                 | <b>Criteria</b>   | <b>Evidence Sources</b>   |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Academic Program</b>         | To what extent have students attained expected skills and knowledge?                                  | School's Accountability Plan and Progress Report(s)   |
|                                 | What progress have students made over time in attaining expected skills and knowledge?                | School's Accountability Plan and Progress Report(s)   |
|                                 | Does the school's instructional program meet the needs of diverse students?                           | Class visits, interviews, data review, Accountability Plan Progress Report                            |
|                                 | Do the school's standards reflect the implementation of high academic expectations?                   | Review of curriculum documents, student work samples ; confirmation of implementation by class visits |
| <b>Organizational Viability</b> | Are students and parents satisfied with the work of the school?                                       | Interviews, survey review   |
|                                 | Are systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and to modify it as needed? | Personnel evaluation policies, minutes and agendas of board, staff meetings                           |
| <b>Unique Aspects</b>           | Are the school's mission and vision clear to all stakeholders?  | Interviews, document reviews  |
|                                 | Are the school's special programs meeting expected targets?   | Accountability Plan, Progress Reports, other docs unique to each school                               |



## APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CARL C. ICHAN CHARTER SCHOOL

### I. Academic Program Goals

| Goal 1: All Carl C. Icahn Charter School students will become proficient readers of the English language  |  |
|---|--|
| Proposed Measures   | Recommendations for the school to consider:  |
| -- 50% of ‘deficient’ become proficient in FIB  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clarify format of FIB report tables</li><li>• Add number of students reaching proficiency by year’s end</li><li>• Revisit writing tools/ measures</li><li>• Report both matched and unmatched grade 4 results in separate columns on a table</li></ul> |
| --75% at Icahn since 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade perform at or above level 3 on NYS ELA Assessment  |  |
| -- higher percentage of Carl C. Icahn Charter School students score level 3 than CS4, CS42, CS55 students   |  |
| -- each cohort improve 3 NCEs per year on ITBS Reading  |  |
| Goal 2: All Carl C. Icahn Charter School students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts |  |
| Proposed Measures   | Recommendations for the school to consider:  |
| --75% at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade perform at or above level 3 on NYS Math Assessment  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Show yearly results for assessments fall to fall or spring to spring, not within year results</li><li>• Align the measure with the goal, i.e., show performance of “all” students by describing the distribution not only the average</li></ul>        |
| -- higher percentage of Carl C. Icahn Charter School students score level 3 than CS4, CS42, CS55 students   |  |
| -- each cohort improve 3 NCEs per year on ITBS Math   |  |
| Goal 3: All Carl Icahn Charter School students will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning                     |  |
| Proposed Measures   | Recommendations for the school to consider:  |
| --75% at Carl C. Icahn Charter School since 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade perform at or above level 3 on NYS Science Assessment                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• See recommendations above</li></ul>  |
| -- higher percentage of Carl C. Icahn Charter School students score level 3 or higher than CS4, CS42, CS55 students   |  |

## II. Organizational Viability Goals

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Goal D: Carl C. Icahn Charter School will maintain strong organizational viability by maintaining strong parent support and commitment to the school via enrollment approval and attendance rates.</b> |   |
| <b><i>Proposed Measures</i></b>   | <b><i>Recommendations for the school to consider:</i></b>   |
| -- average daily attendance > 90%   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• simplify attendance data tables</li> <li>• align narrative to data tables</li> <li>• align survey format with goal description</li> <li>• customize survey statements to Carl C. Icahn Charter School program</li> <li>• offer space for free responses</li> <li>• summarize data showing range of responses on each item</li> </ul> |
| --80 % parents rate school as good or excellent on yearly survey  |   |

## III. Unique Programmatic Area Goals

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Carl C. Icahn Charter C. Charter School does not list any goals for their unique programs, however some of their unique programs are:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. After school</li> <li>2. Saturday Academy</li> <li>3. 192 day school year</li> <li>4. Extended school day</li> </ol> |  |
|   | <b><i>Recommendations for the school to consider:</i></b>  |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present information on each program</li> <li>• Describe the number of students served, link to academic progress</li> <li>• Link unique programs to mission statement</li> <li>• Define a measure of the impact of unique programs and monitor</li> </ul> |