



Charter Schools Institute
State University of New York

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL THIRD YEAR INSPECTION REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

The third year inspection is part of a comprehensive accountability system for New York State charter schools sponsored by the State University of New York Charter Schools Institute. The visit during the school's third year of operation provides an independent assessment of the school's progress toward its academic and organizational goals as defined in its accountability plan.

The inspection complements the yearly reviews conducted by CSI staff and corroborates the school's own annual reports of progress toward the targets it defined in the accountability plan. The visit provides an independent assessment of the school's progress and provides recommendations to the school as it 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 third year inspection to Community Partnership Charter School was conducted on March 17- 18, 2003 by an independent team of experienced educators from SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA.

Dr. Karen Laba, Project Manager, SchoolWorks; former middle and high school science teacher, preservice science teacher educator and supervisor, and consultant in accountability system design and implementation for SchoolWorks.

Janet Schulze, Associate and Project Manager, SchoolWorks; former middle school English Language Arts teacher, high school assistant principal, and superintendent intern; candidate for an Ed. D. in the Urban Superintendents' Program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Harrington Gibson, Consultant with SchoolWorks; fourth grade teacher in Chicago and elementary teacher-coach and administrative intern in the Boston Public Schools; pursuing an Ed.D. in the Teaching and Learning Program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

The team used the school's accountability plan goals as the guide for the examination along with the set of framework questions included in the site visit 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 the annual *Accountability Progress Report*, the 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, students, and visited classes to understand the efforts the school is making to achieve its academic and organizational goals. The team offered a brief oral summary of its findings and recommendations to school leaders and invited them to ask for clarification as needed.

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 the same three categories as the school's other documents: academic program, organizational viability, and unique programmatic areas. The framework for the progress report discussion is shown in **Appendix A**.

The second part of the report, *School Accountability Plan: Assessment and Recommendations*, reports the team's assessment of the quality of the school's own 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

Community Partnership Charter School (CPCS) is the second charter school sponsored by the Beginning with Children Foundation both of which are located in Brooklyn, NY. Community Partnership opened in August 2000 with 100 students in grades K-1. Now in its third year, it enrolls 200 students in two sections each of grades K-3. The population of students at Community Partnership reflects the surrounding area, consisting of 87 percent black, 10 percent Hispanic and three percent white/ Asian. The school enrolls no English language learners, and reported 80.5 percent of the 2002-2003 population qualified for free or reduced price lunch. CPCS occupies space in a renovated armory in the Fort Greene section of Brooklyn, sharing the building with mixed income residences. While not overly generous, the space is adequate for its current size.

The 'sister' school, the Beginning with Children School, has been in operation for ten years, eight years within the Board of Education and the last two years as a charter school under authorization of the New York City Chancellor's Office. CPCS benefits from the experience of

its sponsor in the development of operations and management systems that allow the school to function smoothly. The shared instructional and curricular resources complement the building level services at Community Partnership and enrich the opportunities for staff members to share experiences with a veteran charter school faculty.

At the time of the inspection, Community Partnership Charter School was being led by a three member 'leadership team' comprised of an acting administrator, the Beginning With Children Foundation Director of Charter Schools, and an instructional consultant. The founding director was granted a leave after the start of the school year and the school determined that the three person leadership team would best serve their needs until a permanent replacement could be selected. While on leave, the founding director continues to consult with staff and with the leadership team at the school regularly. The administrator is on site each day, along with the Director of Schools from the Foundation. The instructional consultant has served at the school consistently for one and a half years, until recently providing support to teachers four days a week. Beginning in January 2003, she was obliged to reduce her service to two days per week, with the acting administrator assuming instructional oversight duties in collaboration with the consultant.

The school is governed by a representative Board of Trustees including three parent representatives, three representatives of the Beginning With Children Foundation, and several business and community leaders. The CPCS director is an ex-officio member of the board. The board oversees the work of eight lead classroom teachers, seven assistant teachers and one paraprofessional, one special education teacher and one full time reading specialist. The staff allocation provides two adults per classroom for grades K-2 and specialist intervention for students with Individual Education Plans (IEPs) and for students needing support in literacy. The instructional staff is distributed across the life of the school, with two founding teachers, two returning teachers, and four new staff members, two hired to accommodate the increased number of classrooms. Four of the lead teachers are NYS certified, two are certified in other states, and two have their New York credentials pending. Plans are in place to hire a new full-time director before the end of the spring term to allow a smooth transition between the founding director, the Leadership Team, and the incoming hiree. At the time of the inspection, the Beginning With Children Foundation was nearing final selection of a full time curriculum and instruction specialist to serve both of its sponsored schools.

The academic program at CPCS includes instruction in the core subjects of reading, mathematics, science and social studies, along with daily instruction in music or visual art, and daily recess/ physical education. Students have formal technology instruction in the computer lab at least twice per week, with time allocations varying by grade level. The curriculum is continually evolving, based on the New York State Learning Standards as its framework, complemented with teacher-developed or adapted units and projects compiled from both school sites. The instructional consultant oversees alignment and articulation of the curriculum elements to assure appropriate pacing and adequate content coverage.

PART I: SCHOOL PROGRESS REPORT

I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

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

1. Community Partnership students score at or near the national norm on standardized reading and mathematics assessments.

Community Partnership Charter School (CPCS) administers the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, Revised (PIAT-R) in reading and mathematics to assess attainment of fundamental skills and knowledge. The school reports both the national percentile and normal curve equivalent rank (NCE)* for each grade level group as well as the percentage of students performing at or above grade level. The results reported in the school's 2002 *Accountability Progress Report* are summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1: Community Partnership Charter School PIAT-R, (NCE)

		Spring 2002	
Grade	N	Reading	Math
Kindergarten	49	60.6	49.7
1	42	59.5	54.5
2	35	46.1	50.8

TABLE 2: Community Partnership Charter School PIAT-R, (% above grade level)

		Spring 2002	
Grade	N	Reading	Math
Kindergarten	49	86%	51%
1	42	62%	67%
2	35	43%	46%

Both kindergarten and first grade students at CPCS score above the national norm (50th percentile) in reading, and very near the norm in mathematics. More than half of each of those student groups performed above grade level. The 2002 second graders fell slightly below the norm in reading, and just met the national average in mathematics. Slightly fewer than half the second graders met grade level expectations on the PIAT-R tests.

2. On a diagnostic reading assessment, a high proportion of CPCS students surpass grade level expectations.

* 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.

CPCS administers Fox in a Box, a diagnostic reading assessment parallel with the assessment used widely in the NY City School District, the ECLAS. On each of the four general areas measured with this tool, with few exceptions, CPCS students meet or exceed grade level performance.

TABLE 3: CPCS Fox in a Box, Spring 2002, Percentage at or above grade level

Spring 2002					
	N	Phonemic Awareness	Phonics	Reading and Oral Expression	Listening and Writing
Kindergarten	49	79.9 %	64.3%	48.7%	50.7%
1	43	95.3%	78%	84.6%	67.4%
2	42	100%	66.7%	66.7%	60.3%

The only group with less than a majority of students meeting grade level expectations is the kindergarten. All other cohort groups include a majority of students who are meeting the target.

Overall, students at Community Partnership Charter School demonstrate achievement of expected skills and knowledge as measured by standardized assessments.

3. A summary of results on the school's internal assessments shows that, in general, students at Community Partnership are approaching "solid understanding" of concepts and skills in key academic areas.

The CPCS *Student Report* consists of a comprehensive list of concepts and skills for five major areas: literacy, mathematics, social studies, science, and social emotional development. Teachers assess students using a five stage rubric on each concept or skill listed within a major subject area. The rubric ranges from Stage N, which describes that students do not yet show any understanding, to Stage 4, advanced understanding. Stage 3 represents "solid understanding." In the *2002 Accountability Progress Report*, the school reports the progress of students who score below Stage 2 on the fall report, describing the distribution of the rate of progression from stage 2 to stage 3. A summary of the school's report is shown in Table 4, where N indicates the number of students scoring at or below Stage 2 on the fall 2001 report, and the improvement score is a weighted average of stage growth across all indicators for each subject area.

TABLE 4: CPCS Stage Progress, Fall 2001 to June 2002,

Grade	Literacy		Mathematics		Social Studies		Science	
	N	Improvement	N	Improvement	N	Improvement	N	Improvement
Kindergarten	11	0.44	7	0.47	11	0.09	9	0.39
1	16	0.79	24	0.99	34	1.17	32	1.38
2	12	0.76	21	0.82	16	0.36	22	0.47

The presentation of this summary of performance on internal measures offers several insights into the attainment of CPCS students. First, since each grade level includes

approximately 50 students, in every case except first grade social studies and science, more than half the grade level group were judged to be at Stage 3, “solid understanding” of key concepts and skills. This is consistent with the results on the standardized assessments, which also indicated that more than half the grade level group was at or above expected attainment levels. The greatest growth toward proficiency was demonstrated by the group with the highest number of underperforming students, the 2002 first graders, a typical growth pattern when weaknesses are identified and effectively addressed.

Overall, Community Partnership internal assessments indicate students are achieving proficiency in essential skills and knowledge and weaker students are making adequate progress toward grade level expectations.

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

1. While the 2002 performance of CPCS students on standardized measures indicates that students are attaining essential skills and knowledge, the scores represent a divided indicator of change over time. In reading, the two cohort groups for whom data is available show declines from 2001 to 2002. In mathematics, the same two groups improved their rank.

Two groups of students have been identified as a true cohort at Community Partnership Charter School. The first group of 42 students entered as kindergartners in 2000 and was tested using the PIAT-R in spring, 2001. They were tested again as first graders in spring, 2002. The other group of 35 students began at CPCS as first graders in 2000, and results for their performance on the PIAT-R are provided for spring 2001 and spring 2002. A summary of the results provided in the *2002 CPCS Accountability Progress Report* is presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5: CPCS Cohort Results, 2001 to 2002, PIAT-R, NCE

Grade(s)	N	Reading			Mathematics		
		2001	2002	Change	2001	2002	Change
K - 1	42	66.3	59.5	-6.8	51.6	54.5	+2.9
1 - 2	35	51.9	46.1	-5.8	44.8	50.8	+6.0

Both cohort groups decline in national rank in reading from the first to the second year of the school’s operation. Both cohort groups improved their rank in mathematics, the older group showing a six NCE rank gain. Caution is urged when examining data from only one year’s growth, especially at the start of a school’s existence and considering the potential instability of primary level (K-2) assessment results. The school reports that its disaggregation of these results motivated an adjustment in the reading program to provide targeted assistance to the students with the greatest gap between attainment and expectations. Results from upcoming assessments will indicate whether the curriculum modifications have had the desired effects.

2. As reported in Table 4 under Question 1, finding 3, CPCS students are making sometimes modest and sometimes dramatic progress toward “solid understanding” of essential knowledge and skills as measured by the school’s internal assessments.

From the change in student performance as determined by teacher assessments and recorded on the CPCS *Student Report*, the range of progress on specific knowledge and skills ranges from 0.09 to 1.38 stages of performance. In half the groups reported, students have met the school’s target of one half stage improvement, and in two categories have far exceeded the target.

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

1. The written curriculum at Community Partnership is based on state standards, which are comprehensive, allowing the school to meet the needs of diverse students.

The New York State Learning Standards are the framework on which the CPCS curricula are built, and the range of skills and knowledge is sufficiently comprehensive to allow for meaningful learning opportunities for both struggling and proficient students. The Community Partnership curriculum is thematic, project based, with the yearly scope and sequence guided by projects with a science and/or social studies focus. Literacy and mathematics learning strands feed into the project plan. Alignment with state expectations is overseen by the school’s instructional leader, a two year consultant with the school who provides coaching and mentoring support for the staff. The current challenge according to school personnel is taking the open-ended model and making it efficient and meaningful within the building. The curriculum development task for this year has focused on gathering the lesson samples, activities, anecdotes, assessments and supplementary materials teachers develop and adapt as they design their daily plans. The plan is to create a continually growing body of resources for teachers that reflects a broad range of topics and addresses a comprehensive set of essential and enrichment skills.

2. By design, teachers at CPCS have the flexibility to select and/or create their own lesson activities within the school-wide scope and sequence. In practice, the many new staff members at CPCS face a challenge selecting worthwhile activities that provide the range of experiences required for their diverse class populations.

In almost all stakeholder interviews, comments were made describing the teachers as dedicated and very hard working. During the two days the inspectors were on site, teachers were at school long after student dismissal, researching lessons on the internet and gathering materials. In interviews, teachers noted they have much to do to prepare lessons “from scratch” and praised their colleagues for sharing prepared materials freely. In many classes, teachers assigned tasks to small groups and, despite both lead and assistant teachers circulating to monitor behavior, many students were less than fully attentive to the learning activity. It appeared that some teachers were challenged to

master the skill of orchestrating a classroom at the same time they are expected to design engaging lessons for heterogeneous classes.

While the design of the CPCS academic program allows for opportunities to suit the needs of diverse students, as implemented, the program is not presented in a way that maximizes use of learning time in the class. Based on the range of classes observed during the inspection, the team concluded that the pacing of classroom activities is an area in need of development at CPCS.

3. CPCS provides needed services to students with identified academic weaknesses in a variety of ways.

The school employs a full time “inclusion teacher” to bring the full educational experience to students with identified academic needs. The teacher uses both ‘push in’ and ‘pull-out’ strategies as defined in the students’ Individual Educational Program (IEP), working with the student in the classroom, either independently or in a small group, or bringing the student for individual service in a separate location. The inclusion teacher reports to the Special Education Coordinator, a Foundation employee who serves as coordinator for both Beginning With Children schools. She provides classroom teachers with workbooks and training for modifications suitable to the student population at Community Partnership.

A full time reading specialist supports the work of mostly third graders, the group the school identified as needing extensive support, based on assessment results. She functions within the classroom during reading instruction, working with a small group of students for instruction using the Orton-Gillingham approach to reading. Additional support services are provided at CPCS by a part-time social worker and a part time psychologist, along with contracted speech and occupational therapists.

Beginning this academic year, the school has initiated use of “SuccessMaker,” a computer software system that provides focused practice for students through a series of lively and engaging activities and games. Some of the activities are skill-based while others are more open-ended. Each grade level has scheduled time in the computer center ranging from 25 minutes to 45 minutes depending on age. An aide or assistant teacher works with 10 to 15 students, approximately one fourth of the grade, on designated SuccessMaker activities in reading and mathematics. According to school leaders, the hope is that this reinforcement will support class activities and strengthen student’s skills.

4. Regular and systematic assessment that is analyzed and reported back to teachers offers CPCS staff an accurate picture of their students’ unique needs.

Community Partnership Charter School employs a number of part time interns under the guidance of a full time Director of Research and Evaluation and a testing coordinator employed by the Beginning With Children Foundation to administer the time-intensive diagnostic assessments from the Fox in a Box series. This assessment as well as the Rhode Island Test of Language Skills (RITLS) and PIAT-R provide comprehensive

information about student's strengths and weaknesses. The assessment specialist collects the school-wide information, sorts and organizes it and returns a class report to teachers at the beginning of each year. Teachers then have an accurate profile of student needs on which to base instructional planning decisions. At the time of the inspection, the Foundation was in the process of hiring a full time curriculum specialist to help teachers make effective use of the rich information available to them. In the meantime, teachers work with the school's instructional consultant and with their peers to adjust instruction to accommodate the particular needs of the incoming class group and to adjust throughout the year as needed.

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

1. The elements of the written curriculum at CPCS reflect high expectations for student achievement, including benchmarks and progress checks built into the academic program at relevant stages. While not yet fully developed, the mini-lessons, assessments and instructional strategies appear to be well designed and appropriate to the grade level.

In each interview with teachers, school leaders, and the academic consultants, all indicated standards of performance are discussed regularly. Prior to school opening, teachers are guided to identify the skills and content from the state learning standards appropriate to their grade level and to develop a topical scope and sequence organized into thematic project-based units. The instructional consultant reviews the teachers' program plans, and guides them to assure not only adequate coverage of essential content and skills, but sufficient breadth to provide for a range of student abilities. The instructional consultant continues monitoring the academic program throughout the year at weekly grade level team meetings. In this manner, the school works to provide an academic program that holds students to high standards.

2. As implemented, the academic program is uneven, with a wide range of skill among the school's teachers to facilitate effective learning experiences within the flexible curriculum.

Teachers and academic consultants commented on the flexibility of the school's curricula, praising the creativity it allows teachers in the design of lessons. However, the same flexibility places great demands on teachers' time, energy, and talents, since each lesson requires research and preparation. The primarily young, inexperienced faculty are learning not only the instructional strategies for presenting content to diverse learners, but also mastering classroom management skills to facilitate a smooth, efficient use of class time.

Within the nine classes sampled during the inspection, team members noted a wide range of skill balancing the demands of instruction and management among CPCS teachers. There were few instances in which teachers asked probing questions to extend students'

answers, and student work samples did not consistently have teachers' corrections or student revisions to indicate persistence toward mastery. Students in the focus group were asked to bring a sample of recent work to show the interviewer, and several students brought worksheets of skill practice as samples of their 'best' work. A few shared examples of creative efforts, including poems and book reports, but no student chose to share or discuss extended 'projects' as described in the school's curriculum design.

Management skill was uneven as well among the CPCS faculty. Teachers often used small group arrangements in their class and circulated to monitor behavior. In a number of cases, students would become distracted and off task when the teacher or assistant teacher was working with another group, or attending to another matter. Some teachers skillfully brought attention back to the task at hand, but attention quickly strayed when instructions were unclear or activities unengaging. Team members noted the most common examples of distraction when students were given extended time to complete only moderately challenging assignments. Overall, student attention to academic tasks averaged about 50 percent of available learning time in the classes sampled during the inspection.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY

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

1. Students in the focus group reported strong support for Community Partnership Charter School, citing the variety of instructional methods teachers use as an appealing feature of the school.

A group of eight CPCS students in grades 1, 2 and 3 joined the inspector for the focus group during the visit. Students expressed appreciation for the learning activities teachers design because "they make it real with us." They included several instances highlighting a strong positive relationship with teachers, using phrases such as, "they like us"; "teachers do positive things, they give the kids a book or a treat". When asked whether the school is safe, students cited the teachers again as the source of their sense of being protected and taken care of. Other strong attractions of the educational program at CPCS include the trips, working together with classmates, and 'choice time' each day when students can work on optional activities.

2. Parents in the focus group reiterated students' assessment that the work of the teachers at CPCS is the greatest asset of the school.

Four parents participated in the CPCS focus group, and each repeated the students' assertion that the effort exerted by teachers and staff members to assure that all students achieve to their highest potential is a compelling asset of the school. Teachers were applauded for their efforts to bring parents into the educational process and to structure opportunities for parents to be active partners in the education of their child. Parents cited

the school leaders' knowledge of each child as contributing to the sense of closeness and respect they and their children experience at the school.

Among the curriculum components mentioned by parents, the school's focus on bringing children into their community through regular and frequent 'community walks' as part of both science and social studies lessons were praised highly. Parents claimed this focus encouraged "kids to be part of the community." The parents in the focus group selected CPCS because of its neighborhood quality, so their expressions were consistent with their hopes. Other parents cited the school's ability to offer students with learning difficulties the same opportunities to be part of the learning experience as others. One said, "No child is allowed to fall between the cracks." Each of the parents reported that their frequent contact with teachers and staff members by phone, email, or newsletter helps maintain their feeling of being an integral part of the school's work.

An active parent support group contributes to the positive climate at Community Partnership Charter School. Bi-monthly 'pot luck' suppers had to be moved to a nearby high school because the gathering outgrew available space at CPCS. Attendance is high at monthly performance and awards assemblies. During the inspection, parents, grandparents and other caregivers were frequently in the building providing assorted services to teachers and students, ranging from duplicating to tutoring to assisting with the technology classes.

The school does not have sufficient reliable responses to its 2002 parent survey to corroborate the comments of the focus group from a larger sample of respondents. Only fourteen surveys were returned, a sample size too small to provide useful information. School leaders have discussed adjustments to their distribution and collection strategy to assure better responses on the upcoming survey.

QUESTION 2: Are systems in place to promote the efficient operation of school functions?

1. Community Partnership Charter School has efficient and effective systems in place to manage day to day operations of the school, and competent staff to carry out the essential functions. The implementation of a three member 'leadership team' this year has presented challenges.

The sponsorship of the Beginning With Children Foundation offers CPCS access to the knowledge gained from the operations of the Foundation's other charter school in Brooklyn. Systems to carry out basic management tasks (attendance, reporting, facilities, payroll, purchasing and personnel) are in place and operate smoothly. The Foundation handles some functions with its own personnel, allowing school-based staff to focus attention to direct service needs.

Due to a personal issue, the founding director of CPCS has been on leave most of this school year, only available to serve as a consultant a couple of days per month. The school has been led by a three person leadership team comprised of an acting

administrator, Director of Charter Schools for the Beginning With Children Foundation, and an instructional consultant. While each member of the leadership team has defined responsibilities, each interacts with parents and teachers regularly. The administrator is on site every day, and the Director of Charter Schools generally spends each day at the school as well, though his duties at the Foundation require he be off site occasionally. The instructional consultant had been providing support to teachers four days per week through the fall, but recently reduced her time to two days per week. According to the leadership team, they meet frequently to share information about school issues and feel comfortable that they have integrated their roles effectively. From the teachers' perspective, there are often confusing and sometimes contradictory solutions to everyday problems, often related to student discipline, depending on which leader is available to handle the problem. Of particular concern to teachers was their perceived loss of instructional mentoring from the consultant. While they cited the administrator as having been effective in providing instructional guidance when available, management duties often limit the time he can spend in classes. Plans in place indicate that the selection of a new director will be finalized by May, and the founding director has committed to providing assistance during the transition to a new individual leader for the school.

2. The school's governance structure provides for broad representation of constituent groups, and operates appropriately to set policy and evaluate the performance of the school leaders.

The membership of the Board of Directors for Community Partnership Charter School is a balance of school stakeholders, including three members from the Beginning with Children Foundation, three parents, and three community members. The Director of the school is an ex officio member of the Board. Key topics for Board consideration this year include decisions about the facility for CPCS given the school's planned expansion to fourth grade next year. The current building serves the school's needs but offers little room for growth. The Board is reviewing options of acquiring another site or expanding further into the building it currently leases.

3. The school's system for recruiting and hiring teachers has become more extensive and rigorous. The number of formal teacher evaluations has been reduced this year due to limited staff availability.

According to comments from school leaders and Board members, efforts to improve the selection and retention of high quality teachers are in development, beginning this year with a more rigorous multi-step interview and selection process. Last summer, the director conducted initial phone interviews, after which suitable candidates were invited to teach a sample lesson, observed by a hiring committee consisting of teachers, parents, the director and the instructional consultant. School leaders hope that the extensive contact with prospective teachers will enhance the candidates' understanding of the school's educational beliefs and operations, and provide the school with a more comprehensive appreciation of the candidates' skills. Final decisions were not available at the time of the inspection, but Board members expressed their hope that they would retain all the new teachers hired this year.

In previous years, formal teacher evaluations were completed by the director and the instructional consultant. This year, in the director's absence and with the reduction in availability of the consultant, formal evaluations are reduced in number. In interviews with inspectors, a number of teachers expressed appreciation for the supportive nature of the evaluation feedback they had previously received, and noted their disappointment in its reduction.

QUESTION 3: Are systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and modify it as needed?

1. The school makes effective use of its extensive assessments of student proficiency to evaluate not only the quality of instruction but also to judge the effectiveness of the academic program.

As discussed earlier in this report, the Director of Research and Evaluation at the Beginning with Children Foundation analyzes student assessment results from the spring administration of the PIAT-R and Fox in a Box. She and her colleagues provide teachers with a comprehensive profile of the students entering a class in the fall, allowing teachers to adapt their learning activities to best meet students' needs. The instructional consultant uses her frequent, informal visits to classes to assess the quality of teacher's instructional adaptations. Grade level meetings are the setting for discussions with the consultant of pacing, topic sequencing, and curriculum challenges. Similarly, the inclusion teacher and Special Education Coordinator oversee the quality of the academic offerings for the children they service by their regular presence in classrooms.

In addition to offering instructional guidance, the analysis conducted by the assessment team has identified areas of widespread weakness which have led to changes in program offerings. In one instance, the assessment revealed a striking gap in student's spelling skills. From a follow-up survey of teachers, staff members learned that spelling had not been systematically taught across the early grades. In response, the school adopted a plan to include spelling as a regular component of the literacy program.

A second example of the use of assessment to review and refine the academic program arose when the assessment team recognized the weaknesses in reading among a large proportion of the current third grade. A review of the previous literacy program suggested that the gaps among this group of students would require more focused attention to prerequisite literacy skills, including phonics. This year, the school hired a full time reading specialist to work with the weakest third graders using the structured approach found in the Orton-Gillingham materials.

2. While the school has been able to identify weaknesses in its language/ literacy program by examining student assessments carefully, the balance of the academic program has not undergone a thorough review or audit to assess its effectiveness.

At this point in its existence, the Community Partnership Charter School curriculum consists of a framework of skills and content standards sorted into a scope and sequence for each grade. Under the guidance of the instructional consultant, the faculty is engaged in a process of compiling mini-lessons, activities, benchmarks and assessments across all the subject areas that will comprise the fully developed curriculum. The inspectors affirmed the school's statement in its *2002 Accountability Progress Report* (p. 15) that the curriculum in science, social studies and the arts are not as fully developed as the other curriculum components. Because the academic program is not fully constructed and students have not been systematically assessed in all subject areas, there has not been sufficient evidence on which to base any judgment about the quality of the academic programs in science, social studies, or the arts. As the students mature into the upper grades and participate in the state assessment system in these subjects, more revealing information about the other subject areas will become available for review.

III. UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREAS

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

1. There is a widespread, common understanding of the mission of the Community Partnership Charter School that include references to the quality of the academic program and to the emphasis on a caring community.

Common phrases were used by each stakeholder group interviewed during the inspection that reflected the mission of CPCS. In only slightly different words, Board members, teachers and parents described the school as operating to "build on the strengths of the individual child," and to "take (a) child where they are and work(ing) with each kid at their level." Parents and teachers both mentioned that the children are guided to develop a sense of community within the school, and Board members emphasized their desire to lead a school that uses community resources and whose students "become good members of this community." Board members and parents agreed that the civic and community aspect of the school are important elements that distinguish CPCS from other schools.

From students' perspective, the distinctive feature of the school is being able to work with their classmates, and having their parents actively involved in the school. Teachers credit the flexibility in the curriculum with allowing them to bring the "real world" into lessons as events arise. The assistant teachers agreed, commenting that, while the structure of the curriculum is limited to align with the school-wide scope and sequence, it is not "confining" to teachers' and assistant teachers' creativity. School leaders referred to the original charter describing the school as being a child-centered environment in which quality learning can take place. Teachers, parents and students agreed that the climate and culture of the school is one of respect and caring, including even the discipline systems.

Overall, stakeholders agree on the central academic mission of the school accomplished through a child-centered culture that makes use of and contributes to its community.

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

1. The inspectors identified three aspects of the Community Partnership Charter School that play key roles in the school's program: community relationships, a climate of kindness and respect, and parent involvement. The school's progress toward deriving the full benefit from these features is described below.

Community relationships: The founding charter and mission of CPCS include making productive use of community resources. Toward this goal, CPCS leaders have engaged in several relationships with neighborhood groups to enhance the academic program at the school. A local high school sends tutors to CPCS each week, extending a connection between the charter and the local district. Students from Pratt Institute School of Art and Design visit CPCS to support the arts program at the school. Recently, school leaders developed a connection with the Mark Morris Dance Group which has recently occupied its new center in the Fort Green section of Brooklyn. Students will have opportunities to engage in dance expression activities under the guidance of experts in the field. A display of student art work will be presented at a neighborhood coffee shop in May. In addition to these special events and experiences, CPCS third graders regularly participate in 'community walks' to explore the neighborhood in connection with regular components of the social studies and science curricula.

A climate of kindness and respect: Parents were most vocal in describing the attraction of the school in terms of its treatment of them and their children. Inspectors noted the genuine friendly greetings offered between parents and staff members during arrival and dismissal times. In classes, students were generally well behaved and attentive, and enthusiastic and positive about the school. Teachers reported they felt respected and valued by the school's leaders, explaining that the level of support they receive to help them in their work is evidence of the school's regard for them. School leaders and consultants described their work at the school in collaborative terms, in contrast with the authoritative approach typical of traditional school settings. In the judgment of the inspection team, the school is making strong progress toward developing a culture that values each individual and treats all with kindness and respect.

Involving parents: A core belief among the founders and current leaders of the Community Partnership Charter School is the importance of parents as active partners in the school experiences of their children. The school has fostered the growth of an active parent group which sponsors bi-monthly pot luck suppers to bring together all members of the school community. Monthly assemblies to celebrate student accomplishments are reported to be well attended, and every week parents visit the school for Friday Family Reading time at the beginning of the school day. The parents participating in the inspection focus group expressed enthusiastic support for the school's efforts to involve parents in meaningful ways. Unfortunately, too few of the school's parent survey for spring 2002 were returned to corroborate the comments of the focus group. Anecdotal reports as well as observations on site suggest that the school is making strong progress toward involving parents in their child's education.

PART II: ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN GOALS -- ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS

The Community Partnership Charter School lists ten academic program goals in its accountability plan.

Goal 1: All CPCS students will become proficient readers of the English language.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: 10% increase in number of students at or above grade level over baseline PIAT-R, until at least 65% of cohort at grade level by 5th grade

measure 2: each cohort increase 3+ percentiles on PIAT-R, gr. K-5

measure 3: Fox in a Box for gr K-2, 10% increase in # students at or above grade level until at least 65% each cohort at grade level by grade 2

measure 4: CPCS report card: at or below stage 2 in Jan, improvement of at least half stage by June

measure 5: on CTB gr 3 Reading, CPCS students at least as high as NYC average

measure 6: NYS ELA grade 4, CPCS 4th graders at least as high as NYC averages

measure 7: NYS ELA gr 4, CPCS 4th graders meet or exceed state proficiency index

measure 8: CTB 5th Gr. Reading, CPCS average of all 5th graders will be as high as NYC averages

Goal 2: All CPCS students will become proficient writers of the English language.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: Fox in a Box for gr. K-2, 10% increase in no. students at or above grade level until 65% each cohort at gr. Level by gr. 2

measure 2: CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of ½ stage by June

measure 3: gr. 3 +, writing portfolios assessed for mechanics and expressions by a panel, majority students achieve stage 3

Goal 3: All CPCS students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1 10% increase in number of students at or above grade level over baseline PIAT-R, until at least 65% of cohort at grade level by 5th grade

measure 2: each cohort increase 3+ percentiles on PIAT-R, gr. K-5

measure 3: CPCS report card: at or below stage 2 in Jan, improvement of at least half stage by June

measure 4: on CTB gr 3 math, CPCS third graders at least as high as NYC average

measure 5: NYS ELA grade 4, CPCS 4th graders at least as high as NYC averages

measure 6: NYS ELA grade 4, CPCS 4th graders meet or exceed state standard (API index)

measure 7: on CTB – 5th Grade math, CPCS average all 5th graders at least as high as NYC averages

Goal 4: All CPCS students will demonstrate steady progress in the attainment of knowledge and skills relevant to science achievement.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of at least ½ stage by June

measure 2: NYS 4th Gr Science exam, CPCS 4th graders at least as high as NYC averages

Goal 5: All CPCS students will demonstrate steady progress in the attainment of knowledge and skills relevant to social studies achievement.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of at least ½ stage by June

measure 2: NYS 5th Gr Social Studies exam, CPCS 5th graders at least as high as NYC averages

Goal 6: All CPCS students will develop an appreciation for the many forms of artistic expression and will demonstrate steady progress in the attainment of the knowledge and skills relevant to the arts.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: Grades K-3, art portfolio with 5 new works, judged a stage 2 or better by art teacher

measure 2: Grades 4-5, art portfolio with 5 new pieces, judged stage 2 or better by panel

measure 3: CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of at least ½ stage by June

ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS

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

For Goal 1

1. Overall, the 2002 Accountability Progress Report is a clear presentation of information consistent with the selected measures.
2. It would be helpful for the reader to explain the meaning of ‘stages’ as used for the CPCS Report Card. A copy of the standard definitions could be included as part of the text of the progress report.
3. When data from the CTB-NY and other assessments become available, it would be informative to report results for each whole grade level group as well as for cohorts of continuing students. Both types of information are instructive for a reader.
4. Explaining why measures are not reported as you have done in the 2002 report is helpful.

For Goal 2

1. Identify “Fox in a Box” for a reader unfamiliar with this assessment, explaining its use among similar schools and its purpose as a reading diagnostic tool.
2. When writing portfolios are implemented, identify the panelists who will be rating the work. In addition, it will be important to identify the criteria to be used for scoring, and to describe the training for panelists to assure consistent scoring. If possible, you might want to demonstrate that the school’s scoring criteria align with state criteria (or with a similar accepted/ recognized standard) and describe the process used to standardize the scoring criteria (for example, have criteria reviewed and approved by a university professor with expertise in young children’s writing).

For Goal 3

1. As recommended for Goals 1 and 2, clarify the meaning of stages, and report cohort as well as whole grade level results when new data becomes available.

For Goal 4

1. Consider reporting progress toward the targets using charts showing stage progression, as presented for the reading and math goals.

For Goal 5

1. Consider reporting progress toward the targets using charts showing stage progression, as presented for the reading and math goals.

For Goal 6

1. For the arts goal, explain the criteria the art teacher uses to assign a ‘stage 2’ to student’s work. Try to demonstrate that the standard is not subject to wide variations depending on teachers’ preferences.
2. When panelists are used to assess student work, describe the panelists, their expertise, and how panelists are trained to assure consistency of scoring. As space allows, include the rubric and perhaps an exemplar to describe the criteria used.
3. As recommended for science and social studies, consider using charts showing stage improvement similar to those displayed for reading and math.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY GOALS**Goal 7: CPCS will make responsible financial decisions and demonstrate sound fiscal practices and management.*****Measures proposed by the school:***

measure 1: CPCS submit annual audited financial statements to CSI and SED show clear evidence of sound financial practices

measure 2: quarterly variance reports show sound management of expenses

measure 3: annual budgets and expense reports for current and most recent fiscal year will show alignment with educational objectives

ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS

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 Goal 7

1. Consider defining in your own terms what “sound” means. For example, some schools consider it ‘sound’ to have a particular proportion of the budget allocated to instructional purposes or a specific percentage dedicated to professional development. This will allow the evaluator to make judgments based on the standards you have set for yourselves.
2. CSI will conduct a thorough review of financial status and legal compliance.

III. UNIQUE AREAS

Goal 8: CPCS will maintain an environment that values kindness and respect

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: staff survey show high proportion of teaching and other staff feel valued and supported

measure 2: annual parent survey show at least 80% positive responses on questions related to qualitative measures of a kind and respectful school environment

measure 3: number of disciplinary events involving fighting, disrespecting people and property and using inappropriate language will decrease steadily in each cohort each year

measure 4: 90% students grade 3+ will respond positively to questions

“I feel safe at CPCS”

“I think the adults at the school care about me.”

“My classmates and schoolmates are nice to me.”

Goal 9: CPCS will foster a professional learning community for its teaching staff by providing ongoing professional development opportunities. Teachers will develop short- and long-term goals in collaboration with the Director and progress toward these goals. These goals will be reviewed twice annually in order to direct professional and curriculum development, an integral part of the Beginning with Children Foundation’s educational model.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: student assessment data will reflect appropriate teaching and curricular response to student academic needs

measure 2: teachers’ files will reflect short- and long-term goal planning and the professional development calendar will reflect ongoing interventions that are aligned with these goals

Goal 10: Parents will express a high satisfaction rating with the school.

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: 80% parent survey responses report high satisfaction with CPCS performance overall and on communication and outreach; building quality; discipline, clarity of goals; understanding of child's academic progress and needs; safety

measure 2: No more than 5% students will choose not to re-enroll (for reasons other than family relocation or severe learning needs requiring a special environment or for 'perverse' reasons)

UNIQUE AREAS—RECOMMENDATIONS

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 Goal 8

1. To avoid the problems encountered with the 2002 staff surveys, revise the system used in order to collect surveys from all staff members and to provide a complete set of responses.
2. If space allows, include the actual survey item and the distribution of responses returned for the 2003 survey. Summarize the narrative comments and categorize if possible.
3. As with the staff surveys, avoid the 2002 problems by revising the system used to collect parent surveys to provide as complete a set of responses as possible. Include in your presentation the number of surveys distributed, the number returned, and the percent of the total population represented by the responses.
4. The chart reporting discipline incidences is very informative and clear. Continue adding rows for each successive year.

For Goal 9

1. Provide some additional detail on the school's professional development calendar, for example objective of each session, the learning goals or targets and any evaluations participant might complete assessing whether the session was perceived as valuable.

For Goal 10

1. Because the measure lists specific survey items, include in the report the actual results on those precise items, showing the distribution of responses for each.
2. As with all survey data, report the number distributed, the number returned, the percentage of the population represented by the responses.
3. In addition to the measures indicated in the plan, consider demonstrating parent support by summarizing the number of volunteers, the number of hours served, and the types of tasks parents perform for the school.
4. Capture and report the number of parents who participate in family reading time across the year.
5. When reporting withdrawals, list all the reasons for leaving by category or class if desired. If sufficient information is available, show trends over time. Continue the insightful discussion of the school's response to withdrawal information.

APPENDIX A: FRAMEWORK FOR THE ANALYSIS OF SCHOOL PROGRESS

Category	Criteria	Evidence Sources
Academic Program	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 needs of diverse students?	Class visits, interviews, data review, Accountability Plan Progress Report
	Do the school's standards reflect implementation of high academic expectations?	Review of curriculum documents; confirmation of implementation by class visits
Organizational Viability	Are students and parents satisfied with the work of the school?	Interviews, survey review
	Are systems in place to promote the efficient operation of school functions?	Interviews, observations Staffing history
	Are systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and modify as needed?	Personnel evaluation policies, minutes and agendas of board, staff meetings
Unique Aspects	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
Financial Accountability	Is enrollment stable and sufficient to provide the financial foundation of the school?	
	Does the school's financial management serve the needs of students?	
Legal Compliance	Is the school in essential compliance with legal and regulatory requirements?	

**** Sections assessing Financial Accountability and Legal Compliance will be provided by the Charter Schools Institute and amended to this report as available.**

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL

I. Academic Program

Goal 1: All CPCS students will become proficient readers of the English language.	
** very clear alignment of stated measures and reported information	
Measures	Recommendations
1. 10% increase in number of students at or above grade level over baseline PIAT-R, until at least 65% of cohort at grade level by 5 th grade	-- clear presentation of information (except typos)
2. each cohort increase 3+ percentiles on PIAT-R, gr. K-5	-- clear presentation of information (except typos)
3. Fox in a Box for gr K-2, 10% increase in # students at or above grade level until at least 65% each cohort at grade level by grade 2	-- clear presentation of information (except typos)
4. CPCS report card: at or below stage 2 in Jan, improvement of at least half stage by June	-- clarify definition of 'stages'
5. on CTB gr 3 Reading, CPCS students at least as high as NYC average	-- when data available, report distribution as well as average NCE, results for cohort as well as whole class group
6. NYS ELA grade 4, CPCS 4 th graders at least as high as NYC averages	-- suitable as written (similar recommendations to #5)
7. NYS ELA gr 4, CPCS 4th graders meet or exceed state proficiency index	-- suitable as written (similar recommendations to #5)
8. CTB 5 th Gr. Reading, CPCS average of all 5 th graders will be as high as NYC averages	-- suitable as written (similar recommendations to #5)
Goal 2: All CPCS students will become proficient writers of the English language.	
Measures	Recommendations
1. Fox in a Box for gr. K-2, 10% increase in no. students at or above grade level until 65% each cohort at gr. Level by gr. 2	-- identify "Fox in a Box" for unfamiliar reader as valid and reliable diagnostic tool
2 CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of ½ stage by June	-- (as above) clarify meaning of 'stage'
3. gr. 3 +, writing portfolios assessed for mechanics and expressions by a panel, majority students achieve stage 3	-- identify the panelists, criterion for scoring, training for panelists to assure consistent scoring -- if possible, demonstrate scoring criteria align with state criteria (or similar accepted/ recognized scoring rubric)
Goal 3: All CPCS students will demonstrate steady progress in the understanding and application of mathematical skills and concepts..	
** very clear alignment of stated measures and reported information	
Measures	Recommendations
1. 10% increase in number of students at or above grade level over baseline PIAT-R, until at least 65% of cohort at grade level by 5 th grade	-- clear presentation of information (typos)
2. each cohort increase 3+ percentiles on PIAT-R, gr. K-5	-- clear presentation of information (typos)
3. CPCS report card: at or below stage 2 in Jan, improvement of at least half stage by June	(as above) clarify meaning of 'stage'
4. on CTB gr 3 math, CPCS third graders at least as high as NYC average	(as for ELA/ Reading) report whole class, true cohort results, distribution

5. NYS ELA grade 4, CPCS 4 th graders at least as high as NYC averages	(as for ELA/ Reading) report whole class, true cohort results, distribution
6. NYS ELA grade 4, CPCS 4 th graders meet or exceed state standard (API index)	(as for ELA/ Reading) report whole class, true cohort results, distribution
7. on CTB – 5 th Grade math, CPCS average all 5 th graders at least as high as NYC averages	(as for ELA/ Reading) report whole class, true cohort results, distribution
Goal 4: All CPCS students will demonstrate steady progress in the attainment of knowledge and skills relevant to science achievement.	
Measures	Recommendations
1 CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of at least ½ stage by June	-- consider charts showing stage improvement similar to reading and math
2. NYS 4 th Gr Science exam, CPCS 4 th graders at least as high as NYC averages	-- clear as written; when data available, report as suggested above, whole class, distribution of scores along the proficiency continuum
Goal 5: All CPCS students will demonstrate steady progress in the attainment of knowledge and skills relevant to social studies achievement.	
Measures	Recommendations
1 CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of at least ½ stage by June	-- consider charts showing stage improvement similar to reading and math
2. NYS 5 th Gr Social Studies exam, CPCS 5 th graders at least as high as NYC averages	-- clear as written; when data available, report as suggested above, whole class, distribution of scores along the proficiency continuum
Goal 6: All CPCS students will develop an appreciation for the many forms of artistic expression and will demonstrate steady progress in the attainment of the knowledge and skills relevant to the arts.	
Measures	Recommendations
1. Grades K-3, art portfolio with 5 new works, judged a stage 2 or better by art teacher	-- explain criteria for scoring "stage 2" (fixed or variable, depending on teacher?)
2. Grades 4-5, art portfolio with 5 new pieces, judged stage 2 or better by panel	-- describe the panelists, their expertise, how panelists trained to assure consistency of scoring, rubric/ criteria used
3. CPCS Report card for each grade, below stage 2 in Jan, demonstrate improvement of at least ½ stage by June	(as above) -- consider charts showing stage improvement similar to reading and math

II. Organizational Viability

Goal 7. CPCS will make responsible financial decisions and demonstrate sound fiscal practices and management.	
Measures	Recommendations
1. CPCS submit annual audited financial statements to CSI and SED show clear evidence of sound financial practices.	-- define in your own terms what "sound" means (e.g., particular proportion of budget allocated to instructional purposes? Specific percentage for professional development? Range of allocation preferred for facilities or administration?)
2. quarterly variance reports show sound management of expenses	(CSI will conduct review of financial status)
3. Annual budges and expense reports for current and most recent fiscal year will show alignment with educational objectives.	(CSI will conduct review of financial status)

III. Unique Areas

Goal VIII (8): CPCS will maintain an environment that values kindness and respect.	
Measures	Recommendations
1. staff survey show high proportion of teaching and other staff feel valued and supported.	-- design a system to collect all staff surveys to provide full set of data -- include actual survey item, distribution of responses, narrative comments summarized or categorized if suitable
2. annual parent survey show at least 80% positive responses on questions related to qualitative measures of a kind and respectful school environment.	-- design a system to collect parent surveys to provide full set of data -- report number distributed, number returned, percent of total population represented by responses
3. number of disciplinary events involving fighting, disrespecting people and property and using inappropriate language will decrease steadily in each cohort each year.	-- very informative chart, continue adding rows for each successive year
4. 90% students grade 3+ will respond positively to questions “I feel safe at CPCS” “I think the adults at the school care about me.” “My classmates and schoolmates are nice to me.”	-- as above, report actual survey item, distribution of responses -- indicate number distributed, number returned, percent of total population represented by responses
Goal IX (9): CPCS will foster a professional learning community for its teaching staff by providing ongoing professional development opportunities. Teachers will develop short- and long-term goals in collaboration with the Director and progress toward these goals. These goals will be reviewed twice annually in order to direct professional and curriculum development, an integral part of the Beginning with Children Foundation’s educational model. .	
Measures	Recommendations
1. student assessment data will reflect appropriate teaching and curricular response to student academic needs.	-- provide some additional detail on professional development calendar (e.g., objective of session, goals/targets; evaluations as valuable, useful by participants if used; number of teachers attending/ participating)
2. teachers’ files will reflect short- and long-term goal planning and the professional development calendar will reflect ongoing interventions that are aligned with these goals.	-- text fairly clear (difficult to present in tabular or summary format)
Goal X (10): Parents will express a high satisfaction rating with the school.	
Measures	Recommendations
1. 80% parent survey responses report high satisfaction with CPCS performance overall and on communication and outreach; building quality; discipline, clarity of goals; understanding of child’s academic progress and needs; safety	-- develop system to collect surveys -- report each item mentioned in the measure, distribution of responses for each -- include number distributed, number returned, percent of population represented by responses --consider documenting parent support through volunteer hours, attendance at pot lucks, chaperones for school trips -- family reading time capture # participants across year -- students share writing monthly, attendance assembly, performances
2. No more than 5% students will choose not to re-enroll (for reasons other than family relocation or severe learning needs requiring a special environment or for ‘perverse’ reasons)	-- list all reasons for leaving (by category or class if desired) -- show trends over time (year 1, year 2. . .) if data available --continue discussion of school’s response to this information

****Addendum with additional assessment data: VERY helpful, informative; clearly presented**