



COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL

2016-17 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 22, 2017

By Beginning with Children, Jubilee Mosley, and Nicole
Blair-Barzey

Lower School: 241 Emerson Pl, Brooklyn, NY 11205

Phone: (718) 399-3824

Middle School: 114 Kosciuszko St, Brooklyn, NY

Phone: (718) 636-3904

INTRODUCTION

The Beginning with Children Foundation (BwC), Jubilee Mosley, Lower Principal, and Nicole Blair-Barzey, Middle Principal prepared this 2016-17 Accountability Plan Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Kolz, Amy	Chair, Executive, Finance, Academic Excellence
Baird, Travis	Academic Excellence, School
Baneman, Becca	Executive, Academic Excellence, Finance, Legal
Gulardo, Sonia	Academic Excellence, Legal, School
Morrow, Kiisha	Executive ,Nominating, School
Waldron, Joan	Executive, Nominating, School
Whitten, Gregory	Executive, Finance, Nominating, Legal
Ogbahon, Esosa	Member Ex-Officio/Principal
Mosley, Jubilee	Member Ex-Officio/Lower School Principal
Nicole Blair-Barzey	Member Ex-Officio/Middle School Principal

Jubilee Mosley has served as lower school principal since June 2015.

Nicole Blair-Barzey has served as the middle school principal since August 2016.

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

Community Partnership Charter School (CPCS) was founded in 2000 by a group of parents in Fort Greene, Brooklyn and the Beginning with Children Foundation (BwCF). At CPCS, families, educators, and community members join together in creating a strong academic base in which students learn to read, write, and perform mathematically at levels that exceed citywide averages. Students are expected to achieve high levels of academic growth in an environment that values kindness and respect.

This year we continued efforts to improve the academic success of our students as measured by performance on state-wide testing and to improve school culture. The board hired Nicole Blair-Barzey to lead the Middle School in August 2016, and she joined Jubilee Mosley. Together, they worked to unite the K-8 community. They continued essential work to strengthen the school's implementation of Houghton Mifflin's *Journeys* (K-5), *Collections* (grades 6-8) for Literacy, and Marshall Cavendish's *Math in Focus/Singapore Math* (K-8). They also revised report cards including the parent portal and executed systemic school-wide and grade/subject-based data meetings. They have continued efforts to consistently coach and develop teachers and leaders throughout the school year, as well as monitor student progress in mastering grade level standards. We have engaged new and old partners in efforts to deepen our professional development for leaders and teachers. Marshall Cavendish, University of Chicago, Scholastic, Uncommon Schools, Bronx Charter School for Excellence, Responsive Classroom, Irene Fountas and Elevating Equity have collaborated with us as we continue efforts to reshape our teaching of reading, mathematics and culture.

Academic opportunities were afforded to many of our high performing scholars. Programs such as TEAK Fellowship, Breakthrough NY, Harlem Educational Activities Fund (HEAF), Oliver Scholars and Prep for Prep engaged our scholars in their rigorous admissions screening. Twenty of our alumni and rising 8th graders attended the STEM and Shakespeare Program at Colgate University this past summer in collaboration with Beginning with Children Foundation and Bronx Charter School of Excellence. There, scholars were able to gain an understanding of what it means to be a college student studying on campus and explore areas of science and math under the tutelage of Colgate's esteemed faculty, as well as other faculty from Columbia and American Universities.

As we welcomed new and returning families and staff, there was also an increased focus on building positive school culture characterized by events that celebrated scholar successes while educating families about how the shifts in the Common Core impacted teaching and learning. The lower school hosted an Ice Cream Social, Curriculum Night and Test Buster (ELA and Math workshops). The middle school hosted a Back to School Meet and Greet for families, Chopped Challenge(s); quarterly Learning Leader workshops for parents, as well as consistent Chat and Chews for parents regarding the High School Application process. The middle school has also introduced the Restorative Practice program and an elective program, which supports an Investment Club to teach students financial literacy. CPCS Middle School continues to facilitate the DYCD after school

INTRODUCTION

program to deepen its ties to the parent community. Both the middle school and lower school co-facilitated the school's first CPCS Family Day for grades K-8. The schools also continued to build unity across both campuses through the co-participation of the lower school's Mathstravaganza event, and the middle school's Game Truck Interim Assessment initiative.

With secure buy-in from the majority of our families, we were able to move forward with our focus around strong school culture and our rigorous academic program. Over the course of the year, the leaders continued to host parent forums, which provided opportunities to give feedback to leadership and learn ways to support their scholars' learning and academic growth at home. The lower and middle schools both implemented the use of a school-wide behavioral system called Class Dojo. This was a systematic way of tracking and rewarding scholars academic and behavioral choices. This platform also serves as a great tool for frequent, ongoing, parent communication regarding classroom updates, scholar performance as well as class and school-wide events. We received overwhelmingly positive feedback from our families about the use of Class Dojo: families felt more connected to our school and their child's teacher, as well as more aware of school events. This connection further amalgamated and closed the gap between our families and our team. We were able to leverage this newly developed trust and stability in order to deepen conversations about grade-level benchmarks, reading comprehension and math strategies, while also offering support through academic workshops throughout the year.

Complementary to the academic engagement of families, we also provided opportunities for socialization. Families were encouraged to join us for family visiting days, which were hosted in the fall and spring. Family visiting was an opportunity for parents to experience a portion of the day with their children. Families were also invited to participate in Winter and Spring Sing, an exposition for music as well as all of our partnerships. Scholars artwork is displayed and our double Dutch, step and dance teams perform for their families each semester. At the lower school, moms and dads were celebrated respectively with "Moms and Muffins" and "Dads with Donuts." During these events families connected with other families and our school team and shared their hopes and dreams for their children.

At the middle school, families were invited to attend both the fall and spring talent show. Students were given an opportunity to showcase their talents through song, dance, and the instrumental accompaniments of our 1st Jazz Ensemble. Both the lower school and middle school leader also hosted a series called "Chat and Chew". These events served as a forum for parents and the leader to address challenges, celebrate progress and identify clear next steps for the community.

We were proud to bid farewell to our 8th graduating class of 38 scholars. Seventy-six percent of CPCS 8th grade students (29 out of 38) were placed at high schools with greater than 75% four-year graduation rates.

We were also proud to announce that one of our alumni was accepted to Princeton for this fall. As we look ahead to the 2017-18 school year, we are hopeful that Community Partnership Charter School will continue to be a school that fosters academic achievement that provides opportunities to our scholars and families.

INTRODUCTION

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2011-12	48	51	48	50	53	49	50	29	-	378
2012-13	50	49	49	51	52	52	49	42	26	420
2013-14	46	46	52	48	51	46	52	38	36	415
2014-15	45	43	52	45	44	46	39	55	33	402
2015-16	40	52	51	48	55	51	62	50	47	456
2016-2017	34	33	45	43	43	38	54	52	38	380

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

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

BACKGROUND

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

CPCS offers a wide range of books for students, through extensive classroom libraries, which include meaningful, culturally relevant texts, as well as classic stories and engaging books on a variety of topics, themes and levels, and a book room that supplements classroom materials with multiple copies of texts for targeted guided reading groups. With guidance, each student is able to freely select books from the classroom library for his or her independent reading.

In 2016 -2017, CPCS continued to use the Journeys Common Core literacy program developed by Houghton Mifflin in grades K-5. Journeys embeds Common Core-based instruction into every unit and lesson and is a comprehensive program that provides the resources needed to plan, teach and engage, as well as assess our students.

During the 2016-17 Summer Institute, teachers worked in grade groups to prepare grade specific planning and were able to review the texts and all support materials in advance. Teachers were able to take a deep dive into the intervention components and plan for differentiated instruction for below, on and above grade level students. The leadership team also led professional development around guided reading to further enhance teachers' abilities to support student growth in reading at all levels.

In 2016 -2017, with a solidified approach to teaching reading through the Journeys Curriculum, the lower school team began to delve deeper into developing teacher pedagogy and content knowledge around reading. With the support and guidance of Ignite LLC, a reading consultant group, teachers were able to delve into the curriculum unit by unit, and identify key standards and reading comprehension strategy lessons that needed to be revised and connected to strong read-aloud texts for effective modeling. Since there are 7 metacognitive reading comprehension strategies, and in light of our NYS data, we decided to focus the scope of our work and anchor it around inferring and summarizing. Reading lead teachers met with our consultant to map out the first 20 days of school (rituals and routines for building a successful classroom environment and culture). They also identified main and sub objectives within inferring and summarizing, combed through Scholastic and other vendors to identify texts that lent themselves to effective instruction around these comprehension strategies. Teachers worked in grade groups to prepare grade-specific

planning and were able to review the texts and all support materials in advance. The level of consistency and continuity across grades increased as lessons and units were being planned collectively with support. As a result, teachers were able to take a deep dive into the intervention components and plan for differentiated instruction for below, on and above grade level students. We also further leveraged our co-teaching model as every teacher provided instruction during our reading block either through whole group or targeted small group instruction (i.e. guided reading, phonics or word work) which further enhanced teachers' abilities to support student growth in reading at all levels.

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

In the middle school, for the 2016-2017 school year, ELA teachers in grades 6-8 conducted a full year with the Collections curriculum. The Collections program has Common Core-based standards throughout each lesson, unit, task, and assessment. Through this curriculum, scholars are provided with engaging and relevant stories that force them to think critically and engage in inquiry and active learning. Collections uses a multi-faceted approach to reading in which scholars use close-reading to maneuver through complex texts. Each unit is comprised of text sets of various genres that are compiled to support the acquisition of a specific skill. Each unit is centered around a guiding question that will be used at the end of each unit to construct a performance task where scholars will be asked to produce a product. These tasks vary from essays to speeches to brochures to posters. Teachers will complete selected units to ensure that scholars collect as much information to be successful with the performance task at the end of each unit. There are several additional resources provided that allow scholars choice and support for learning needs. Each unit in Collections has a multimedia project that allows scholars access to build their 21st century technology skills.

In the 5th grade, we continued the Journeys Common Core curriculum-mapping to further concretize the Common Core standards needed for grades 6-8. Our Response to Intervention looked very different than the Journeys 3-tier system in which the Leveled Literacy library is used. Teachers routinely assessed data and grouped scholars accordingly. The materials used ranged from Rally and Ready test prep material, online resources, novel studies, and curriculum assessments. Teachers created plans to address deficit areas for struggling scholars or enhancement of skills for scholars who achieved mastery. As a team, we collectively shared that data and strategized on how to address trends across grade levels. For our students with disabilities, small group pull-out and in-

class push in groups were implemented according to scholars' individualized education plans, and our scholars demonstration of significant deficit areas.

During the 2016-17 school year, the ELA department in the middle school experienced increased coaching and professional development. There was a heightened emphasis on weekly observation and feedback, Thursday midday content meetings, and one-on-one class data analysis coaching meetings. With that, we continued to refine our analysis of data. Teachers created SMART Goals that gave a clear and direct focus to inform instruction and identify scholars to work with to improve productivity. The data collected informed that we needed to increase the opportunities to collectively analyze our students' writing across the school in order to effectively respond to student needs across the grades. Writing was assessed through the curriculum-aligned writing assignments, as well as through the RALLY mock assessments. The data was used to create targeted small groups and Saturday Academy groups in order to meet the needs of the scholars approaching proficiency. During grading, we noted the strengths and deficits of the individual scholars, by class, by grade, and committed to targeted teaching for our students' learning. Saturday Academy was structured for a targeted group and progress was tracked and recorded regularly. Moving forward, small group instruction will be owned by the teachers and scheduled as a part of the instructional day.

All teachers in 5-8 grades will continue extensive professional development throughout this next year, beginning in the 2017 summer intensive conducted by Generation Ready. The yearly scope and sequence will be revised to provide teachers with what they should be teaching, the order they teach the material, the amount of time to spend on each skill, and the expected deadline for work product and assessments. Two 3-week intervals of time will be allotted during the school year for a novel study unit. Teachers will structure ways to implement the intervention component of Collections to ensure that all students meet expectations. The summer intensive PD also included progress monitoring where teachers understand the roles of formative and summative assessment from the lens of the Collections program and plan for how to effectively inform daily instruction using Collections assessments.

CPCMS continued the use of Fountas and Pinnell (F&P) Benchmark Assessment System in 2016-17. F&P is very similar to STEP used in the lower school. Scholars read leveled text to an evaluator while they track certain aspects of a scholar's fluency, comprehension, and error analysis. Scholars were evaluated three times during the academic year. Each scholar's goal is to increase three F & P levels with improved behaviors by the end of the academic year. At each level, teachers track and monitor certain behaviors that scholars at that level are expected to be able to perform. F&P allows scholars to choose books on their independent reading level to increase engagement and decrease frustration. This assessment allows teachers the opportunity to address a scholar's specific needs as it may have related to errors in their F&P assessment. Teachers will use the data to plan instruction for guided reading groups and classroom instruction. Effective implementation requires that teachers use the F&P Literacy Continuum, the Guided Reading resources, and teaching for comprehension and fluency. These resources provide the step-by-step guidance to address the issues seen in different learners. With the ELA department all on the same page, the vertical alignment necessary for student proficiency will be evident across grade levels.

This year was the first year that Guided Reading was attempted at CPCMS for the full academic year. The team attended Fountas and Pinnell training at Lesley University with Irene Fountas herself in 2016. We were given guidance on the implementation, benefits, and instruction on how to use the guides efficiently. We made a major push towards Guided Reading this year. The teachers did not struggle as much in comparison to last years' implementation. Guided Reading in middle school looks different to the Leveled Literacy Intervention. That resource worked best with 5th and 6th grade, while 7th and 8th grade teachers had to approach Guided Reading with selected materials. The overall goal for Guided Reading was interpreted in a variety of ways across grade levels. The purpose for Guided Reading in the 2016-2017 school year was to aid in ensuring scholars the opportunity to practice and enhance reading skills with one-on-one or small group assistance.

It is our priority at Community Partnership Charter School to ensure that all scholars are receiving the necessary interventions and supports to help address their specific needs. During the 2016-17 school year, the middle school consistently served our SETSS and at-risk students. We moved two students who received SPED services, into a level 3 on the state assessment. We also doubled our students who are performing at a level 2, thus lowering the number of students who scored a Level 1. This cohort has shown the most growth.

The middle school uses the push-in model for our English as a New Language Learners (ENL). Using that model, an ENL teacher works with ENLs in collaboration with general education classroom teachers to provide language acquisition and vocabulary support. In 2016-2017 there were four ENL students, three in 7th grade and one in the 8th grade. The ENL teacher sat in with all ENL students during alternating 45-minute periods in their ELA classes. The ENL teacher provided supports by working alongside with the ENL students, taking guided notes and documenting each meeting with students. The ENL teacher would also have bimonthly conversation with the ENL families to keep them up to date on their student's progress.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above proficiency on the New York State English language arts examination for grades 3-8.

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts ("ELA") assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in April 2017. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year).

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ¹				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	43					43
4	41					41
5	37					37
6	52					52
7	52					52
8	35					35
All	260	0	0	0	0	260

RESULTS

32 percent of all CPCS students in grades 3-8 scored at levels 3 and 4 on the 2017 NYS English Language Arts exam, whereas 34 percent of students in at least their second year at the school did.

Performance on 2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	35%	43	34%	32
4	34%	41	41%	27
5	22%	37	21%	33
6	21%	52	22%	36
7	40%	52	42%	48
8	43%	35	43%	35
All	32%	260	34%	211

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

As evidenced in the following table, CPCS made large gains from 2015 to 2016, but stayed steady at 34% in 2017.

¹ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	22%	37	34%	32	34%	32
4	17%	35	19%	36	41%	27
5	14%	35	19%	31	21%	33
6	36%	25	29%	34	22%	36
7	19%	47	50%	30	42%	48
8	47%	32	49%	43	43%	35
All	25%	211	34%	206	34%	211

Goal 1: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective ("AMO") set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 English language arts AMO of **111**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.²

RESULTS

The 2017 CPCS Performance Level Index calculates to 104, just short of this year's AMO of 111.

English Language Arts 2016-17 Performance Level Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
260	27	40	27	5

$$\begin{array}{rclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 40 & + & 27 & + & 5 & = & 72 \\
 & & & & 27 & + & 5 & = & \underline{32} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 104
 \end{array}$$

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.³

RESULTS

34 percent of students in at least their second year at CPCS scored at proficiency in ELA, whereas 40 percent of K-8 students at NYC District 13 did so in 2017. However, CPCS grades 7 and 8 did outscore District 13.

2016-17 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All NYC District #13 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	34%	32	49%	993
4	41%	27	49%	1025
5	21%	33	41%	955
6	22%	36	27%	695
7	42%	48	32%	618
8	43%	35	34%	582
All	34%	211	40%	4868

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Although CPCS is located within the NYC Geographic District 13, only 35 percent of enrollment lives within #13. When compared to the group of districts⁴ where the majority (85%) of our students reside, CPCS scholars outperformed the districts in ELA, 34% to their 32%.

³ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

⁴ CPCS enrolls 7 percent or more from the following districts; NYC #13, #14, #16, #17, #18, #19 & #32

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

English Language Arts Performance of Charter School and Local District by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Scoring at or Above Proficiency Compared to District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
3	22%	30%	34%	47%	34%	49%
4	17%	33%	19%	44%	41%	49%
5	14%	30%	19%	38%	21%	41%
6	36%	18%	29%	24%	22%	27%
7	19%	17%	50%	27%	42%	32%
8	46%	20%	49%	30%	43%	34%
All	25%	25%	34%	37%	34%	40%

Goal 1: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

METHOD

The SUNY Charter Schools Institute (“Institute”) conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school’s performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school’s actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school’s actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

Grades 7 and 8 had an effect size greater than 0.3, however the overall effect size average to 0.17 based on 2015-16 ELA results which is slightly higher than expected.

2015-16 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	93.8	44	30	26.4	3.6	0.2
4	81.8	50	16	30	-14	-0.78
5	90.2	47	19	20.1	-1.1	-0.07
6	85.5	59	22	22.1	-0.1	-0.01
7	80	44	39	23.9	15.1	0.93
8	78.7	45	47	30.5	16.5	0.94
All	85	289	28.2	25.4	2.8	0.17
School's Overall Comparative Performance:						
Slightly higher than expected						

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The ELA effect size for 2016 is much improved over 2015.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2013-14	3-8	77.99	266	28.57	21.80	0.48
2014-15	3-8	75.4	24.5	22.5	22.3	0.01
2015-16	3-8	85	289	28.2	25.4	0.17

Goal 1: Growth Measure⁵

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2015-16 and also have a state exam score from 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 score are ranked by their 2015-16 score and assigned a percentile

⁵ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.⁶

RESULTS

The overall mean growth percentile for 2016 is 53.7, greater than the statewide median. Grades 6-8 showed excellent growth, all greater than 56.

2015-16 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	46.8	50.0
5	45.4	50.0
6	56.1	50.0
7	59.4	50.0
8	56.7	50.0
All	53.7	50.0

EVALUATION

CPCS achieved this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The 2016 mean growth percentile for grades 4-8 is up greater than 7.5 points over 2015.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			Statewide Median
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	
4	58.5	29.5	46.8	50.0
5	54	36.4	45.4	50.0
6	53	48.8	56.1	50.0
7	61	52.2	59.4	50.0
8	48	54.3	56.7	50.0
All	54.9	44.1	53.7	50.0

⁶ Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's Business Portal: portal.nysed.gov.

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

2016-17 marked a year for rolling out new programs and solidifying our school under a new leadership team. The programs put in place are to be built upon going forward and student outcomes should improve as these programs take effect over time. Although student performance in English Language Arts stayed steady at 34 percent proficient overall, the local district saw gains. Although CPCS demonstrated growth in 2016, the school did not meet the other ELA absolute and comparative accountability measures.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State English language arts exam for grades 3-8.	Did Not Meet
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state English language arts exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Did Not Meet
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state English language arts exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 results.)	Did Not Meet
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in English language arts for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile. (Using 2015-16 results.)	Met

ACTION PLAN

Data from our performance on the state ELA exam continues to inform our strategic planning for ELA curriculum and instruction and professional development. We did not meet our goal of 75% proficiency in ELA. CPCS has already contracted and solidified professional development for the 2017-18 school year, working with Generation Ready, Literacy consultants, including Emily Hoefling, and the University of Chicago Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress (S.T.E.P.), as well as immersing a number of teachers and leaders in more comprehensive literacy training through Irene Fountas at Lesley University. Along with these steps, it is imperative that teachers are given a voice in the improvement process.

To increase teacher effectiveness and scholar proficiency, we will continue to have heightened engagement, development and monitoring of:

- **Implementation of both Collections and Journeys curriculum:** A scope and sequence and a pacing guide will be created to ensure that teachers keep track of skills and concepts taught.
- **Leveraging our consultants and leadership teams to sharpen teacher effectiveness:** Teachers worked to create a yearly scope and sequence and sculpt the end of unit tasks and assessments. We also emphasized that teachers will utilize a new pedagogical approach to help to build student mastery. All teachers will:

- S. State expectations for the standard/learning
- T. Teach and assess
- A. Apply the knowledge acquired (projects/performance)
- R. Reflect on the knowledge acquisition process

This process will engender an environment in which teachers will have multiple ways to evaluate student mastery of the skills in a unit and students will have multiple ways to demonstrate their learning.

An ELA specialist from Generation Ready will work with the middle school team to strengthen ELA, teacher leadership and efficient coaching. We plan to increase station teaching and writing across the curriculum. All content areas will be responsible for the implementation of a writing structure (Example, critical response strategies for writing answers in math.) Using the data, we have structured time for our advanced learners to receive enrichment during the morning block, which we will call Literacy Academy. Our 6th and 8th grade team leaders will conduct the advanced enrichment for our high level performers in response to the need that has been discussed.

- **Co-teaching model:** in the lower school, we have identified the co-teaching models we believe to be the most effective for our scholars: alternative teaching, parallel teaching, and station teaching. The lower school team will provide instruction in one of these three structures daily. This will help to ensure scholars are being taught in targeted small groups for most of the day and that we are leveraging both teachers instructional abilities throughout the day in order to help scholars meet and exceed grade-level benchmark expectations.
- **Centers/Stations** to provide opportunities to work on deficit skills or enrichment for advanced scholars. The middle school will utilize this best practice so that teachers and scholars can use time effectively to address a multitude of skills.
- **Effective Modeling for the teaching of reading strategies:** including questioning and discussion techniques and vocabulary in context
- **Guided Reading** – Analysis of scholar growth will be reviewed in set intervals to address progress or lack thereof for lower school and 5th grade scholars. Scholars will be cycled in and out as needed to help scholars navigate through texts with accuracy, fluency, and increased comprehension.
- **Close Reading Instruction and PD:** Close reading is introduced with Journeys/Collections primarily to teach scholars how to strategize, comprehend, and write responses to complex grade level text with the RACE methods.

R= Restates all parts of the question before including the answer

A= Accurately answers the question by drawing the right conclusions

C=Cites relevant evidence from the text to support conclusions

E=Explains evidence by adding some type of revelation or connection to larger themes of the story.

In the past we have started Close Reading Instruction and PD mid-year. However, given our retention of upper grade teachers who have received this PD and are well equipped

to provide Close Reading instruction, and in order to provide our scholars with adequate time engaged in writing *about* reading, we will begin to provide close reading instruction by the end of September 2017.

- **Word Study:** We will have a stronger push for vocabulary, spelling, phonics, and word study for the upcoming year. Teachers will learn and understand the nine areas of learning related to word study. Earlier concepts, such as letter recognition/knowledge will not be used unless a student's needs call for it. This focus will help scholars on the remedial aspect. Grade level vocabulary will be used with our Collections and Journeys programs
- **Data Driven Instruction:** Frequent and ongoing assessments using F & P, RALLY, Journeys/Collections Assessments, STEP benchmarks, and exit tickets to reflect, reteach, and regroup students for success.
- **Response to Intervention** to ensure all scholars are receiving necessary intervention to help address their specific needs. Regularly scheduled meetings will take place to discuss student performance and action steps to assist the scholar in need.
 - ENL
 - SWD
 - At-Risk
- **Tier II and III instruction:** for the 2017-18 school year, we have continued to schedule supplemental "at-risk" support periods for our SETSS and at-risk students and will be better able to track those students' progress over the course of the year.
- **ENLs** – we will continue to refine our Push-in model for our English as a New Language Learners (ENL). During the 2017-2018 school year the ENL teacher will document each meeting in an online/shared document for all leaders to have access to. The ENL teacher will increase weekly meetings with the ELA teacher in order to accommodate the ENL students with more differentiation strategies and techniques.

Goal 2: Mathematics

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

BACKGROUND

This school year marked our 4th official year using Math in Focus, Singapore math curriculum. This curriculum highlights problem solving as a focus of mathematical learning. The program teaches concepts using a concrete-pictorial, abstract learning progression and anchors learning in real world experiences.

CPCS lower school continued to implement the Math in Focus program during its 75-minute math block. Some of the key elements of CPCS's math program are described below.

Math in Focus is a Common Core Standards-aligned math program. The program supports teachers in providing students with systematic and explicit instruction in the key areas of math as identified by the authors of the Common Core State Standards and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study. Those key areas are: making sense of problems and solving them; reasoning abstractly and quantitatively; constructing viable arguments and assessing the work of others; modeling with mathematics; using appropriate tools strategically; attending to precision; looking for and making use of structure; and looking for, and expressing regularity in repeated reasoning. The Math in Focus Curriculum emphasizes depth of mathematical topics rather than breadth. Math in Focus lessons are organized in a way that meets the needs of students. Specifically, Math in Focus uses a concrete-pictorial-abstract approach to introduce topics to students.

CPCS's initial implementation of Math in Focus was supported by pre-service professional development and in-service professional development by a Singapore Math implementation consultant at the school. However, this year there was no external professional development activity.

Key Attributes of the CPCS's implementation of the Math in Focus program include the following:

- Consistent terminology is used throughout the program
- Hands-on activities are a regular part of the program reinforcing and giving meaning to abstract concepts
- Frequent use of Interactive Whiteboard lessons
- Frequent use of in-program unit assessments to assess learning and plan for future instruction
- Embedded varying levels of ELL supports through the use of consistent language and concrete-pictorial-abstract progression
- A focused, coherent curriculum that emphasizes teaching to mastery
- A visual, balanced approach that meets students' needs

MATHEMATICS

- Confidence in knowing that the program has informed the creation of the common core math standards

Since no program can cover all of the students' diverse needs, we supplemented Math in Focus with Every Day Counts Calendar Math and the Mathletics program.

The middle school completed its 3rd official year using Math in Focus, Singapore math curriculum. Our math team comprised of four content teachers, two ICT teachers and one assistant teacher. Sixty-six percent of the team was new to teaching using the "Math in Focus" model, and four members of the team were in their first year of teaching in the United States, Therefore, our goals for the year concentrated on the following major components:

- Scope & Sequence alignment to CCLS State Exam
- Gradual Release Model of Instruction
- Pre and Post Unit Assessments
- Unit & Lesson Planning
- Using Data to Inform Instruction
- Professional Development

Scope & Sequence alignment to CCLS State Exam

The math department had to make adjustments to the M.I.F. pacing calendar, which did not provide the opportunity to teach all tested standards prior to the date of the NYS Math Common Core Assessment. Throughout the year we continued to update the adjusted document as teachers completed the assessment cycle for each unity. We used data from class assessments and mock exams to inform updates made to the adjusted document.

Gradual Release Model

We utilized the Gradual Release Model of instruction, which requires the teacher to guide students toward using different skills, strategies and procedures independently. In this model of instruction the students assume more responsibility with less support from the teacher throughout the course of the lesson. When students take responsibility for their own learning, they become explorers capable of leveraging their curiosity to solve real-world problems. To that end, the Gradual Release Model guide teachers toward designing learning experiences that permit student independence and foster lifelong learning.

The gradual release model is aligned to the MIF instructional approach, which asks scholars to grapple with a real world problem while using investigation to learn the skills necessary to solve the example. Math in Focus lessons are planned for 45 minutes. However, our math classes were scheduled for 90-minute blocks of time at the middle school. This enabled the math team to do the following:

- Accommodate teacher comfort with the material and student learning
- Teach and assess all standards in the scope and sequence on pace with the CCLS State Exam

In addition to the 90-minute daily math class at the middle school, we created a 30-minute block titled "Skills Block," which met at least 3 times a week across all grades. During this time students used supplemental material from NY Ready and Engage NY.

Pre and Post Unit Assessments

During the planning of each unit considerable emphasis was placed on pre-work. Teachers were required to use the following procedure:

- Learn and review CCLS standards to be taught in particular unit.
- Review the pre and end of unit MIF assessment as well as released annotated questions (focusing on those standards) from 2013 – 2015 CCLS State Exams.
- Take chapter assessment and label each question as novice, basic, application. Return to the chapter and identify where each standard was actually taught.
- Identify the pre-requisite skills required to attain mastery of unit standards.

Once these steps were completed teachers were asked to administer a pre-assessment two weeks before the introduction of the unit. Teachers used the data to inform the planning of the unit. At the end of the unit teachers administered the MIF chapter exam, with an additional 3 – 4 questions pulled from NYS Released Annotated Questions. Using the Illuminate dashboard teachers identified the standards/questions where students had a less than 70% proficiency rate. Those standards were reviewed, and re-assessed until the 70% proficiency rate was achieved. On a bi-monthly basis the Academic Dean would prepare CFU's (Check for Understanding) based on previously taught standards. This 5 – 10 question quiz was prepared using questions from previous years CCLS state exams and the NY Ready Test Prep resources. The data would be used to gauge retention of previously taught material. The data also gave independent insight as to which standards needed to be scaffolded as teachers continued to move through the scope and sequence.

Unit & Lesson Planning

Unit and Lesson Planning followed the adjusted scope and sequence created at the beginning of the year. Teachers conducted pre and post assessment preparation. They also assigned 1-2 projects or performance tasks in each unit to assure students ability to apply concepts to real world application. Lessons followed the gradual release model, including an introduction, mini lesson, guided practice, independent practice, summary and exit ticket.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics examination for grades 3-8.

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in April 2017. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

The table below summarizes participation information for this year's test administration. The table indicates total enrollment and total number of students tested. It also provides a detailed breakdown of those students excluded from the exam. Note that this table includes all students according to grade level, even if they have not enrolled in at least their second year.

MATHEMATICS

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ⁷				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	43					43
4	40	3				43
5	35	2			1	38
6	51				3	54
7	51			1		52
8	33	2		4	3	42
All	248	7	0	5	7	272

RESULTS

26 percent of the 204 CPCS students enrolled in at least their second year achieved a score of a 3 or 4 on the 2017 NYS math exam.

Performance on 2016-17 State Mathematics Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grades	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
3	30%	43	31%	32
4	18%	40	23%	26
5	23%	35	26%	31
6	20%	51	20%	35
7	25%	51	28%	47
8	27%	33	27%	33
All	24%	253	26%	204

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Proficiency rates in math dipped in 2017 after being greater than 32% in both 2015 and 2016.

⁷ Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

MATHEMATICS

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	49%	37	38%	32	31%	32
4	57%	35	31%	36	23%	26
5	34%	35	32%	31	26%	31
6	48%	25	35%	34	20%	35
7	17%	47	30%	30	28%	47
8	19%	32	26%	43	27%	33
All	36%	211	32%	206	26%	204

Goal 2: Absolute Measure

Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index ("PLI") on the State mathematics exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective ("AMO") set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.

METHOD

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an AMO each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state's learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a PLI value that equals or exceeds the 2016-17 mathematics AMO of **109**. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.⁸

RESULTS

The Performance Level Index in math calculates to 84, falling short of the AMO of 109.

Mathematics 2016-17 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
253	40%	36%	20%	4%

$$\begin{array}{rclclclclcl}
 \text{PI} & = & 36 & + & 20 & + & 4 & = & 60 \\
 & & & & 20 & + & 4 & = & \underline{24} \\
 & & & & & & \text{PLI} & = & 84
 \end{array}$$

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

MATHEMATICS

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in the school district.⁹

RESULTS

The local NYC Geographic District #13 outscored CPCS in math this year, 32 percent proficient versus our 26 percent. However, CPCS grades 7 and 8 did outscore District 13.

2016-17 State Mathematics Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All NYC District #13 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	31%	32	49%	1007
4	23%	26	36%	1030
5	26%	31	35%	957
6	20%	35	26%	705
7	28%	47	17%	623
8	27%	33	6%	488
All	26%	204	32%	4810

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

⁹ Schools can acquire these data when the New York State Education Department releases its database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The NYSED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Although CPCS is located within the NYC Geographic District 13, only 35 percent of the 2016-17 enrollment lives within #13. When compared to the group of districts¹⁰ where the majority (85%) of our students reside, CPCS scholars in at least their second year outperformed the combined districts in math, 26% to their 25%.

Mathematics Performance of Charter School and Local District
by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District 13	Charter School	District 13	Charter School	District
3	49%	37%	38%	42%	31%	49%
4	57%	31%	31%	40%	23%	36%
5	34%	36%	32%	36%	26%	35%
6	48%	16%	35%	23%	20%	26%
7	17%	16%	30%	16%	28%	17%
8	19%	7%	26%	9%	27%	6%
All	36%	26%	32%	30%	26%	32%

Goal 2: Comparative Measure

Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State.

METHOD

The Institute conducts a Comparative Performance Analysis, which compares the school's performance to that of demographically similar public schools statewide. The Institute uses a regression analysis to control for the percentage of economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. The Institute compares the school's actual performance to the predicted performance of public schools with a similar concentration of economically disadvantaged students. The difference between the school's actual and predicted performance, relative to other schools with similar economically disadvantaged statistics, produces an Effect Size. An Effect Size of 0.3, or performing higher than expected to a meaningful degree, is the requirement for achieving this measure.

Given the timing of the state's release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

¹⁰ In 2016-17, CPCS enrolled 7 percent or more of the total BEDS Day enrollment from the following districts; NYC #13, #14, #16, #17, #18, #19 & #32.

MATHEMATICS

RESULTS

Based on the results from the regression analysis of 2015-16, grade 8 achieved an effect size greater than 0.3, but overall students fell short in math averaging a 0.06 effect size in grades 3-8 when compared to other schools in NYS with similar economically disadvantaged levels. However, the comparative performance was slightly higher than expected.

2015-16 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3	93.8	46	28	28.9	-0.9	-0.04
4	81.8	51	24	32.9	-8.9	-0.44
5	90.2	47	26	23.2	2.8	0.15
6	85.5	58	28	24.2	3.8	0.18
7	80.0	44	23	21.1	1.9	0.10
8	78.7	46	24	16.1	7.9	0.41
All	85.0	292	25.6	24.6	1.0	0.06

School's Overall Comparative Performance:

Slightly higher than expected

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The overall effect sizes in 2014 and 2015 were greater than 0.3.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2013-14	3-8	77.99	266	36.07	26.9	0.48
2014-15	3-8	75.4	245	34.0	27.5	0.33
2015-16	3-8	85.0	292	25.6	24.6	0.06

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Growth Measure¹¹

Each year, under the state's Growth Model, the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.

METHOD

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making in comparison to other students with the same score in the previous year. The analysis only includes students who took the state exam in 2015-16 and also have a state exam score in 2014-15 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2014-15 scores are ranked by their 2015-16 scores and assigned a percentile based on their relative growth in performance (student growth percentile). Students' growth percentiles are aggregated school-wide to yield a school's mean growth percentile. In order for a school to perform above the statewide median, it must have a mean growth percentile greater than 50.

Given the timing of the state's release of Growth Model data, the 2016-17 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2015-16 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.¹²

RESULTS

The overall mean growth percentile for 2015-16 calculates to below the statewide median of 50 at 43.3. While grade 6 was greater than 50 at 55, grade 5 showed little growth and brought down the average.

2015-16 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	41.6	50.0
5	24.3	50.0
6	55.0	50.0
7	48.2	50.0
8	44.3	50.0
All	43.3	50.0

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this outcome measure.

¹¹ See Guidelines for [Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan](#) for an explanation.

¹² Schools can acquire these data from the NYSED's business portal: portal.nysed.gov.

MATHEMATICS

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

The mean growth percentile has been steady year to year with quite substantial differences among grades.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	Statewide Median
4	54.5	38.2	41.6	50.0
5	30.5	28.7	24.3	50.0
6	47	67.3	55.0	50.0
7	44.5	38.9	48.2	50.0
8	42	55.4	44.3	50.0
All	<u>43.7</u>	<u>44.2</u>	<u>43.3</u>	50.0

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Unfortunately, math goals proved challenging this reporting cycle. Absolute, comparative and growth goals measures were not met. Please refer to the math strategies going forward for plans to improve performance.

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State mathematics exam for grades 3-8.	Not Met
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state mathematics exam will be greater than that of students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.	Not Met
Comparative	Each year, the school will exceed its predicted level of performance on the state mathematics exam by an Effect Size of 0.3 or above (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for economically disadvantaged students among all public schools in New York State. (Using 2015-16 school district results.)	Not Met
Growth	Each year, under the state's Growth Model the school's mean unadjusted growth percentile in mathematics for all tested students in grades 4-8 will be above the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Not Met

ACTION PLAN

Data from our performance on the 2016-17 NY State Mathematics exam continues to inform our strategic planning for our Mathematics curriculum, instructional practices and professional development. We believe the curriculum we are utilizing can be a tremendous resource in helping both students and teacher transcend these deficits. We have begun our professional development series with Marshall Cavendish (Math in Focus) for Kindergarten through eighth grades. The first two sets of sessions targeted 1) deepening teacher familiarity with the curriculum and the requisite conceptual shifts required for teaching according to the program expectations and 2) developing scope and sequence as well as stretching ourselves to think through problems in the ways our students will experience math this year. We have planned quarterly follow up sessions with the staff developer to ensure fidelity of instructional delivery. Teachers and coaches will also utilize coaching sessions to practice instructional delivery with each other before they present lessons to class.

During Summer Institute, teachers and leaders examined internal assessments data as well as the initial state data about student performance. As we continue to examine the recently released item skill analysis from the state exams, we will make adjustments to our initial plans, but we have already elected to begin addressing the aforementioned skills.

We further determined that in order to raise the percentage of students performing at/above grade level in math we must continue to:

- Increase scholar engagement through hands-on learning experiences during math (i.e. use of manipulatives and other math tools, such as online platform Mathletics)
- Build scholars ability to critically think and respond to single and multi-step word problems through EYT questions (Explain Your Thinking)
- Continue collaborating with Marshall Cavendish professional development to deepen educator understanding of the Math in Focus approach, strategies and resources for differentiation
- Provide professional development customized for individual teacher needs. During the 17-18 school year, our MIF Staff Developer will now focus on instructional observations, modeling lessons, and providing feedback and unit planning, instead of quarterly PD sessions around content. He will be observing teachers and providing feedback in real time, which we believe will eliminate the gap between PD and actual practice.
- Employ “parallel-teaching” and station teaching as the primary form of co-teaching to ensure scholars are receiving more targeted instruction in smaller groups for core subjects
- Use math unit assessment data to drive instructional decisions and use current data to identify at-risk students for targeted small group instruction from the start of the school year
- Effectively utilize daily exit slips: teachers will sort exit slips into mastered, approaching, and intervention and respond accordingly by the next instructional day to support. Teachers may either reteach in a different way, provide differentiated instruction and/or additional opportunities for practice.
- Implement four additional Tier 2 intervention periods per week per grade level. These intervention supports are in addition to any mandated services
- Create and refine math interim assessments that support the tracking of common core standards mastery
- Conduct vertical alignment meetings to support the transferring of math curricular and instructional knowledge between grade level teams

MATHEMATICS

- Continue participating in the New York City Charter Center's Collaborative Assessment Scoring of NYS Tests to further refine our understanding of how students demonstrate mastery of common core math standards
- Plan to continue to further integrate math instruction into Morning Meeting in order to give students more opportunities to practice and reinforce math concepts
- Provide ongoing weekly coaching and professional development and coaching for all teachers

The middle school will also continue to develop the curriculum through the integration of Cognitively Guided instruction and Student Centered Learning with technology.

Cognitive Guided Instruction Block

Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) will be facilitated daily for 30 minutes and is geared towards strengthening our student's ability to problem solve.

The goals of CGI are:

- Analyze story problems and number sentences to determine their mathematical demands and recognize student responses in terms of cognitive development.
- Assess students' thinking and design problems that will develop students' understanding of concepts and skills.
- Facilitate discussions that provide a window into children's thinking, strengthen children's ability to reason about arithmetic, and build their capacity for algebraic reasoning.
- Use open and true/false number sentences to develop students' understanding of mathematical concepts and skills.

Student-Centered Learning Stations

Teachers will introduce student-centered learning stations where students will work on standards specific to their learning goals. Web-based resources such as Learnzillion, READY NY, and IXL will also allow for a level of personalized learning, with opportunities to monitor progress, engagement, and digitally assess competencies.

Both CGI and Student-Centered Learning Stations are designed to tighten Tier 1 Instruction at the middle school in order to ensure solid implementation of the Math in Focus curriculum. We have leveraged our consultants and leadership teams to help sharpen teacher effectiveness with curriculum, assessment, data analysis, school and classroom culture, and instructional delivery. Teachers will continue to utilize the S.T.A.R. pedagogical approach in order to help to build student mastery. Teachers will enable students to:

- S. State expectations for the standard/learning
- T. Teach and assess
- A. Apply the knowledge acquired (projects/performance)
- R. Reflect on the knowledge acquisition process

This process will engender an environment in which teachers will have multiple ways to evaluate students' mastery of the skills in a unit and students will have multiple ways to demonstrate their learning.

MATHEMATICS

Finally, we will continue to focus on tier II and III instruction. Through the consistent implementation of the SETTS and At-Risk programs in the 2016-17 school year, Community Partnership Charter School Middle School saw trends of positive growth in our Special Education department, with multiple examples of students jumping from a level 1 to a level 3 in the course of one year.

The Middle School has received a certified Speech Therapist from our district's related service provider, for the 2017-18 school year. With these mandated services now provided to our students within the school day, we can ensure that they are receiving the additional vocabulary development, reading comprehension, phonemic and grammatical support that they are entitled to. This, too, will help students make the growth necessary to raise their level of achievement.

Goal 3: Science

CPCS students will become proficient in Science.

BACKGROUND

In the lower school, science continues to be taught by our K-4 teachers. These teachers will continue to utilize the FOSS science units of study. There is an expectation for CPCS students to not only be engaged in the day-to-day “hands-on” approach to learning in science labs, but also to be able to demonstrate their learning through projects and showcases like the annual science fair.

In grades 5-8 CPCS science specialists implement science to strengthen our core science instruction in seventh and eighth grades. Our 7th and 8th grade science teacher leads an elective Earth Science Regents class during “zero” period Monday through Thursday. CPCS middle school students who have taken the Earth Science Regents have passed at 64% (2017), 35% (2016) and 68% (2015) in each of the last three years.

Finally, CPCS middle school students continue to participate in extracurricular science programs that enhance the science content including but not limited to the STEM & Shakespeare Institute at Colgate University.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure

Each year, 75 percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State science examination.

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2017. The school converted each student’s raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year to score at proficiency.

RESULTS

85 percent of students in at least their second year of enrollment at CPCS achieved proficiency on the NYS fourth grade science exam. Thirty-seven 8th grade scholars who have been enrolled in at CPCS for at least two years and 73 percent of them scored at proficiency on the NYS Science 8 exam. Overall, 79% of students tested in NYS 4 & 8 science achieved proficiency.

SCIENCE

Charter School Performance on 2016-17 State Science Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	All Students		Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	84%	32	85%	20
8	73%	37	73%	37
All	79%	69	79%	57

EVALUATION

CPCS achieved this outcome measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Grade 8 science proficiency is the highest it has been in three years at 73%. Many of our highest performing grade 8 students opt to take the Earth Science Regents so that affects the remaining proficiency level.

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	100%	32	79%	34	85%	20
8	69%	32	67%	43	73%	37
All	84%	64	73%	77	79%	57

Goal 3: Comparative Measure

Each year, the percent of all tested students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency on the state science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the school district of comparison.

METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the public school district of comparison. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year and the results for the respective grades in the school district of comparison.

RESULTS

District Science results have not been released publicly as of this report.

SCIENCE

2016-17 State Science Exam Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	85%	20		
8	73%	37		
All	79%	57		

EVALUATION

Pending

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

CPCS did outperform the local district in science in 2015 and 2016.

Science Performance of Charter School and Local District by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Charter School Students at Proficiency and Enrolled in At Least their Second Year Compared to Local District Students					
	2014-15		2015-16		2016-17	
	Charter School	District	Charter School	District	Charter School	District
4	100%	81%	79%	86%	85%	
8	69%	43%	67%	46%	73%	
All	84%	65%	73%	71%	79%	

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

CPCS achieved this absolute measure of having an overall science proficiency rate greater than 75%. District results have not been posted, but CPCS did outperform district 13 the past two years.

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

ACTION PLAN

In the lower school, science continues to be taught by our K-4 teachers. These teachers will continue to utilize the FOSS science units of study. They will join the BwCCS 2 science specialist in working to align the standards with the curriculum and to participate in professional development to deepen their facility with program expectations.

In the middle school, CPCS science specialists will introduce the Next Generation Science Standards to our core science instruction in fifth through eighth grades. We have hired a veteran 5/6th grade science teacher to deepen our ability to engage students in experiential science activities that are standards-based. This new teacher will collaborate with our returning 7/8th grade teacher to ensure vertical planning as well as to provide strict adherence to the dissemination of standards-based content. Our 7/8th grade science teacher will also lead an Earth Science Regents class for all 8th grade students and lead Earth Science lab during first period Monday through Thursday.

There will be a heightened expectation for CPCS students to not only be engaged in the day-to-day “hands-on” approach to learning in science labs, but also to be able to demonstrate their learning through projects and showcases like the annual science fair.

Finally, CPCS middle school students will continue to participate in extracurricular science programs that enhance the science content including but not limited to the STEM & Shakespeare Institute at Colgate University.

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the CPCS’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

Goal 4: Absolute Measure

Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the school’s Accountability Status is in good standing: the state has not identified the school as a Focus School nor determined that it has met the criteria to be identified as school requiring a local assistance plan.

METHOD

Because *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state issues School Report Cards. The report cards indicate each school’s status under the state’s No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) accountability system.

RESULTS

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

EVALUATION

CPCS met this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

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

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2014-15	Good Standing
2015-16	Good Standing
2016-17	Good Standing