Charter Schools Institute
State University of New York

HARBOR SCIENCE AND ARTS 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 third year inspection complements the yearly reviews conducted by CSI staff and corroborates the school's annual reports of progress toward the targets it defined in its 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 of Harbor Science and Arts Charter School was conducted on March 10 and 11, 2003 by an independent team of experienced educators from SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA.

- 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.
- Eleanor Bartlett, former principal/director of the New Covenant Charter School, retired educator of the Albany City School District, deputy superintendent, interim superintendent, principal and special education teacher.
- Dominique Astier, Education Consultant: curriculum and program development and review, school inspections, charter school renewals; former middle and high school French and Spanish teacher, administrator, teacher mentor.

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 inspection protocol to assess the school's academic and organizational effectiveness. Prior to the one-and-a-half-day visit, the team reviewed the school's documents including its annual *Accountability Progress Report*, 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

The Harbor Science and Arts Charter School in East Harlem opened in September, 2000 in partnership with Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc., a not-for-profit educational institution. The school opened with 155 students in grades 1-7 and in its third year of operation currently enrolls 176 students in grades 1-8. According to the charter, the school planned to add a kindergarten and have an enrollment of 196 students by the end of its fifth year. In the February, 2002 Board meeting, the board decided not to add a kindergarten for the 2003-2004 school year and increased its target enrollment to 210 students for the 2003-2004 school year. The school occupies two full floors within the large Boys and Girls Harbor (Harbor) building and makes use of the cafeteria and swimming pool facilities as well. The classrooms and hallways are spacious and include a dance studio and arts room. The majority of the eleven-member Board has been with the school since its inception and three of the members are affiliated with the Harbor.

The Harbor Science and Arts Charter School was designed to emphasize science and technology while integrating them with the arts and seeks to use the many community resources in the area, including the services provided by the Harbor. The school originated from the Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc. as a way to extend their services. For five years before the charter, the Harbor operated a school in collaboration with Community School District #4. The challenge of

operating a school within a large system led the Harbor to apply for charter status. At the end of its second year, the Board became aware of some problems at the school, hired an independent consultant to review the school, and ultimately decided to dismiss the majority of the staff, including the director. Over the summer a committee of the Board conducted interviews and searched for a new director. Currently, the school has a director, deputy director, counselor, an intervention coordinator, and disciplinarian/PE teacher. Also on staff are an office manager, two administrative assistants and a bus monitor. The school currently has 12 fulltime teachers and six fulltime assistant teachers who partner with teachers in grades 1-3 or provide social studies and science instruction. For special education services, the school has a fulltime special education teacher and a speech therapist. The school receives its fiscal and human resources services, as well as some specialty instruction in art and music, from Harbor employees. The Harbor Science and Arts Charter School wrote its first accountability plan, accepted and approved by the Charter Schools Institute in 2002.

PART I: -PROGRESS REPORT

I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

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

1. **Accountability plan measures have not yet occurred and internal measures are not clear enough to make any determination about their meaning. Based on the available standardized test data, students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School are not attaining expected skills and knowledge.**

The measures included in the accountability plan to assess students' academic progress have not yet occurred. One measure is based on percentile growth on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, but that test was given for the first time this fall (2002). The other measures are for students who have attended the school for three years. That data should be available for the first time at the end of this year.

In the *2002 Accountability Progress Report*, the school reports data from the Gates Maginitie reading test, the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) for math, the New York State Test for English Language Arts, and the Test of the New York State Standards(TONYSS) for reading and math in 2002 for grades 3, 5, 6 and 7. The data from both the Gates MacGinitie and the WRAT is difficult to interpret and original reports were not available at the time of the inspection. During the initial interview, the director recognized the lack of clarity in the previous testing reports and stated she felt the tests were not valid because untrained personnel graded the tests. (A discussion of the Gates Maginitie and the WRAT data contained in the progress report is in the next section.) In general, the data shows all students are below grade level in reading and students in last year's grades 3, 4, and 5 are at grade level in math while students in last year's 6th and 7th grades are below grade level in math.

The school gave the Iowa Test of Basic Skills for the first time this fall. Results are reported as percent of students above, on, or below grade level, with 'above' defined as five or more months ahead, 'on' defined as from three months below to four months above, and 'below' defined as four or more months behind. The school also reports the mean score for each grade. The team did not see the original report from the testing company and did not have time during the visit to use it to create a data report based on NCEs in order to see the range of distribution of scores. Based on the school's report of the mean grade level equivalent for students on the ITBS, with the exception of the 1st grade, Harbor Science and Arts students are one to two years below grade level in reading, language, and math.

TABLE 1: Harbor Science and Arts Charter School: ITBS Results for Fall 2002 (Percent above, on, or below grade level)

Grade	Reading				Language				Math			
	Above	**On**	**Below**	**Mean**	**Above**	**On**	**Below**	**Mean**	**Above**	**On**	**Below**	**Mean**
1	13.6%	63.6%	27.2%	**1.1**	4.2%	70%	25%	**1.0**	0%	41.6%	58.3%	**k.6**
2	4.1%	58.3%	37.5%	**1.7**	4.3%	47.8%	47.8%	**1.8**	0%	34.8%	65.2%	**1.3**
3	4.5%	36.4%	59%	**2.5**	0%	27.3%	72.7%	**2.3**	4.5%	27.3%	68%	**2.4**
4	23.8%	33.3%	42.8%	**3.5**	5%	20%	75%	**2.9**	15%	25%	60%	**3.4**
5	20.8%	21.7%	43.5%	**4.3**	13%	26%	86.4%	**3.7**	9.5%	9.5%	80.9%	**4.3**
6	34.8%	21.7%	43.5%	**5.6**	13.6%	0%	86.4%	**4.3**	9.5%	9.5%	80.9%	**4.9**
7	13%	4.3%	82.6%	**5.7**	8.3%	0%	91.6%	**4.8**	8.7%	17.4%	73.9%	**5.7**
8	14.3%	14.3%	71.4%	**6.2**	7.1%	0%	92.9%	**5.2**	7.1%	21.4%	71.4%	**6.2**

The chart above is a replica of the information provided by the school. Based on the ITBS results, the majority of students after grade one are performing below grade level. In grades 1 and 2, the majority of the students are on or above grade level in reading and language and below grade level in math. In grades 4, 5, and 6, a little more than half of the students are at grade level in reading. In grades 3 through 7, the majority of students are below grade level in language, and math. Mean refers to the mean grade level equivalent score of students at that grade. For example, students in grade 1 have a mean score of 1.1 in Reading, meaning the average mean of students in this grade is equivalent to a first grader in the first month of school.

The school also has results from the 2002 Test of the New York State Standards (TONYSS) in reading and math for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. Those results show the majority of students are below grade level in both subjects in all grades tested.

TABLE 2: Harbor Science and Arts Charter School: Results for TONYSS Reading and Math, Spring 2002

	Level 1	**Level 2**	**Level 3**	**Level 4**
Grade 3 (n=25)				
Reading	24%	64%	12%	0%
Math	56%	40%	4%	0%
Grade 5 (n=23)				
Reading	12%	67%	21%	0%
Math	55%	45%	0%	0%
Grade 6 (n=26)				
Reading	27%	46%	27%	0%
Math	50%	35%	15%	0%
Grade 7 (n=18)				
Reading	22%	33%	39%	6%
Math	44%	50%	6%	0%

Students scoring below level 3 are considered to be below proficient. In all grades tested, the majority of students are below (Level 1) or near (Level 2) standard in reading and math. In grade 3 reading, 88% of the students are not meeting proficiency and 96% of the students are not meeting proficiency in mathematics. In grade 5, 79% of the students are

not meeting proficiency in reading and 100% are not meeting proficiency in mathematics. Seventy-three percent of the sixth graders are not meeting proficiency in reading and 85% of them are not meeting proficiency in mathematics. For the seventh grade, 55% of the students are not meeting proficiency in reading and 94% are not meeting proficiency in mathematics.

Based on the New York State Standards Tests in ELA and Math (Tables 3 and 4), fourth grade students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School are not achieving mastery of the state standards in ELA or Math. In 2001, 87.5% of the fourth graders did not meet proficiency in mathematics and 83.3% did not meet proficiency in English language arts. For those students who were fourth graders in 2002, 61.8% did not meet proficiency in mathematics and 61.9% did not meet proficiency in English language arts.

TABLE 3: Harbor Science and Arts NYS Grade 4 Math

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3 + 4
2001 n=24	41.7% (n=10)	45.8% (n=11)	8.3% (n=2)	4.2% (n=1)	12.5%
2002 n=21	23.8% (n=5)	38% (n=8)	33.3% (n=7)	4.8% (n=1)	38.1%

TABLE 4: Harbor Science and Arts NYS Grade 4 ELA

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 3+4
2001 n=24	12.5% (n=3)	70.8% (n=17)	16.6% (n=4)	0% (n=0)	16.6%
2002 n=21	19% (n=4)	42.9% (n= 9)	38.1% (n=8)	0% (n=0)	38.1%

2. **Internal measures: It is not possible to assess student achievement based on any internal measures because they either do not exist or are not presented in a manner that is valid or understandable.**

At the time of the visit, the school did not have any way of showing student achievement in a consistent or comprehensive manner. There was no summary of grades, projects, or portfolios. The school states in its *2002 Progress Report* that it uses portfolios as a means of assessing student progress. The portfolio report card presented in the progress report does not indicate how the portfolios were scored, what they were designed to measure, or who scored them. There was no additional information presented during the site visit to clarify the use of portfolios in the first two years of the school's operation. The current administration, hired at the start of the 2002-2003 school year, has continued the use of portfolios and provided various examples for the team during the site visit. However, the portfolio examples consisted of a collection of student work organized by subject and quarter. The work included worksheets and student writing. There was no indication of what skills or knowledge the portfolios are measuring or how the work is measured. There were no rubrics indicating how the students were assessed on the various works. Some of the portfolios contained a printout of the student's ITBS scores from this year in a section labeled "baseline", but there was no indication of how the work in the portfolio aligned with the skills measured by the ITBS. There was no way of knowing what the portfolios are assessing or what standard of performance students are expected to demonstrate.

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

1. **Currently, there is little way of assessing the progress of Harbor students over time in attaining expected skills and knowledge. There is no reliable standardized test data available that shows student achievement over time.**

The school was using the Gates Maginitie test to assess the reading skills of the students and the WRAT to assess math. However, the way the data is presented in the progress report is unclear. The numbers do not coincide in a logical manner and there was no one on staff able to explain the meaning of the reported data nor were any of the original testing reports available for the team to use to conduct an independent analysis. During the site visit, the director stated the data was not useable because it was graded by untrained personnel and she also did not understand the reported data. The school began using the Iowa Test of Basic Skills this fall as a baseline and will test again in the spring. The school plans to use the ITBS each year in order to track student achievement over time.

The team did attempt to draw some conclusions using what was available from the progress report. According to the school's *2002 Accountability Progress Report*, students have shown increases in their reading ability based on the Gates Maginitie. The school reports the data in columns showing average NCEs for all students enrolled for two years at the school. Based on this data it appears all of the students had an average NCE of approximately 32 in 2000, 43 in 2001, and 46 in 2002. However, as noted earlier, the inspectors did not have access to the original data to corroborate the school's presentation of results.

Scores for the WRAT math test are also presented, but here the average standard scores for students are reported by grade level in column form for 2001 and 2002. The chart states a standard score of 100 is considered grade level. Based on the chart provided in the progress report, students in last year's 3rd, 4th, and 7th grades showed improvement, while students in last year's 5th and 6th grades showed declines.

The school has scores from the 4th grade New York State ELA and Math tests from 2001 and 2002 (see Tables 3 and 4 on page 6). On this test, last year's group of 4th graders scored higher than the group in the 4th grade class of 2001 as noted on the tables.

There is no school-developed data that shows student achievement over time. As indicated under question 1, the school includes a portfolio report card in its progress report, but without any explanation, examples of rubrics, or personnel on staff able to speak to how the portfolios were used or scored, it is impossible to assess the validity or the purpose of the portfolio report card. The director has implemented new portfolios this year, mainly in language arts. As described in question 1, the current portfolios are not developed in a fashion that would allow for valid and reliable assessment of student progress over time.

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

1. **Because the curriculum is in the beginning stages of development and there is not a scope and sequence in place or a way to see how skills and knowledge are developed over time, it is difficult to see if the curriculum meets needs of diverse learners.**

Based on 18 classroom observations, teacher interviews, and a review of sample portfolios, it appears the curriculum needs more structure and flexibility in order to meet the needs of diverse learners. For example, it is not clear what happens to students who are either ahead of or struggling with the existing curriculum. The original charter does include learning standards on which the school's curriculum was based. At the time of the visit, there was not evidence of a written curriculum in place from the first two year's of the school's operation. The majority of the current curriculum is in the process of being created this year. Under the guidance of the director, teachers developed pacing guides based on the state standards and existing textbooks. Teachers use the guides to write weekly lesson plans that are monitored by the director. The inspection team saw these guides along with the developing lesson plans and teachers and the director spoke of these as the existing curriculum. The school decided to implement Everyday Math this year for its math curriculum and began using the Foss science kits for science classes. In a focus group, the teachers reported they used TERC math before and it was not successful. For language arts, the director reported she had teachers base their pacing guides on "a 90-minute literacy block modeled after Teachers' College," with grades 4 and up based on a "novel based approach to reading." The director reported the school only used Spector Phonics before and no other curriculum was in place. Spector Phonics remains in place for the lower grades. The teachers reported they created rubrics this year for internal assessments, and they are beginning to use portfolios as well as the ITBS as measures of student academic performance.

2. **From classroom observations, instruction varied in meeting the needs of diverse learners. Some support services and after school programs are available for students and the school has both pull out and push in services for special education.**

Most of the 18 classes observed during the visit were taught as a whole group. In some classes, structured cooperative groups were used during a portion of the lesson as students worked on their assignments. Interviews with the director and teachers indicate students in the lower grades are sometimes grouped by ability for reading. In general, from classroom observations during the inspection visit, the inspection team did not feel instruction in the upper grades provided opportunities for all students to participate.

For example, in one class, a student sat off to the side, and was not engaged in lesson. The teacher did not use any methods to try and engage her. In a few classes in the upper grades, the same 3-4 students spoke out, or boys spoke and girls did not. Also, one student in a class was completely disengaged the entire time with his head down.

This year the school received a READ grant which provides tutoring for elementary students from upper grade students. In addition, students have access to the after-school

programs at the Boys and Girls Harbor. The Harbor offers behavioral health services such as substance abuse prevention, individual and group counseling. Other programs at the Harbor include computer training, youth leadership development, a literacy center, and conservatory for the performing arts. Administration reported about fifty percent of the students are currently enrolled in an after school program at the Harbor.

The school does have supports in place to meet the needs of its special education population. The director reported there are 16 students with IEPs. A full time special education teacher provides both pull out and push in services. The school decided to retain a part time counselor from last year as a full time employee and added another full time counselor to meet the needs of students requiring counseling services as part of their individualized education plans. The school contracts for its speech therapy services. The director reported the school has a great relationship with District 4 of the New York City school department for special education support.

Currently there are no formal services in place for English language learners. While the school reports there are no students who are classified as English language learners as determined by the home language survey, teachers reported there are currently about four students at the school who require some assistance in learning English. For the present time, teachers reported they rely on another teacher who knows Spanish to provide some translation. According to the teachers, this works well and is not a problem and translation is mainly needed with one student. One teacher reported there is a student who came from Central America in the fall with first grade skills and knowing no English. The special education teacher works with her to learn basic phrases such as, “I need to go to the bathroom.” The teacher reported the student’s progress has been “remarkable.” Given this example, the inspectors were concerned about the effectiveness of the school’s process for accurately identifying students in need of language assistance. While the numbers are small now, the director reported the school will be trying to draw more students from the surrounding neighborhood next year. This has the potential to result in a larger population of English language learners in future years.

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

1. **From classroom observations during the visit and review of the pacing binders, it appears the majority the curriculum in lower grades is appropriate for students and teachers hold the students to high expectations. It is not clear if curriculum for the upper grades is challenging, especially in math, and classroom observations indicated uneven instruction.**

The majority of the curriculum is new this year and is in process of being developed by the school, with the exception of *Everyday Math* in grades 1-6. The director stated she modeled the language arts curriculum loosely after Teachers College, using 90 minutes of instruction a day. For the math curriculum, the director made the decision to use the *Everyday Math* program with input from the teachers. Teachers received two after-school professional development sessions to learn the program. In order to develop the

curriculum, teachers created pacing guides in the beginning of this year and have revised them periodically throughout the year. Teachers submit weekly lesson plans to the director based on pacing guides. Currently, the curriculum is dependent upon individual teacher's skill and knowledge. There is no clear way of knowing scope and sequence of curriculum since it is in the process of being compiled throughout this year.

The level of expectation for student academic performance and behavior varied across the school and from teacher to teacher. Observations in the lower grades indicated classroom teachers held students to high academic and behavior expectations. The team noted especially strong instruction in grades 1-3. Teachers had well-organized lessons and students were engaged and participating enthusiastically throughout the lessons. Observations in the upper grades indicated variability. In general, teachers did not exhibit high expectations for students, especially in grades 7 and 8. During classroom observations in these grades, some students appeared disengaged and the same few students participated in the lesson. For example, in one class only three students completed a homework assignment and the teacher simply told the rest of the class to turn it in the next day. In other rooms, teachers did not attempt to engage students who were clearly not paying attention.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY

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

1. **While the students expressed general satisfaction with the school, the parents expressed a great deal of concern.**

The school has not conducted any parent or student surveys, so assessment of their level of satisfaction is based solely on the parent focus group of eight parents and the two student focus groups of 17 total students. In general, students in both focus groups reported they like the work at the school and feel most of their teachers are caring and fair. Students in the upper grades especially noted the science program as a favorite class. They also reported they feel safe at the school and can go to anyone at the school if they have a problem. The students note a change this year and stated the school is more organized. Student complaints included reference to inconsistency in follow-through on the discipline policy, being treated too harshly by the disciplinarian at the school, and not feeling challenged enough in math.

The parent focus group consisted of six parents. They expressed confidence in the majority of the teachers and felt the teachers were committed and worked hard. The parents had three main concerns: lack of communication between home and school, low achievement of the students, and an unchallenging curriculum. The parents expressed concern that the teachers do not "push kids enough" and the instruction is "not focused on the real world," especially noting the lack of computer use. The majority of the parents in the focus group expressed dissatisfaction with the current administration mainly due to communication issues between school and home. Parents stated they were

not adequately informed about discipline matters. One parent stated she was not notified when her child soiled her pants at school and was sent on the bus with no underwear or socks. They were also confused as to the process or reasons why teachers were removed last year and this year. Parents also expressed concern over security in the building. Since the building houses a few different programs, there is access to the school after hours and the parents felt that the presence of one security guard for the three levels of the school was not sufficient.

Parents also had concerns about instruction. They stated one of the features they most like about the school is the presence of two teachers in each classroom but they are concerned this is not going to occur next year. Finally, the parents stated they felt the curriculum was not challenging enough for the students. They were aware of the ITBS scores and stated they did not know what the school was doing to address the needs of the students. In general, the parents stated they felt students need to be "more challenged" and "pressed to think."

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

1. **Harbor Science and Arts Charter School has some systems in place to manage the efficient operations of essential services such as payroll and benefits. Many new systems have been put into place by the new director and have yet to be tested for their efficacy.**

Some systems at HSACS are in place to monitor the efficient operation of school functions. Financial and personnel services such as pay roll and health benefits are provided by Boys and Girls Harbor Incorporated. Other systems at the school seem to have all been developed this year by the new director. Prior to her arrival, it is unclear what systems the school used to ensure efficient operations.

The director has developed her own systems for managing the day to day operations of the school. Most of these are centered around developing the school's curriculum and providing support to the teaching staff. For example, she has a system in place for reviewing lesson plans. Teachers turn their plans into her on a weekly basis and she provides detailed feedback. She has a system for evaluating the teachers consisting of three formal observations each year based on an evaluation instrument she created. She also conducts many informal observations and provides instructional coaching to teachers as needed. Teachers reported they appreciate the detailed feedback they receive from the director and many had examples of how she had helped them improve their teaching. One teacher stated, "She was so thorough and I was so grateful. I am becoming a better teacher because of it." They feel that besides the formal evaluations and feedback, they can also meet with her to talk about any curricular or instructional issues. The director meets with the staff every Monday after school.

2. **The role of the Board of Trustees in making decisions affecting school operations is unclear.**

The system or process for board decision-making is unclear. A recent dramatic decision to remove almost the entire staff appears to have been made quickly and without provisions in place to ensure it does not happen again or that the situation that made it necessary in the board's view will not recur. During the visit, the board described the decision for the removal of the majority of the staff last year. In the spring of last year, parents came to some board meetings with complaints and concerns about the operations of the school, specifically concerns with the academic program and the leadership. Based on these concerns, the board decided to hire an independent consultant to conduct a review of the school. According to the board, the consultant spent a few days at the school and delivered a report stating the school lacked discipline and the teachers lacked skills in teaching the basics to students. The consultant also reported that many of the problems stemmed from the leadership at the school. The board decided to dismiss all of the teachers and the director. A committee of board members interviewed the teachers who wanted to remain and made an assessment as to whether or not they would be renewed. The decision to keep a few staff was based on some input from the former director and from the interviews. The board stated they interviewed the teachers to determine if they showed "flexibility and a willingness to spend time and learn the trade." Six staff and the office manager returned out of about 20 staff and the rest, including a new director, had to be hired over the summer. The new recruitment process for teachers included a few of the remaining teachers who worked with another consultant to interview prospective teachers. A board member met the current director and heard about her successes in a charter school in California. She interviewed and was hired in August and started in September. The interview committee narrowed the teacher search down to 30 applicants. The director interviewed them over the phone and made the final selections.

3. Other systems, especially those related to the hiring, retention and firing process for personnel appear to be based on personal decisions rather than any formal procedure.

The new teachers, director, and deputy director (a new position) were in place for the start of the 02-03 school year. The director reported she gave the new teachers a three month probationary period. In November, she dismissed four of the new employees based on her evaluations and replaced three with new teachers. She could not find a suitable replacement for one of the teachers so the position was restructured to be covered by existing teachers and the director. From information provided by focus groups and interviews conducted during the site visit, it does not appear the board's decision last year to dismiss the majority of the teachers and staff was based on any formal procedure or formal evaluation process linked to classroom instruction or effectiveness. From the site visit, the inspectors felt the current director's decision-making process for releasing staff also did not appear to be based on any formal procedure. For example, the director and the board described one reason for dismissing a teacher. The director informed one teacher of a rule about rewards for students, but the teacher did not comply with the rule the following day, and the teacher was released. In another instance, the inspectors learned of an instructional mentor position that existed in the school's organizational chart, but, when they inquired about the role, the director stated the person serving in the position was ineffective and was released. The position was not re-filled at the time of the

visit. From the interview with the board and the director, it was unclear if there were defined criteria or consistent procedures for personnel decisions in the past. From these same interviews, it is unclear how these decisions are currently made or how they will be made in the future. In the judgment of the team from the information provided during the inspection visit, there does not appear to be a consistent or sufficiently formal process in place for the hiring or termination of school personnel.

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

1. **There does not appear to be a system in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and adjust it as needed. Currently, the board relies on the director to make any program changes she deems necessary based on her judgment.**

The school does not appear to collect, analyze or use data in a systematic manner. As discussed under question 1 of the academic program section, test scores are not clearly reported, thus the school does not appear to have available sufficient student performance data to inform instructional or programming decisions. Other than reports from the director during board meetings, the school does not conduct any regular academic or programmatic reviews. Based on parent concerns, the board did hire an independent consultant to conduct a school review at the end of the 2001-2002 school year, as mentioned earlier. The board reported the consultant spent a few days at the school and provided them with a review and report. The inspection team did not see the report during the visit. As discussed in question 2, the board used the consultant's review to make numerous personnel changes.

The board appears to rely heavily on the director to make any current academic or program decisions. For example, the entire development of the school's curriculum is the responsibility of the director. It appears that whatever curriculum or scope and sequence present during the school's first two years of operation did not remain during the transition to the third year. In order to develop the curriculum, the director had teachers create pacing guides for the current year based on the state standards and their text books. The teachers then use the guides to write their lesson plans, making adjustments to the pacing as the year progresses. The director is the sole provider of on-site professional development for and evaluation of the teachers and all of the staff. In the beginning of the year, the director also worked with staff to develop a new code of conduct for the school to address student discipline concerns. In late September, the director noticed the 4th grade class was not sufficiently responding to the new discipline code, so along with teachers and the counselor, she decided to split the class and make two classes of twelve, changing the two teachers per room structure for that grade. A few weeks later they decided to do the same thing with the 5th grade. The director reported the split in the 4th grade was due more to abilities of the students and the split in the 5th grade was due more to personalities of the students. In December, she decided to implement a rotating schedule for the 7th and 8th grade students and departmentalize the subjects. Based on the inspection visit, it does not appear the Board gave input, reviewed, or formally approved any of these examples of changes in policy or the structure of the academic program.

The board has not developed and does not have any formal way of evaluating the director. During the board interview, board members stated they are thinking about how they will evaluate the director. The board does not have a formal way of assessing how the school is progressing. Currently they rely on limited student performance data summaries and reports from the director.

In sum, the board chose to correct prior problems by replacing the majority of the staff. Without any formal systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the current director, the new developing curriculum, or the academic progress of the students, it is unclear what will happen if the school continues to face problems. By relying on the new director for overseeing the development of the entire curriculum; the creation of all systems such as discipline, student assessment by portfolios and standardized tests; and the evaluation of all staff as well as deciding on and providing professional development for teachers, the board leaves the entire responsibility for the success of the school on one person who is new to the school. In the judgment of the team, the board does not have adequate systems in place for monitoring the academic program of the school.

III. UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREAS

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

1. **While some groups at the school cited parts of the school's written mission, the major elements of the school's mission or vision do not appear to be clear to all stakeholders.**

The mission of Harbor Science and Arts Charter School states, "*It is the mission of the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School to create a learning environment where children and adults are engaged together in the learning process, where children use technology to support a hands-on curriculum that integrates math, science and technology with the arts and where all students are held to high academic standards in a non-competitive, supportive environment.*"

During the site visit, various groups reported how they saw the school's mission. The board reported the mission as "making kids want to learn," "more structure and more discipline and consequences," "develop into life-long learners," and "basic tools to be on grade level." Teachers reported it as "using thematic instruction," having a "non-competitive environment," setting "high academic standards," and "supportive, integrative approach to arts and technology." During the focus group, none of the parents stated they knew the mission of the school. Overall, the site visit indicated that there is not a clear, focused and shared understanding of the mission or vision of the school.

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

1. **The school is just beginning to make systematic efforts to report progress toward its special program targets.**

It is not possible to measure the school's progress on their special programs based on the measures in the *2002 Accountability Progress Report* because the measures are in the early stages of development. The team examined the special programs stated in the school's original charter and mission and was able to make some comments based on the site visit. Following each unique program goal and its measures listed below is an assessment of the school's progress thus far in meeting each measure. After that is commentary regarding more general progress towards the goal based on the site visit.

HSACS Unique Program Goal 1: "*Students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will develop knowledge and appreciation for arts and music.*"

The measure for this goal states, *"All students will compile an art portfolio throughout the year. Students will identify their best work of art, publish an artistic analysis of the piece demonstrating a satisfactory understanding and use of key artistic terms, and display the art work at an annual gallery exhibition."* As of the site visit, the school was in the process of developing student art portfolios for the first time. The portfolios in place at this point consisted only of a collection of the students' works without feedback or assessment. Students also wrote a brief piece about the work by completing a worksheet. A gallery exhibition had not yet occurred. During the site visit, the director and the art instructor stated they were planning a gallery night for this spring, perhaps in conjunction with the science coordinator.

The school has a fulltime art instructor and contracts some performing arts classes through the Harbor Conservancy for Performing Arts. The arts instructor is responsible for all of the art classes in grades 1-8. Students have art once a week, including a monthly class on art history. Based on the visit and in the opinion of the inspection team, there is not any more emphasis on the arts at HSACS than is found in a regular elementary program, and less than students could receive in the middle school if they were taking an art elective. Other than the monthly art history class, there is no evidence of the arts being integrated into the curriculum or instruction.

The school has various teachers from the Harbor Conservancy for the Performing Arts who conduct enrichment classes. Students participate in a variety of classes, depending on grade level, once a week. Current examples are 5th and 7th grade drumming, 3rd and 8th grade Brazilian capoiera dance, and 1st grade music. These classes provide a more varied experience for students, but observations indicate teacher expectation is variable in these classes. For example, during one class taught by a Harbor Conservancy teacher, the teacher spent the majority of the time trying to control students' behavior and used phrases such as, "I know this isn't fun," "You have no opinion," and "You don't have a choice." The director recognizes the variability in the quality of instruction from these enrichment classes and stated she is trying to work with these teachers to improve the classes. One strategy she implemented was to reduce the class size by half, so half of the students go to the enrichment class and half stay with the homeroom teacher for additional language arts and then the two groups switch.

HSACS Unique Program Goal 2: "*Students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will develop a curiosity for exploring and questioning the world around them by learning to apply the scientific method to all areas of scientific study.*"

There are three measures for Goal 2. The first states, "*All students will keep a field journal to record data from weekly fieldwork…*" The school is in the beginning stages of developing this measure. The science coordinator is developing rubrics for the journals.

Measure 2 states, "*All students will keep a lab notebook to record lab explorations including content, research, investigations, evidence of questions, hypothesis testing, analysis and conclusion…*" The school is in the beginning

stages of developing a rubric and a process for implementing and assessing the lab notebooks.

Measure 3 states, "*Students will use a variety of research methods to develop project entries for the annual Harbor Science Fair to be held in the Spring of 2004…"* This measure has not yet occurred.

In general, the team did not see any evidence of the use of scientific reasoning or the scientific method during classroom observations. One classroom had the scientific method posted and an examination of lesson plans showed the scientific method included in one lesson description. During the focus groups, students at all grade levels were unaware of the use of or the terms associated with the scientific method or scientific reasoning in their classrooms and appeared confused by the question. An interview with the school's science coordinator indicates she has a well-thought out plan for developing the measures in the accountability plan and is in the process of creating a way for the students to use journals to record their observations. She reported last year she began to work with grades 5, 6 and 7 on the field journals and using the scientific method. She also plans to hold the science fair next spring.

PART II: SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN: ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS

The Harbor Science and Arts Charter School was operating without an accountability plan during its first two years. The recommendations below are based on the first and most recent Accountability Plan which was approved in November, 2002.

Goals and measures are quoted from the HSACS *Accountability Plan*

Goal 1: "All students at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will become proficient readers and writers of the English Language."

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: each cohort of Harbor Science and Arts Charter School students will improve their reading scores in reading comprehension and vocabulary by an average of three percentiles per year in national rank according to the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Cohorts will include the scores of all eligible students in grades 2-8, with the 2002-2003 school year as the baseline year.

measure 2: Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will meet the state standard for public school performance, currently represented by a Performance Index of 150, on the New York State English Language Arts (ELA) Assessment, administered to grades 4 and 8 (calculated to include students enrolled in their third year at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School).

measure 3: a greater percentage of students enrolled in their third year at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA than District 4 students.

measure 4: at least seventy-five (75%) percent of students enrolled in their third year at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will perform at or above Level 2 (Medium) on the ECLAS Listening, Writing, and Reading Assessment administered to 3rd grade students.

Goal 2: "All students at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of mathematic computation and problem solving."

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: each cohort of Harbor Science and Arts Charter School students will improve their math skills by an average of three percentiles per year in national rank, according to the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Cohorts will include the scores of all eligible students in grades 2-8, with the 2002-2002 school year as the baseline year.

measure 2: Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will meet the state standard for public school performance, currently represented by a Performance Index of 150, on the New York State Math Assessment, administered to grades 4 and 8 (calculated to include students enrolled in their third year at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School).

measure 3: a greater percentage of students enrolled in their third year at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Math Assessment than District 4 students.

Goal 3: "All students at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning."
Measures proposed by the school:
measure 1 at least sixty (60%) percent of students enrolled at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School for three years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science Assessment, administered to 4th and 8th grade students.
measure 2: a greater percentage of Harbor Science and Arts Charter School students enrolled in the school for three consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science Assessment than District 4 students.

Goal 4: "All students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of social, geographical, civic, and world studies."
Measures proposed by the school:
measure 1: at least sixty (60%) percent of students enrolled at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School for three years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science Assessment, administered to 5th and 8th grade students.
measure 2: a greater percentage of students enrolled in their third year at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies Assessment than District 4 students.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM 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.

1. The school was previously using the Gates-Maginitie reading test and is now switching to the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. The school should consider explaining the change in their *Accountability Progress Report*. During the visit, the administration reported a problem with the accuracy of the Gates-MacGinitie. If it is possible to attain accurate scores from the original testing data, the school could consider continuing to give the Gates Maginitie test to a select cohort of students in order to document growth over time. With the ITBS, the school will have one year's growth to show at the time of their renewal evaluation.
2. The school is advised to maintain records of true cohorts of continuing students and to report their scores as they begin the assessment process with the ITBS and continue it with the Test of the New York State Standards (TONYSS).
3. The ITBS was given for the first time this fall. The scores were reported as percentage of students below, on, or above grade level. The school is advised to report scores as NCE as required by NYCSI *Accountability Plan Guidelines*.
4. The school compares itself to District 4 in its *Accountability Plan.* It would be helpful if the school included the scores for District 4 in its *Accountability Progress Report* so readers

would know their expected target. Also, it would be helpful if the school explained the reason for selecting District 4 for comparison versus similar schools. While the school is located in District 4, the administration reported about 50% of the students come from other districts.

5. The Accountability Plan states the school will use the ECLAS as a way of assessing third graders. It was unclear if this was a measure that is starting this school year and if it will be given each year from now on.
6. The same comments for Reading are suggested for Goal 2 regarding Math.
7. The use of 60% as a measure for demonstrating competency in scientific reasoning seems like a low target, especially for an Arts and Science charter school.
8. There is a typo in Goal 4, measure 1. The word "science" needs to be changed to "social studies."
9. The school could consider using other forms of assessment in order to supplement the ones |in the *Accountability Plan*. For example, the school has the results from the TONYSS from last year for grades 3, 5, 6, and 7. It could continue to report this data and even select a cohort of students between the 3rd and 6th and the 5th and 7th grades as another way to show some growth over time. The school is in the beginning stages of portfolio development. If these are completed in a valid manner that aligns to the state standards, the school could also use them as a way to show progress.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY GOALS

Goal 1: "The Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will maintain strong organizational viability by maintaining active parental support and commitment to the school."
Measures proposed by the school:
measure 1: in a yearly parent survey distributed to all parents/guardians, parents will respond positively about the school's overall effectiveness.
measure 2: during the school year, Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will maintain an enrollment level equal to or exceeding ninety percent capacity and a waiting list equal to or exceeding ten percent of the school's population.
measure 3: each year, the average daily attendance rate of all Harbor Science and Arts Charter School students will be ninety percent or better.

Goal 2: "The Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will demonstrate strong organizational viability by maintaining sound financial practices."
Measures proposed by the school:
measure 1: actual and proposed budgets for each school year will show proper allocation of resources to ensure effective school programs.
measure 2: yearly balance sheets will show that the school is fiscally sound and maintains adequate cash reserves.
measure 3: yearly submission of audited financial statements will demonstrate that the school is responsible and prudent with public resources.

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.

1. When the school reports the survey data, it is recommended they report the number of surveys distributed and the number returned and the percent of the total population represented by the responses.
2. It would be helpful if the school qualified what it means by "respond positively." Depending on the survey the school decides to use, one suggestion in reporting the survey data is to cite the number of "strongly agree" answers to a specific set of questions that deal with school satisfaction.
3. Clarify the school's enrollment policy. Unless the school does not accept students after a certain grade, it would make sense that the enrollment goal would be 100% with a 10% waiting list.
4. It would be helpful if the school reported attendance rates for comparison schools or for District 4 in the *Accountability Progress Report*. The school is also advised to have yearly attendance records available for review by the renewal evaluation team.
5. It would be helpful if the school defined "proper allocation of funds" as it relates to the school and its goals. Also, the terms "adequate cash reserves" "responsible" and "prudent" could be defined in relation to the school and its prior history and future plans.
6. The school could consider using other goals to show viability besides parent satisfaction and finances. Given the prior history, the school could include a goal for leadership and for teachers. Examples could include professional development of staff, teacher retention, staff surveys, student surveys. Including these in the *Accountability Plan* along with a discussion of the school's responses to previous experiences would help demonstrate any learning that took place as a result of last year's dramatic change in the composition of the staff.
7. The school could also include other means of demonstrating parent participation in its *Accountability Progress Report*; such as documenting the number of parents attending school events and the number of parents who volunteer at the school and the hours they contribute to the school.

III. UNIQUE PROGRAM AREA GOALS

Goal 1: "Students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will develop knowledge of and appreciation for art and music."

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: all students will compile and art portfolio throughout the year. Students will identify their best work of art, publish an artistic analysis of the piece demonstrating a satisfactory understanding and use of key artistic terms, and display the art work at an annual gallery exhibition.

Goal 2: "Students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will develop a curiosity for exploring and questioning the world around them by learning to apply the scientific method to all areas of scientific study."

Measures proposed by the school:

measure 1: all students will keep a field journal to record data from weekly fieldwork. Field journals will contain observations and questions, evidence of hypothesis development and testing, field catalog with label data, recorded notes, analysis of data and conclusions. At least 75% of students at the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will score a 3 or above on field journals (using a 4 point rubric), which will evaluate documentation of essential information, evidence of hypothesis, analysis of evidence and individual style.

measure 2: All students will keep a lab notebook to record lab explorations, including content, research, investigations, evidence of questions, hypothesis testing, analysis and conclusion. At least 75% of students at Harbor Science and Arts Charter School will score a 3 or above on lab notebooks (using a 4-point scale), which will evaluate attention to essential procedures, developing and testing hypotheses, analysis and scientific inquiry.

measure 3: Students will use a variety of research methods to develop project entries for the annual Harbor Science Fair to be held in the Spring of 2004. In groups of three, all students will collaboratively complete an investigative project to display at the Science Fair. At least 75% of the projects will meet proficiency standards by demonstrating an appropriate use of the scientific method and presenting an educational product of scientific discovery.

UNIQUE PROGRAM AREA 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.

1. Define the term "satisfactory." As written, the term "satisfactory" seems a low expectation for an Arts charter school.
2. When reporting the field journals and the lab journals, it is recommended the school also include the rubrics and a description of the process for scoring the journals. It would increase the validity of the scores if the rubrics were aligned to the state standards in science or based on a known measure of scientific reasoning. It would be helpful to also include examples or excerpts from student lab notebooks.
3. At the time of the visit, the school did not have working rubrics in place for the field or lab journals and it appeared the students had not yet begun to use them. In order to have two years worth of data for the renewal visit, the school is advised to begin using the journals as soon as possible.
4. Describe how the students will be assessed for the science fair; what will the assessment be based on? Who will assess the students? How will the school ensure reliability among the scorers?

5. The school could consider using other measures in its *Accountability Progress Report* to demonstrate student participation in art. For example, music is part of the goal, yet there is no method of measuring student exposure to music. Also, the art measurement is based on one culminating activity. The school could also consider using more science measures. Since this is the school's first *Accountability Plan*, it would be a stronger *Progress Report* if the school included as much data as possible to demonstrate what they have done this year and will do next year.

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 to 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 HARBOR SCIENCE AND ARTS CHARTER SCHOOL

I. Academic Program Goals

Goal 1: All students at HSACS will become proficient readers and writers of the English language	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- cohort will improve reading scores 3 percentiles per year in national rank according to ITBS…2002-2003 baseline -- meet state standard, performance index of 150, on New York ELA assessment grades 4 and 8 (for students enrolled in their third year)	-- maintain records of cohorts -- report as NCE scores as required by NYCSI -- explain change from Gates to IOWA -- if there are accurate Gates data, continue to use Gates for a select cohort of students to document growth over time -- clarify how many students will meet this goal. -- maintain records of students enrolled
-- a greater percentage of students enrolled in their 3rd year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA than District 4 students -- at least 75% of students enrolled in third year will perform at or above Level 2 on the ECLAS Listening, Writing, and Reading assessment administered to 3rd grade students	-- include District 4 percentage; explain why comparison to District 4 (if 50% of students are not from district 4); compile a list of similar schools for comparison as requested by NYCSI… see accountability plan final approval letter -- indicate if this goal is for every year; when does the measure start (this school year)
Goal 2: All students at HSACS will demonstrate competency in understanding and application of mathematic computation and problem solving	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- each cohort will improve by 3 percentiles each year…ITBS -- HSACS will meet state standard of 150, on NY state math assessment for grades 4 and 8, for students in their third year -- a greater percentage of students enrolled in their third year at HSACS will perform at or above level 3 on NY state math assessment than District 4	-- report as NCE scores as required by NYCS -- clarify how many students will meet this goal. -- report scores for District 4, explain why comparison to District 4, compile list of similar schools for comparison.
Goal 3: All students at HSACS will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of scientific reasoning	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- at least 60% enrolled for three years will perform at or above level 3 on NY State science assessment; 4th, 8th grades -- a greater percentage of HSACS students enrolled for three consecutive years will perform at or above level 3 than district 4 students	the goal of 60% seems low for a science charter school -- cite district 4 scores, use similar schools for comparison

Goal 4: All students at HSACS will demonstrate competency in the understanding and application of social, geographical, civic and world studies	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- at least 60% will perform at level 3 on NY assessment -- greater percentage than district 4	fix the typo from "science" to "social studies" in measure 1 -- what's the percentage of students in district 4 who score 3 or above? -- same comments about use of district 4 for comparison
Other recommendations:	-- consider using other measures of student performance in order to show progress/ performance of all grade levels and to supplement the standardized tests… portfolios, grades

II. Organizational Viability Goals

Goal 1: The HSACS will maintain strong organizational viability by maintaining active parental support and commitment to the school	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- in a yearly parent survey distributed to all parents/guardians, parents will respond positively about the school's overall effectiveness -- during school year, HSACS will maintain an enrollment level equal to or exceeding 90% capacity and a waiting list equal to or exceeding ten percent of school's population -- each year, the average daily attendance rate will be 90% or better	-- no evidence of a survey -- qualify "respond positively;" how many parents, what does respond positively mean? How is a score on a question measured? -- if waiting list is 10%, then enrollment should be 100% capacity, unless school caps enrollment at a certain grade level -- what is attendance rate of comparison schools? -- have yearly attendance records available
Goal 2: maintaining strong financial practices	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- actual and proposed budgets for each year will show proper allocation of resources to ensure effective school programs. -- yearly balance sheets will show that the school is fiscally sound and maintains adequate cash reserves. -- yearly submission of audited financial statements will demonstrate that the school is responsible and prudent with public resources	-- define what "proper allocation of funds" means as related to what school goals? -- define "adequate cash reserve"; what does that mean for this school, given prior history and future plans? -- define "responsible" and "prudent"; as measured how?
other recommendations	-- consider using other goals to show viability besides just parents/ finances. Given prior history: include goal for leadership; for teachers (professional development/ teacher retention/ staff survey/student survey) -- consider using other forms of documentation to show parent support…document number of parents who volunteer/days/time -- numbers of parents attending events

III. Unique Programmatic Area Goals

Goal 1: Students at the HSACS will develop knowledge and appreciation for art and music	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- all students will compile and art portfolio throughout the year. Students will identify their best work of art, publish an artistic analysis of the piece demonstrating a satisfactory understanding and use of key artistic terms, and display the art work at an annual gallery exhibition	-- define "satisfactory" -- the term satisfactory seems a low expectation for an arts school
Goal 2: Students at the HSACS will develop a curiosity for exploring and questioning the world around them by learning to apply the scientific method to all areas of scientific study.	
Proposed measures	***Recommendations for the school to consider:***
-- all students keep a field journal to record data from weekly fieldwork; at least 75% of students will score a 3 or above on field journals (using a 4 point rubric) -- all students will keep a lab notebook to record lab exploration; 75% will score 3 or above	-- include scoring rubric and examples of scored student work -- 75% seems low for a science charter school -- include scoring rubric and examples of student work
-- students will use a variety of research methods to develop project entries for Science Fair in Spring 2004..75% will meet proficiency by demonstrating an appropriate use of the scientific method and presenting an educational product of scientific discovery	-- as measured how? How will students be assessed?
Other recommendations	-- consider using another measure for art: now, only measuring visual arts and only based on one event.