Community Partnership

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL

2015-16 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN PROGRESS REPORT

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 15, 2016

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 2015-16 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the school's board of trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Kolz, Amy	Chair, Finance, Academic, Executive
Baird, Travis	Academic Excellence
Baneman, Becca	Legal, Academic Excellence
Cunningham, Katie	Executive, Academic Excellence
Gulardo, Sonia	Academic Excellence, School
Morrow, Kiisha	Nominating, School
Waldron, Joan	Nominating, School
Whitten, Gregory	Executive, Nominating, Legal
Ogbahon, Esosa	Member Ex-Officio/BwCS 2 LS Principal
Mosley, Jubilee	Member Ex-Officio/LS Principal
Nicole Blair-Barzey	Member Ex-Officio/MS 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

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 in an environment that values kindness and respect.

This year we continued efforts to turn both the lower and middle schools around. We welcomed new and returning families and staff. There was 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 Bash, Chopped Challenge(s); an International Woman's Concert and continued its DYCD afterschool program to deepen its ties to the parent community. Despite the meticulously developed plan there was a bit of unevenness in both how the programs were rolled and the perceptions developed therein.

At the lower school we managed discordant voices among parents and staff lamenting the prescribed changes for improving the school's culture and students' academic performance. Some of the key challenges were linked to a sentiment that staff voices were not the predominant variable in the selection of the new leader. Other challenges rested in a small group's protest of the change from a dress code to uniform school and the implementation of a schoolwide discipline system. Still others were challenged by the shift to an assessment based report card. Over the course of the year the leader hosted a series of parent forums, calibrated shift and secured buy-in from the majority of families.

The middle school by contrast had a more mellifluous launch as there was a greater level of acceptance among parents and teachers at the outset. By midyear, the middle school leader resigned and the Chief Academic Officer of BwCF along with the two remaining academic deans closed out the school year. The Board, as well as the leaders on the ground, continued to outreach to families, parent leaders and staff to assure the community that we would secure a skillful leader to steady the school and transcend what was undoubted a challenging moment in time.

The board hired Nicole Blair-Barzey in August and she joined Jubilee Mosley and they have begun the work to unite and heal the K-8 community. They have also continued essential work to strengthen the school's implementation of Houghton Mifflin's *Journeys* (K-5) and *Collections* (grades 6-8) for Literacy and Marshall Cavendish's *Math in Focus/Singapore Math* (K-8), revise report cards including parent portal and executive systemic school-wide and grade/subject based data meetings. They have also continued efforts to consistently coach and develop teachers and leaders throughout the school year as well as monitor student progress in mastering of 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

INTRODUCTION

Elevating Equity have begun sets of collaboration with us as we continue efforts to reshape our teaching of reading, mathematics and culture.

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. Additionally, we hosted our annual culture night. In partnership with an organization, International Youth Fellowship, parents were invited to celebrate the cultural diversity that exists within our school community, many families attired in traditional garb, brought food, drinks and dessert to share. Our gymnasium transformed into a cultural museum with several artifacts from countries around the globe. Through these events, we hoped that families would gain a better understanding of the changes in our academic environment as well as gain a better awareness of the day-to-day culture in our school. The lower 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.

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. In collaboration with Beginning with Children Foundation and Bronx Charter School of Excellence, this past summer twenty of our alumni and rising 8th graders attended the STEM and Shakespeare Program at Colgate University. 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.

We were also proud to bid farewell to our 4th graduating class of 47 scholars. Eighty percent of CPCS 8th grade students (38 out of 47) were placed at high schools with greater than 75% four graduation rates. We were also proud to announce that one of our alumnus was accepted to several Ivies and M.I.T. and has matriculated to Harvard University this fall.

As we look ahead to the 2015-16 school year, we are hopeful that Community Partnership Charter Middle School will continue to be a school that fosters academic achievement that provides opportunities to our scholars and families.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

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

BACKGROUND

Brief narrative discussing English language arts curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the English language arts program or staff prior to or during the 2015-16 school year.

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. Non-fiction 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 2015 -2016, CPCS began its third year of the process to fully overhaul its approach to teaching reading. CPCS selected the Journeys Common Core literacy program developed by Houghton Mifflin in grades K-4. 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.

All lower school teachers prepared for Journeys Common Core instruction during our 2015 Summer Institute where they participated in hands on professional development conducted by Bronx Excellence and Journeys' Consultants. Teachers were able to delve into the curriculum unit by unit and review all components of the program. 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.

CPCS also continued to implement the STEP assessment program PK-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 and miscues. 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, literacy teachers continued to work in collaboration with literacy consultant Isoke Nia for the beginning portion of the 2015-2016 year. Journeys Common Core was continued in the 5th grade curriculum mapping that began three years prior. At the same time, the other middle school ELA teachers worked to further concretize common core planning for their respective grades. With the Journeys Common Core Response to Intervention (RTI) materials, CPCS also began to enhance its intervention program for "at-risk" students. The Journeys curriculum included a multi-tiered system of support for struggling students. CPCS general and special education teachers were tasked with addressing three levels of intervention; Tier I supplements the core curriculum with small group support using leveled readers and guided instruction, Tier II combines the core curriculum and small group instruction for students who are at least one year behind with a Write-In Reader that scaffolds the development of vocabulary, phonics and decoding, and Tier III provides supplemental instruction for students who need intensive intervention. On Tier III teachers utilize a Literacy Tool kit that supports instruction in phonics and word study, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension. The kit assesses and prescribes instruction and offers practice and application to ensure mastery. This three tiered intervention system was an addition to the CPCS intervention work. It enhanced our ability to refine our approaches to targeted and intensive support for "at-risk" students.

By midyear, it was clear that curriculum co-developed by our teachers and consultant lacked the layered resources to support our "at-risk" students. Our curriculum effectiveness audit also earthed other challenges that limited our abilities to systematically appraise what skills and strategies students had mastered at the end of units. It was necessary to shift to a more comprehensive set of resources to support the teaching of reading and writing. In February, we transitioned to Houghton Mifflin's *Collections* for grades 6-8. *Collections* was Common Core aligned and presented standards based lessons, units, tasks, and assessments. *Collections* uses a multi-faceted approach to reading in which scholars use close-reading to maneuver through complex texts. All teachers in grades 6 through engaged in an onboarding professional development conducted by *Collections* consultants prior to roll out. Teachers began creating scope and sequence and sculpting the end of unit tasks and assessments. Teachers also structured ways to implement the intervention component of *Collections* to ensure that all students would meet expectations. They also have begun to gain experience with progress monitoring through formative and summative assessments in the program.

This year teachers also experienced an increase in both the frequency and consistency of coaching by a consultant and/or a school leader. There was continued emphasis on weekly observation and feedback cycle. We also utilized common planning time (midday on Tuesdays/Thursdays) to delve into content or to parse through individual class and student performance data. Teachers created SMART Goals to inform instruction and to identify scholars who needed additional resources to improve productivity.

CPCMS continued the use of Fountas and Pinnell (F&P) Benchmark Assessment System 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 for the academic year. Each scholar's goal is to increase three F & P levels by the end of the academic year. F&P allows scholars to choose books on their independent reading level to increase engagement and decrease frustration. This allowed teachers the opportunity to address a scholar's specific needs as it may have related to errors in their F&P assessment. Teachers used the data to plan instruction for guided reading groups and classroom instruction.

Guided Reading, embedded in both Journeys and Collections, is the most significant teaching practice to ensure scholar growth in reading fluency and comprehension. Guided reading groups were created to be flexible and generally pushed teaching at the students' frustration level. However, this year there was greater emphases placed on familiarizing teachers and students with both the construct and strategies of the concept. At times, teachers placed scholars in similar leveled groups or heterogeneous groups based skill deficits. Within this segment of the day, teachers also utilized centers/stations in which they provided scholars with the opportunity to practice deficit or enrichment skills. Groups of 5-8 students rotated each station for 15-20 minutes working on carefully selected activities.

In 2015-2016, we will continue to build on developing skills and efficiencies with the curricular programs we have selected. We will also continue to develop teacher effectiveness with teaching the reading skills and strategies as well as addressing learning deficiencies that emerge throughout the year.

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 2016. 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).

2015-16 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	44			2		46
4	50			1		51
5	47			1		48
6	59					59
7	44			1		45
8	45			2		47
All	289			7		296

[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

RESULTS

Overall, 34 percent of grade 3-8 students in at least their second year at CPCS achieved proficiency levels on the NYS ELA exam in the 2015-16 school year. 28 percent of total 3-8 students scored at levels 3 and 4.

Performance on 2015-16 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	30%	44	34%	32
4	16%	50	19%	36
5	19%	47	19%	31
6	22%	59	29%	34
7	39%	44	50%	30
8	47%	45	49%	43
All	28%	289	34%	206

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure as fewer than 75 percent of the cohort students scored at standards 3 and 4.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Overall, students in at least their second year improved by 9 percentage points in ELA after a five-point dip in 2013-14.

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	43%	42	22%	37	34%	32
4	17%	47	17%	35	19%	36
5	30%	40	14%	35	19%	31
6	20%	41	36%	25	29%	34
7	35%	34	19%	47	50%	30
8	36%	36	47%	32	49%	43
All	30%	240	25%	211	34%	206

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

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 2015-16 English language arts AMO of **104**. 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 CPCS ELA Performance Level Index of 100 fell just short of the target AMO of 104.

English Language Arts 2015-16 Performance Level Index

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
289	28	44	22	6

PI	=	44	+	22	+	6	=	72
				22	+	6	=	28
						PLI	=	100

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure.

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 local school district.

METHOD

A school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. 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]

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

[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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

RESULTS

Although CPCS did outperform the local district in three of the six grades, overall CSD #13 did have 37% proficient in ELA versus CPCS' 34%.

2015-16 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 #13 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	34%	32	47%	1016
4	19%	36	44%	1001
5	19%	31	38%	903
6	29%	34	24%	668
7	50%	30	27%	688
8	49%	43	30%	666
All	34%	206	37%	4942

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure. Our grades 7 and 8 performed best with 50% and 49% at levels 3 and 4.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Both the district and CPCS increased levels of proficiency in 2015-16.

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 Local District Students					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	43%	30%	22%	30%	34%	47%
4	17%	31%	17%	33%	19%	44%
5	30%	33%	14%	30%	19%	38%
6	20%	17%	36%	18%	29%	24%
7	3%	17%	19%	17%	50%	27%
8	36%	20%	46%	20%	49%	30%
All	30%	25%	25%	25%	34%	37%

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.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

Overall the effect size for grades 3-8 in ELA was 0.01 for CPCS. Only grade 7 achieved an effect size greater than 0.3 in 2014-15.

2014-15 English Language Arts 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	73.3	44	18	24.8	-6.8	-0.48
4	68.9	40	18	26.9	-8.9	-0.66
5	85.1	44	16	17.0	-1.0	-0.08
6	68.4	34	26	24.2	-1.8	0.12
7	86.5	51	18	14.4	3.6	0.32
8	62.5	32	47	31.0	16.0	1.01
All	75.4	24.5	22.5	22.3	0.2	0.01

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
Slightly higher than expected

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure using data from 2015-16.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

ELA scores declined in 2014-15, which explains the low effect size. We look forward to seeing how the score improvements in 2015-16 affect the analysis results.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2012-13	3-8	74	271	23.6	22.3	0.08
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

Goal 1: Growth Measure[4]

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 2014-15 and also have a state exam score from 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 score are ranked by their 2014-15 score 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[5]

RESULTS

The overall Mean Growth Percentile in 2014-15 ELA is 44.1, falling below the statewide median of 50.0. Only grades 7 and 8 were above 50 in 2014-15.

2014-15 English Language Arts Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	29.5	50.0
5	36.4	50.0
6	48.8	50.0
7	52.2	50.0
8	54.3	50.0
All	**44.1**	50.0

[4] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

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

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

2014-15 marked the first year that CPCS overall mean growth percentile came in under the statewide median.

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

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Statewide Median
4	55	58.5	29.5	50.0
5	40	54	36.4	50.0
6	54	53	48.8	50.0
7	54	61	52.2	50.0
8	54	48	54.3	50.0
All	**51**	**54.9**	**44.1**	50.0

SUMMARY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS GOAL

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

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 Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state English language arts exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Did Not Achieve
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 local school district.	Did Not Achieve
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.	Did Not Achieve
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.	Did Not Achieve

ACTION PLAN

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to maintain or improve academic performance based on the *specific results* associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts or sub-populations.

Data from our performance on the state ELA exam continues to inform our strategic planning for ELA curriculum and instruction and professional development. We have already contracted ongoing PD for the 2016-2017 school year with Literacy consultants including and University of Chicago Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress (S.T.E.P.) as well as immersed a number of teachers and leaders in more comprehensive literacy training through Irene Fountas at Lesley University.

The combination of newly enrolled students and newly employed teachers support our ongoing strategic plans to review, revise and re-launch teaching and learning initiatives K-8. Prior to Summer Institute, teachers and leaders examined both state and internal assessments data as well as data points we collected about the impact of the adult and student culture on our school's effectiveness. Out of those conversations emerged sets of recommendations that would shape the focus of this year Summer Institutes. While the recommendations were broad they spoke to the need for a school that lived up to its name, Community Partnership. All stakeholders want to re-imagine a school in which great instruction happens in every class, every day. They also want to be trained to ensure that they can deliver at the highest levels. Finally, they wanted the students to learn, to be celebrated and to be true stewards of their community with and outside of the school building.

We outlined several focus areas and have begun to heighten engagement, development/training and to design plans for monitoring and adjusting in real time at both the lower and middle school campuses. First, we agreed to tighten Tier 1 Instruction to ensure solid Implementation of Journeys or Collections' curriculum. At the lower school there is a newly adopted "First Twenty Days" initiative aimed at focusing both teachers and students on reader and writer expectations. There will also be an emphasis on coaching teachers to effectively teach the seven reading strategies. Our state exam and internal assessment data indicate that students have not sufficiently mastered these strategies. For example, they display significant deficiencies with inferring and summarizing as well as with referencing appropriate details in texts. We will utilize our guided reading blocks to target small groups displaying similar gaps at every level of our reading continuum. We will also fortify our reading instruction to help scholars successfully navigate through grade level texts with accuracy, fluency and increased comprehension. We recognize the delicate balance this dichotomy presents but both Journeys and Collections provides resources that will support our strategy. Both anthologies provide both grade level texts (excerpts of books, articles, passage) and leveled readers that enables teachers to support readers who are at-risk or significantly below the grade level expectations. They also include close reading that supports our abilities to teach scholars how to strategize, comprehend, and write complete written responses to complex grade level text with the use of the RACE strategy.

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.

Secondly, 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 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 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 student mastery of the skills in a unit and students will have multiple ways to demonstrate their learning.

Thirdly, we agreed that it will be essential for all teaching decisions to be grounded in data. Data driven instruction only happens if we produce frequent and ongoing assessments. Teachers will use exit tickets, STEP benchmarks, Journeys/Collections units and benchmark assessments & Rally mock assessments to reflect, reteach, and regroup students for success. This focused/differentiated approach will limit the number of students who have traditionally fallen behind because lessons were not resonating in the ways they were being taught. The middle school will also launch their *Who's Our Ten Initiative*? This initiative asks *all staff members* to closely monitor as well as strategically plan for the growth of 10 scholars towards mastery. Teachers will analyze various data points and devise a plan of action to maintain/increase the performance levels of at least 10 students towards proficiency and mastery in ELA and math.

Finally, we are renewing our focused on tier II and III instruction. We have inconsistently served our SETSS students beyond the CTT model. This year we have secured skilled practitioners on both campuses and have rolled out comprehensive SETSS services. We have also scheduled supplemental "at-risk" support periods and will be better able to track those students' progress over the course of the year.

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

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

BACKGROUND

Brief narrative discussing mathematics curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the mathematics program or staff prior to or during the 2015-16 school year.

CPCS 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 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
- 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 also completed its 3rd official year using Math in Focus, Singapore math curriculum. Our math team comprised of three content teachers, four ICT teachers and one assistant teacher. Sixty percent of the team was new to teaching using the "Math in Focus" model, and two members of the team were in their first year of teaching. 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. 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. 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, we created a 30 minute block titled "Action Planning," which met 3 times a week across all grades. During this time students used the Accelerated Math program published by Renaissance Learning. It is a software tool used to customize assignments and monitor progress in math for students in grades 1–12. The Accelerated Math software creates individualized assignments aligned with state standards and national guidelines, scores student work, and generates reports on student progress. We used Accelerated Math in an effort to provide targeted skill review for all students across grade levels.

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 dash board 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 questions quiz was prepared using questions from previous years CCLS state exams and the NY Ready Test Prep resources. This 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. Pre and Post Assessment preparation was conducted as well as 1 -2 projects/performance task being assigned in each unit to assure students ability to apply skills and concepts in 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.

MATHEMATICS

METHOD

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in 3rd through 8th grade in April 2016. 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.

2015-16 State Mathematics Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested[6]				Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	Refused	
3	46			0		46
4	51			0		51
5	47			1		48
6	58			1		59
7	44			1		45
8	46			1		47
All	292			4		296

RESULTS

32 percent of CPCS students enrolled in at least their second year scored at levels 3 and 4 on the NYS Math exam. Grade 3 performed best with 37% coming in at proficiency levels.

[6] 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

Performance on 2015-16 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	28%	46	38%	32
4	24%	51	31%	36
5	26%	47	32%	31
6	28%	58	35%	34
7	23%	44	30%	30
8	24%	46	26%	43
All	25%	292	32%	206

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Scores came in slightly lower in math this year as compared to previous years' results.

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	66%	41	49%	37	38%	32
4	49%	47	57%	35	31%	36
5	20%	40	34%	35	32%	31
6	39%	41	48%	25	35%	34
7	12%	34	17%	47	30%	30
8	33%	36	19%	32	26%	43
All	38%	239	36%	211	32%	206

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.

MATHEMATICS

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 2015-16 mathematics AMO of 101. 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.[7]

RESULTS

The math PLI calculates to 93, below the target AMO set at 101.

Mathematics 2015-16 Performance Level Index (PLI)

Number in Cohort	Percent of Students at Each Performance Level			
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
292	34%	41%	21%	5%

PI	=	41	+	21	+	5	=	67
				21	+	5	=	26
						PLI	=	93

EVALUATION

CPCS did not meet this metric.

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 local school district.

METHOD

A school compares the performance of tested students enrolled in at least their second year to that of all tested students in the surrounding public school district. 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.[8]

RESULTS

CPCS outperformed the local school district in math, with 32% proficient versus their 30%.

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

[8] 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.

MATHEMATICS

2015-16 State Mathematics 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 #13 Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	38%	32	42%	1022
4	31%	36	40%	1014
5	32%	31	36%	906
6	35%	34	23%	664
7	30%	30	16%	689
8	26%	43	9%	558
All	32%	206	30%	4853

EVALUATION

CPCS achieved this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

CPCS has performed better overall than the local district #13 for the past three years.

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					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	66%	34%	49%	37%	38%	42%
4	49%	33%	57%	31%	31%	40%
5	20%	33%	34%	36%	32%	36%
6	39%	20%	48%	16%	35%	23%
7	12%	12%	17%	16%	30%	16%
8	33%	9%	19%	7%	26%	9%
All	38%	24%	36%	26%	32%	30%

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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

RESULTS

In 2014-15, the CPCS math performance yielded an effect size of 0.33, higher than expected to a meaningful degree.

2014-15 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	73.3	44	43	35	8.0	0.43
4	68.9	40	53	36.9	16.1	0.93
5	85.1	44	34	26.6	7.4	0.40
6	68.4	34	38	31.6	6.4	0.34
7	86.5	51	18	17.4	0.6	0.04
8	62.5	32	19	18.7	0.3	0.02
All	75.4	245	34.0	27.5	6.4	**0.33**

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
Higher than expected to a meaningful degree

EVALUATION

CPCS achieved this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

CPCS has had an effect size greater than 0.3 for the past three years.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch/ Economically Disadvantaged	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2012-13	3 -8	74	271	30.3	23.5	0.40
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

Goal 2: Growth Measure[9]

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 2014-15 and also have a state exam score in 2013-14 including students who were retained in the same grade. Students with the same 2013-14 scores are ranked by their 2014-15 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 2015-16 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2014-15 results, the most recent Growth Model data available.[10]

RESULTS

In 2014-15, the CPCS mean growth percentile for grades 4-8 averaged to 44.2, less than the statewide median.

[9] See Guidelines for Creating a SUNY Accountability Plan for an explanation.

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

2014-15 Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile	
	School	Statewide Median
4	38.2	50.0
5	28.7	50.0
6	67.3	50.0
7	38.9	50.0
8	55.4	50.0
All	44.2	50.0

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Although CPCS did improve math scores and outperform the district in 2015-16, the growth has been below the statewide median through 2014-15.

Mathematics Mean Growth Percentile by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Mean Growth Percentile			
	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Statewide Median
4	47	54.5	38.2	50.0
5	46	30.5	28.7	50.0
6	39	47	67.3	50.0
7	51	44.5	38.9	50.0
8	18	42	55.4	50.0
All	42	43.7	44.2	50.0

SUMMARY OF THE MATHEMATICS GOAL

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

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.	**Did Not Achieve**
Absolute	Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the state mathematics exam will meet that year's Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	**Did Not Achieve**
Comparative	Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least	**Achieved**

	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 local school district.	
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.	**Achieved**
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.	**Did Not Achieve**

ACTION PLAN

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to maintain or improve academic performance based on the *specific results* associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts or sub-populations.

Data from our performance on the state Mathematics exam continues to inform our strategic planning for our Mathematics curriculum, instructional practices and professional development. Both internal and state exams highlight student struggles with basic number sense across all grade and fraction operations particularly in 7th and 8th grades. 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.

Like in ELA, the combination of newly enrolled students and newly employed teachers require that we review, revise and re-launch our strategic plans for teaching and learning. Prior to 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 release item skill analysis from the state exams we will make adjust 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:

- Increase scholar engagement through hands-on learning experiences during math (i.e. use of manipulatives and other math tools)
- Build scholars ability to critically think and respond to single and multi-step word problems through EYT questions (Explain Your Thinking)
- Employ "parallel-teaching" as the primary form of co-teaching to ensure scholars are receiving more targeted instruction in smaller groups for core subjects
- Use current data to identify at-risk students for targeted small group instruction from the start of the school year
- Implemented 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
- 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
- Plan to continue to use math unit assessment data to drive instructional decisions
- Continue collaborating with Marshall Cavendish professional development to deepen educator understanding of the Math in Focus approach, strategies and resources for differentiation
- Provide ongoing weekly coaching and professional development and coaching for all teachers

Secondly, we believe there is a need to tighten Tier 1 Instruction to ensure solid Implementation 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. We will emphasize that teachers will utilize a new pedagogical approach to help to build student mastery. All 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.

Thirdly, we will continue to hold steadfast to the practice that all teaching decisions are grounded in data. Data driven instruction only happens if we produce frequent and ongoing assessments. Teachers will use daily exit tickets, Math in Focus unit & benchmark assessments and our Rally mock state exam assessment to reflect, reteach, and regroup students for success. This

focused/differentiated approach will limit the number of students who have traditionally fallen behind because lessons were not resonating in the ways they were being taught. Like in ELA, the middle school will utilize their *Who's Our Ten Initiative*? This initiative asks *all staff members* to closely monitor as well as strategically plan for the growth of 10 scholars towards mastery. Teachers will analyze various data points and devise a plan of action to maintain/increase the performance levels of at least 10 students towards proficiency and mastery in ELA and math.

Finally, we are renewing our focused on tier II and III instruction. We have inconsistently served our SETSS students beyond the CTT model. This year we have secured skilled practitioners on both campuses and have rolled out comprehensive SETSS services. We have also scheduled supplemental "at-risk" support periods and will be better able to track those students' progress over the course of the year.

MATHEMATICS

MATHEMATICS

MATHEMATICS

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

CPCS students will become proficient in Science.

BACKGROUND

Brief narrative discussing science curriculum, instruction, assessment and professional development at the school and any important changes to the science program or staff.

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 2015. 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

79 percent of students in grade 4 performed at proficiency on the science exam, whereas 67 percent did so in grade 8. Overall, 73% of students scored at levels 3 and 4 on the NYS science exam.

Charter School Performance on 2015-16 State Science Exam
By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	All Charter School Students		Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	78%	49	79%	34
8	63%	46	67%	43
All	71%	95	73%	77

EVALUATION

CPCS did not achieve this measure.

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Although grade 4 achieved greater than 75%, the CPCS NYS Science scores dipped in 2015-16.

SCIENCE

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	98%	47	100%	32	79%	34
8	71%	35	69%	32	67%	43
All	87%	82	84%	64	73%	77

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 local school district.

METHOD

The school compares tested students enrolled in at least their second year to all tested students in the surrounding public school district. 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 local school district.

RESULTS

District results pending release.

2015-16 State Science Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent Proficient	Number Tested	Percent Proficient	Number Tested
4	79%	34	TBD	
8	67%	43	TBD	
All	73%	77	TBD	

EVALUATION

TBD

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Historically, CPCS has outperformed the local district in science.

SCIENCE

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					
	2013-14		2014-15		2015-16	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
4	98%	82%	100%	81%	79%	TBD
8	71%	40%	69%	43%	67%	
All	87%	62%	84%	65%	73%	

SUMMARY OF THE SCIENCE GOAL

Present a narrative providing an overview of which measures the school achieved, as well as an overall discussion of its attainment of this Accountability Plan goal.

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.	Did Not Achieve
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 local school district.	N/A

ACTION PLAN

Narrative explaining what specific steps the school will take to improve or maintain academic performance based on the specific results and patterns associated with this goal, focusing in particular on strategic interventions including providing enhanced support or program revisions for explicit grades, cohorts, or student sub-populations based on the data presented.

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 work to align the standards with the curriculum as well as participate in professional development to deepen their facility with program expectations.

CPCS science specialists will continue to implement science in grades 5-8 and strengthen our core science instruction in seventh and 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 elective Earth Science Regents class during first period Monday through Thursday.

SCIENCE

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 BwCF's Doctors for a Day program and 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
2013-14	Good Standing
2014-15	Good Standing
2015-16	Good Standing