

**OUR WORLD NEIGHBORHOOD CHARTER SCHOOL
SECOND YEAR INSPECTION REPORT**

I. INTRODUCTION

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

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

II. CONDUCT OF THE VISIT

The inspection of Our World Neighborhood Charter School was conducted on January 29-30, 2004 by an independent team of experienced educators from SchoolWorks, Beverly, MA.

Dr. Karen Laba, Director of Resource Development, SchoolWorks: Karen is a former middle and high school science teacher, preservice science teacher educator and supervisor, and consultant in accountability system design and implementation for SchoolWorks.

Aretha Miller, Project Manager, SchoolWorks : Aretha is an eight year veteran special education teacher in the Boston Public Schools and the former curriculum coordinator for an alternative education program that provides services for at-risk and out-of school youth throughout Massachusetts..

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

Emilys Peña, School Quality Review Consultant, SchoolWorks: Emilys worked for Boston Public Schools for 10 years as a bilingual special needs teacher for grades K-6, a literacy specialist at the middle school level, and at the high school level as Assistant Headmaster in charge of Teaching and Learning. Mrs. Peña has been involved as a teacher and principal of numerous summer programs targeting students who wish to gain entrance

into Boston Exam Schools. She has worked as a consultant for SchoolWorks for over 2 years conducting charter school inspections in Massachusetts and New York, as well as reviews of underperforming and exemplary district schools.

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

This report is organized into two parts. *Part I: School Progress Report*, offers the team's judgments about the school's effectiveness at meeting the broad goals defined in the charter school law (Education Law §2850(2) (a-f)):

- improving student learning and achievement;
- increasing learning opportunities for all students (particularly students at risk of academic failure);
- encouraging the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- creating new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- expanding parental choice in public schools; and
- moving from a rule-based to performance-based accountability system by holding schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

The judgments of the team are organized into three categories: academic program, organizational viability, and unique programmatic areas. The framework for the progress report discussion is shown in **Appendix A**.

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

III. SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Our World Neighborhood Charter School is in its second year of operation, serving just fewer than 500 students in grades K-6. The school's charter was approved by the State University of New York Charter Schools Institute in 2001, but the school deferred opening for a year until 2002-2003 to continue facility plans and preparations.

Our World Neighborhood serves a diverse community from its location in Astoria, Queens. Its founders, parents of children in the area, determined to take advantage of the diversity of the

neighborhood to design a school that would focus on the elements of effective human communities as a central part of its academic program. To achieve that goal, the Board of Our World Neighborhood contracted with Mosaica Education, Inc., in part because of its proprietary Paragon curriculum, a comprehensive interdisciplinary curriculum incorporating geography, literature, music, the arts and history. For its core academic curriculum the school uses *Open Court Reading*, *SRA Mathematics* and *Science 2000* published by Harcourt Brace. The school's design also included plans to make use of technology to enhance learning and facilitate teaching. Each classroom has six computers with the software, Success Maker, installed. In many classes, students used the software program to practice basic skills as one of the 'centers' incorporated into their morning routines. Students begin instruction in Spanish in kindergarten.

The school is staffed by 21 classroom teachers, 3 administrators, 8 assistant teachers, one Special Education coordinator, one English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher, one music, one physical education, and one Spanish teacher. At the time of the inspection, class sizes in the 21 classrooms ranged from 19 to 27 students. Many of the kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 classrooms have an assistant teacher.

As a parent-founded school, Our World Neighborhood prides itself on welcoming parents to share in the education of their children. Regular "Paragon nights" provide frequent opportunities for parents to view the products of their child's exploration of some aspect of the Paragon curriculum. Parents volunteer to assist with the meals programs and in assisting classroom teachers.

The school identifies services for special education students and student behavior issues as their greatest challenges. The reorganization of the New York City Public Schools disrupted existing relationships with the administrators in District 30 with whom the school coordinated its testing and service provisions for students with special needs. New communications channels with Region 4 officials are only recently confirmed. Student behavior has been a concern since the school's opening as revealed in parent surveys and staff interviews. To address that challenge, the school hired a Dean of Students in November 2003 to implement systems to enhance the learning environment at the school.

Now completing the second year of its charter and its second year of operation, Our World Neighborhood Charter School is moving toward its academic and social goals by addressing its challenges and celebrating its successes with enthusiasm and commitment.

PART I: SCHOOL PROGRESS REPORT

I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

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

1. Students at Our World Neighborhood Charter School rank at or near the national mean on norm referenced tests, particularly at the early grades. Students entering O.W.N. in grades 4 and 5 rank below the national norm in reading but near the mean in mathematics. (See ITBS table, Question 2). Seventy-two percent of the school’s fourth graders achieved Level 3 and above on the NYS Math Test in Spring 2003, while only 46% of the same group achieved that level in English Language Arts.

During the first year of the school’s operation, student attainment was measured using the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) in November 2002 and again in May, 2003. Follow-up yearly administration of the ITBS continued in October 2003. Results appear in the table under Question 2. The fall 02 column indicates students entering the school achieve at or near the national norm in reading in grades K, 1, and 3 and somewhat below in grades 2, 4 and 5. In mathematics, K students ranked well above the national mean, grades 1, 3 and 4 are at or near the mean, and students in grades 2 and 5 rank somewhat below the norm. As measured by comparison to a national sample, O.W.N. students display a range of achievement typical for the elementary grades.

Attainment of proficiency on the New York State ELA and Math tests varied for the O.W.N. fourth grade class of 2003. Mathematics achievement is strong, with 72 percent achieving Level 3 or Level 4, and only 28 percent below that standard. In ELA, however, fewer than half the fourth graders attained a Level 3 or above (46 percent), with 56 percent falling below the school’s target defined in its accountability plan (60 percent at or above Level 3).

New York State Tests: Math and ELA, Spring 03

NYSTP Math 05/03			NYSTP ELA 02/03		
	O.W.N.	Dist 30		O.W.N.	Dist 30
	%/ n	%		%/ n	%
Level 4	16%/ 8	25.5%	Level 4	11%/ 5	16.1%
Level 3	56%/ 28	48.3%	Level 3	35%/ 15	41.8%
Level 2	18%/ 9	19.4%	Level 2	44%/ 20	35.9%
Level 1	10%/ 5	6.7%	Level 1	11%/ 5	6.2%

O.W.N. n = 51; 50 students tested O.W.N. n= 54; 45 students tested

In comparison with students in District 30, O.W.N. almost matches the percentage of students at Level 3 or above in mathematics (72% for O.W.N.; 73.8% for District 30). O.W.N. students fall below the performance of their peers in District 30 in English Language Arts, with only 46 percent achieving Level 3 or 4, while 57.9 percent of students across the district attain that level of proficiency. The school’s data reports are in conflict with the state assessment reports, which

indicate the school enrolls 54 students at the time of the 2003 NYSTP Grade 4 ELA test. The school reports 50 students enrolled for this assessment. The school should offer an explanation of the confusion over the data and explain the status of any students not tested in ELA in 2003 along with its data presentation in the annual progress report.

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

1. During the school's first year and a half of operation, no strong patterns of gains or declines are evident in the standardized test results. Scores are not identified for continuing students so claims about the impact of school programs cannot be made with confidence.

As shown on the table below, reading scores for grade level groups within the same school year (F 02 to S 03) show strong increases for K students, slight increases for those in grade 1, 4 and 5, and declines in grades 2 and 3. Math scores show a similar within-year variation, with gains in grades 2 and 4, but declines, sometimes significant, in the other grades (K, 1, 3, and 5). While the fall to spring scores on the ITBS show strong gains, the team can not make a conclusive judgment because the scores are not valid due to the fact that the test is not designed to track student progress within a given school year.

The number of students tested in each grade level group are not identified in the school's data report so the change between years cannot be clearly attributed to school influence. According to interviews during the inspection visit, a number of students chose other placements between the end of year 1 (June 2003) and the start of the current school year. Across year changes, F 02 to F 03, show variability too disparate to be considered representative of a trend. For example, in mathematics, first graders tested in fall 02 scored at the 50th percentile, but when tested again as second graders, only ranked at the 39th percentile. However, second graders ranked at the 42nd percentile in fall 2002, but as third graders in fall 2003 scored at the 51st percentile. While reading performance among fourth graders on the spring 2003 ITBS approaches or exceeds the national norm, those scores do not correlate with the weak performance of those students on the NY State ELA Assessments. The conclusion of the team is that there is insufficient data to assert the influence of the academic program at Our World Neighborhood on student achievement.

ITBS Reading and Math, within year and across year (NCE)

	Reading				Math		
	F02	S03	F03		F02	S03	F03
Gr K	52.1	64.1	55		62.3	55.8	54
Gr 1	50.9	51.2	61		50.1	45.6	50
Gr 2	44.7	43.5	42		42.2	48.2	39
Gr 3	49.6	45.2	52		52.6	44.5	51
Gr 4	39.5	40.6	50		48.8	49.6	47
Gr 5	33.3	34.8	49		41.7	39.9	53
Gr 6			42				41
Ave	45.02	46.57	50.1		49.6	47.3	47.8

** the 'n' for each group is not reported*

- 2. There are no internal assessment measures at O.W.N. that have been systematically applied to allow their use to measure attainment or progress over time. In its Accountability Plan, the school proposes only standardized measures for demonstrating its progress. Preliminary information from the use of Success Maker suggests it may offer a viable internal tracking tool for individual progress.**

During the inspection, staff members and school leaders referred to an interest in developing school portfolios as a tool to demonstrate growth in student achievement. At this point in the school's operations, they have not put into place a structured protocol for making use of collections of student work to monitor achievement at either the individual, classroom or school level.

In the school's design, the use of technology to monitor student progress is listed as a unique characteristic. For the 03-04 school year, the school has begun using Success Maker, a software collection for use by students. Teachers can extract reports from the program to monitor student progress toward pre-defined goals. During interviews at the inspection, only one teacher expressed confidence in her ability to use this aspect of the program to get the report she wanted. While the tool has promise for allowing efficient monitoring of student progress, O.W.N administrators and staff have not begun to make use of its potential.

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

- 1. The commercial materials selected by the school for reading, mathematics, science and social studies form the de facto curriculum at the school. As written, the commercial products include a range of activities suitable for addressing the needs of diverse students. However, as implemented, the programs at O.W.N. are limited in their attention to diverse student abilities or interests.**

Our World Neighborhood uses the *Open Court* Reading series for literacy, *SRA Mathematics* and Prentice Hall *Mathematics*, Harcourt Brace *Science 2000*, and the Mosaica *Paragon* programs as their curriculum. In interviews with the inspectors, the Program Director, Special Education Director and several teachers agreed that the *Open Court* and *SRA Mathematics* are not suitable for students with special educational needs. Staff members claimed that the pacing of the programs within the classroom is too fast for students with learning challenges.

The *Paragon* program is designed to offer a broad range of opportunities for students of varying abilities to access the content of the curriculum. At O.W.N., *Paragon* lives up to its promise in the primary grades (K-2) with its numerous projects and activities designed to allow students to translate what they learn about other cultures into experiences they can simulate in their own classes. During the inspection, second graders were creating 'ponchos' like the Incas to demonstrate how Inca children would stay warm in their mountainous climate. Displays in hallways and classrooms included dioramas, graphic representations of nomadic living, and artistic depictions of behaviors and traditions in different cultures.

According to samples of student work, interviews with teachers and students, and visits to classes, Paragon lessons become more text based at the upper elementary grades (3-6). Work products from the upper grades students often included worksheets asking students to fill in details from their reading. In class, students explained they read and answer questions from the text. They expressed preference for projects and noted regret that they don't have as many opportunities to do them in the upper grades. Both the ESL Director and special education director commented that the text focus makes the Paragon curriculum less accessible to students with language or learning challenges, requiring extensive intervention for weaker students. In one class visited during the inspection, a student with limited English proficiency was observed struggling to figure out the instructions for the Paragon lesson and was unable to comprehend the reading she was assigned.

A quick overview of the fourth grade mathematics book revealed that it does not appear to offer sufficient practice in the broad range of learning defined in the New York State Learning Standards. For example, there are two brief sections on probability and statistics which seem to only briefly address the NY learning standards under *Uncertainty*: “. . . determine the reasonableness of results; predict experimental probabilities; make predictions using unbiased random samples; and determine probabilities of simple events.” (*NYS Learning Standards, Mathematics, Science and Technology, Elementary level*). A survey of the cumulative assessment in the end of the textbook includes few problem solving situations using manipulatives or applications of mathematics to real-world situations, a key expectation of the state standards. There are no questions asking students to derive a solution and explain their reasoning in writing.

Fourth grade teachers confirmed that they have noted weaknesses in the mathematics program and have supplemented the program with other materials. One tool they use to supplement the math program is Success Maker, the software program referenced earlier. While their recognition of the current weaknesses is commendable, there is no structured analysis of the gaps in concepts and skills between the existing materials and student learning needs. For example, O.W.N. student performance is strong in mathematics, but weaker in English language arts. Attention to the deficiencies that may exist in the reading program were not mentioned or discussed directly by school leaders or management company advisors.

2. There is widespread expression at the school of the inability of Our World Neighborhood to serve the needs of students with educational or behavioral challenges or language limitations.

In interviews with Board members, administrators and teachers, the inspection team heard frequent claims that the school has neither the financial nor the space resources to serve the needs of students with special challenges, in contrast with plans presented in the school's charter application for serving the range of students expected to enroll at the school. Comments from the Program Director and teachers that the curriculum pace does not serve special education students were corroborated by the Special Education director. Observations in classrooms where 'centers' were the primary instructional strategy revealed that students were expected to complete the same task at each station with little individualization and little oversight by the classroom teacher, who was occupied with the small group instruction at one of the other

stations. Teachers assert that the 20 minutes or so with each small group is an opportunity to customize instruction to meet the needs of students who struggle with the content.

English language learner services are offered in a pull-out setting with the ELL coordinator. Again, in contrast with plans provided in the charter application, there is no apparent curriculum for that population of students, nor is there a systematic process for identifying students with language needs. According to school personnel, parents are invited to provide the school information about students' learning needs at enrollment on the registration form, but the inspectors wondered whether parents of limited English proficient students would be able to complete the form which is provided only in English.

Students with Individual Education Programs are provided services in both a pull out and push in methods, but only one teacher is available to support the students. On 2002-2003 BEDS form, the school reported 11 students with IEPs. In addition they reported 16 students as English Language Learners. These numbers suggest insufficient staff to support the needs of the students with particular learning, behavior or language challenges. The Special Education director indicated eight referrals have been put forward in 2003-2004 and are awaiting action by the Committee on Special Education at the regional office of the New York City school district. The referral process has been more challenging this year due to the reorganization of the district and reassignment of roles and responsibilities within the New York City regional offices.

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

1. The curriculum at O.W.N. is appropriate and engaging and, if implemented well, could provide a challenging learning opportunity for students.

In the 19 classes visited during the inspection, more than 12 revealed students engaged and involved in the lesson activities. In classes using 'centers,' there was occasional off-task behavior but for the most part students attended to their tasks with determination and purpose. The few less engaging classes were those with a whole class listening to teacher talking or waiting for classmates to answer a question or read a passage.

While the students were engaged and involved in their work, the level of work varied across the school. In general, in the primary grades students were being challenged to persist in their tasks, to revise and refine their efforts to meet the expectation set by the teacher. As an example, first grade student teams were given five minutes to write as many words beginning with a designated letter as they could recall. When some children began losing interest, the teacher strolled to the team and offered an enticing 'hint' that reinvigorated the team's efforts. Similar challenging and encouraging actions by teachers were observed in several grade K, 1, and 2 classes.

The 11 classes in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6 were more varied in their level of engagement and interest exhibited by students. The two 'book buddies' classes when upper grade students read to kindergarten 'buddies' and vice-versa were meaningful and worthwhile learning opportunities for students in both grades. In other classes, however, worksheets required merely recall

responses or, in mathematics, procedural work. There were few opportunities for students in grades 4, 5, and 6 to engage in high level discussion or to share alternative solutions to real-world problems as intended by the state standards. While teachers claimed tasks were aligned with the state standards, the alignment is between the topics covered in the standard and not the intricate cognitive processes, including ‘analyze,’ ‘interpret,’ and ‘construct,’ expected of students in the state documents.

Complementing the visits to the 19 classes during the inspection, the team examined 80 pieces of student work selected by the school to represent the range of products expected of students at Our World Neighborhood. The students from whom the work was selected were randomly chosen by the team from the master student list provided by the school. The random selection included special needs students, English language learners, as well as regular education students. The samples were examined for their appropriateness to the grade/ age, the expectation or challenge inferred from teachers’ assessment and feedback to students about the work, and the alignment with the state learning standards.

Judgments about the O.W.N. student work samples correlate closely with the observations of classes. In the primary grades overall, student work products reflected challenging material and appropriate expectations, with kindergarten students using invented spelling while teachers began correcting spelling and grammar on first and second grade papers. The young students were being asked to do a large amount of writing, for reader responses in English language arts as well as in Paragon classes. Science lessons also required written work in a free response style. In mathematics, students practiced following a ‘six step’ pattern for solving extended math problems. In Paragon, students were asked to write a creative story following the teacher’s story web presumably from class discussion. Comments on the work sample showed teacher correcting spelling and grammar, but not making comments on the creativity of the essay, the identified purpose of the lesson.

Samples from the upper elementary grades did not often include teachers’ assessments, so inferences about expectations for students are based on the demands of the assignment and the quality of the work. A number of samples for these students included a standard “book report” form, which listed four or five questions for which students had to enter a phrase or sentence in response. Many of the responses were literal repetitions of words from the book. Teachers explained that the book report form was developed to respond to the expectation listed in the NYS learning standard that students read a specified number of books per year. While the book report form serves as a suitable record of the number of books read by students, it does not serve as an appropriate demonstration of student’s ability to evaluate, make decision, or form opinions, as defined in the standards as desired outcomes from the students’ reading experiences.

In mathematics, student work samples focused almost entirely on operations – multiplying decimals, graphing functions, and calculating area. Paragon work samples ranged from simple – construct a timeline – to more challenging –write a response from a different character’s point of view. However, on many of the pieces of written work, there were few constructive comments from teachers making it difficult to determine the quality standards that were expected of students for acceptable work. The few science samples in the selections were appropriate to the grade and to the standards, but did not contain feedback from the teacher.

The overall assessment of the O.W.N. curriculum is that, while it ‘covers’ the topics identified in the state learning standards, there are few instances in the upper grades, beyond occasional Paragon projects, for students to engage in the depth of learning described by the full range of state learning standards. For example, there are seven standards in mathematics, science and technology, only one of which requires students to conduct accurate operations using numbers. However, the majority of mathematics instruction observed during the visit and examined in student work samples addressed this single standard. In English language arts, standard 3, “Language for Critical Analysis and Evaluation,” asks that students “read and form opinions”; “make decisions about the quality and dependability of texts”; and “evaluate strategies for reading. . .” Opportunities to develop these skills were not evident in class visits or in samples of student work provided for the inspector’s review.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY

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

1. Students in the focus group expressed approval of the school and agreement that the school is ‘safe’ this year.

Fourteen students were gathered for the focus group during the inspection. Of those, 13 were in their second year at O.W.N. and one was new to the school in 03-04. Two students said the class work was “too easy” while the remainder declared it “challenging” or “just right.” One student struggled with homework, claiming to spend 4-5 hours per night.

Students declared that Paragon is the best part of the academic program, with teachers as a close second in the rank of the ‘best’ about O.W.N. When asked whether they feel safe at the school, they all agreed that the school is safe. The returning students explained that the climate is calmer and safer this year. The message and intention of school leaders to create a positive learning environment was clear to students as a result of strong actions including the addition of a dean of students for 2003-2004.

Students’ comments about school safety were confirmed by comments from Board representatives, administrators and teachers. The school claims that the first year of operation (02-03) attracted a number of students with significant behavior problems to the school, a number of whom were encouraged to find other placements since O.W.N. had insufficient resources to serve the needs of students needing substantially separate placement due to emotional or behavioral concerns. Adults also confirmed students’ assessment that the current school year is calmer than the previous year. The inspectors interviewed the Dean of Students hired in November, 2003. According to his estimates, he deals with approximately 30-50 referrals from teachers per week. There was insufficient time to explore the range of infractions for which students are referred to the Dean and whether this represents a quantitative improvement over the previous year.

2. Parent satisfaction as revealed in responses to the annual survey are generally strong. School enrollment for 03-04 was below expectations in the early grades.

Our World Neighborhood saw 67 percent of their parent surveys returned, a commendable rate. Ratings on a scale of 1-10 ranged from 6.5 (special education services) to 8.92 (feel welcome at the school). The three parents in the focus group enthusiastically confirmed that the school welcomes parent involvement in the education of their children. Two of the focus group parents had home schooled their children prior to enrolling them at O.W.N., indicating that their welcome involvement was a particular draw for them. (A number of respondents on the parent survey disagreed with the focus group parents, complaining that the principal was inaccessible and they felt unwelcome. Neither the focus group nor the surveys are representative of the larger parent population but their comments merit awareness of the differences in point of view.) The school earned strong ratings on the survey in the area of satisfaction with their child's primary teacher and communication with their child's teacher. Discipline practices earned weaker approval.

The open response items on the 2003 parent survey reveal the range of issues at O.W.N. which concern parents. The most prevalent are concerns about discipline and security. As described by students, Board members, and administrators, behavior issues occupied a great deal of time during the school's first year of operation. In addition to student to student infractions, lack of security at the building entrance was mentioned in at least 10 surveys. On the days of the inspection, team members were able to enter the building without challenge because the security person was away from the entry desk. We sought him out but noticed several other adults entering without drawing attention.

The lack of contact with teachers of the special subjects was raised in at least half a dozen comments on last year's surveys, as was the lack of challenge for bright students. Consistent with the low rating of special services on the first year surveys, several parents added narrative comments that hearing, speech and remedial reading services were not provided to their children. Several parents complained that the school had not kept its promise of providing an 'individualized' education for each child. These critical comments are an important checkpoint for the school to monitor.

While survey responses, both ratings and open responses, were generally favorable, the concerns raised by the respondents can serve as an indicator of issues needing school attention.

In their *2003 Accountability Progress Report*, the school asserts that the re-enrollment rate was "brisk" for the opening of the second year of operation. However, final enrollment for 03-04 was well below planned in grades K, 1, and 4. Instead of 100 students each in grades K and 1, only 89 enrolled in K and 92 in grade 1. Instead of the 75 expected for grade 4, only 61 students are enrolled. Overall the school is 30 students under enrolled for 03-04, raising financial challenges since the budget is projected on 100 percent enrollment. Without further investigation, it is not possible to affirm whether the under-enrollment is an indicator of lack of parent satisfaction or a product of other forces. The school proposes several factors including its extended school year as likely reasons for lower than expected numbers, but the team could not confirm or reject the school's claim.

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

- 1. The use of data to monitor individual or group progress is limited at O.W.N. At the present time, the focus of attention is on the results of the ITBS and state assessments, a limited source for tracking progress at the individual or classroom level.**

In the presentation of the school's performance in the *2003 Accountability Progress Report* for O.W.N., the authors of the progress report refer only to performance of students on the ITBS, a norm referenced test designed to rank students against a national sample of students of similar age, and to the performance of the small group of fourth graders at O.W.N. There is no presentation of information that describes how individual students are attaining expected skills on the state standards at other than the fourth grade tested year, or how students are improving their achievement within the school year. Teachers explained that they sometimes use rubrics to score essays and projects, but the scoring has not been systematized so that grades are comparable across the year or from year to year. The school indicates an interest in using portfolios as an assessment measure but has not created a protocol to move toward that goal.

- 2. Under the direction of the Board of Trustees, teachers, board members, administrators and parents engaged in an extensive review of school operations. Results of the review have become the basis for a school improvement plan designed to guide policy and program decisions.**

Toward the end of its first year of operation in spring 2003, committees of stakeholders (teachers, administrators, board members and parents) at O.W.N. conducted reviews of several areas of school operations and rated the school's performance on a scale of 0-5. For its progress in defining benchmarks for student performance, the committee rated the school a "0," a judgment confirmed by the inspectors' review of school practices. A similar rating (0 out of 5) was assigned for completion of Individual Improvement Plans for students, an original goal of the school. Separate committees rated implementation of Paragon, completion of a curriculum map, and professional development involvement a "2" on a scale of 0-5. Promotion and retention policies and definition of procedures for identifying at-risk students rated a score of 1 out of 5 from the committees studying these areas. Staff turnover was scored a "0" by the committee responsible for examining this aspect of school operations.

From the comprehensive review conducted spring 2003, the school identified at least five targets for 03-04, including hiring an additional Program Facilitator and Special Education staff. The school's progress report does not identify how progress toward these goals will be monitored and what response will be forthcoming should the targets not be accomplished.

The self-assessment process fostered by the Board is worthy of commendation, and should be complemented with explicit definition of actions, persons responsible, and regular, periodic benchmarks to monitor progress toward the school's worthy targets over the coming year.

- 3. Monitoring of the day to day implementation of curriculum relies on administrator review of weekly lesson plans and informal class visits by the program facilitator and principal. There is no school wide collection of classroom implementation data which the school can use to conduct analyses of the effectiveness of its academic programs.**

Teachers submit weekly lesson plans to the principal or to the Program Facilitator, who offer feedback to guide instruction. According to teachers, informal visits to classes complement the lesson plan review. While both activities are effective methods for monitoring instruction, school leaders have not begun collecting the information about instruction in a systematic way to allow them to identify trends and patterns linking classroom instruction to student performance/improvement. The school's data on day to day implementation of instruction is limited to informal, anecdotal reports. Daily information accumulated over time would serve as a useful complement to the comprehensive review conducted last year by the Curriculum Subcommittee of the Board.

According to teachers interviewed during the visit, classroom instructional decisions are the responsibility of the individual teacher. While some grade level groups informally coordinate their planning and pacing, there is no requirement that teachers use common methods or instructional styles with their students. Teachers did report frequent sharing of ideas and materials within their grade level, though on an informal basis. The daily school schedule does not allow all teachers within each grade to meet during a common preparation time. Because of this limitation, grade four teachers have begun to meet weekly after school to coordinate the intensive work for their students to prepare for the New York State Assessments.

Teacher quality is assessed by monthly individual self-evaluations and by periodic formal observations by administrators. Experienced teachers are formally observed once per year and less experienced teachers receive two formal visits per year. Each month, teachers complete a self-assessment rubric covering four areas: professionalism, preparation, instruction/classroom management, and student achievement. The inspection team did not have an opportunity to explore the quality of evidence used by teachers to assess their own performance on each of the criteria included in the rubric. With thoughtful and careful use, the self-assessment rubric has the potential to be a valuable tool for identifying effective practices within the school.

III. UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREAS

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

- 1. There is a wide range of understanding about the mission and vision of Our World Neighborhood Charter School among members of the school community. Gaps exist**

between the understanding of the principles that serve as the basis of the school's purpose and the practices designed to achieve the school's ideals.

The most frequent phrases used by teachers, administrators and parents to describe the mission of O.W.N. is "meeting the needs of individual students" in a "safe and welcoming environment." Among teachers, the means by which they are expected to achieve the goal of meeting individual needs is through differentiated instruction. To most teachers, the use of 'centers' as defined by the Mosaica model, allows them to differentiate sufficiently to meet the needs of a diverse population.

Teachers as well as parents offered the belief that the school is designed to provide a safe and welcoming environment in which students can thrive and parents can participate actively in their child's education. Responses to the parent survey and comments from Board and administrators suggest that the first year at O.W.N. did not live up to that hope in all regards, but student and parent interviews assert that the current environment is much improved.

The written mission statement for O.W.N. does not include specific reference to meeting the needs of individual students, differentiated instruction or dedication to a safe and welcoming environment. Rather, the written mission offers the philosophical foundation of the design of the academic program at the school, namely its focus on leading children to understand "the interdependence of our world." To members of the inspection team, the differences in understanding of the purposes of the school appear closely linked to the roles and responsibilities of the speakers when asked to describe the vision. Teachers appropriately mentioned their responsibility to teach students who come from a diverse array of backgrounds. Parents, not unexpectedly, referred to their primary concern, namely the safety of their children and the availability for their involvement in their child's school experience. At this early stage in the school's operations, there is minimal concern about parent's tendency not to reference specific academic programs as unique elements of the school. As more opportunities are offered for parents to participate in Paragon Nights (demonstration of student's work on the Paragon interdisciplinary curriculum), hopefully parents will speak more confidently about the unique nature of the school's curriculum.

Gaps exist between teachers' understanding of the school's purpose and the practices in place to accomplish their goals. Almost every group of teachers described their responsibility for addressing individual student needs as central to their role at the school. As noted previously, grouping students for 'centers' is the strategy designed to allow individual attention. In the judgment of the inspectors, the implementation of the 'centers' strategy is insufficient at the present time to allow differentiation of the content and pace of instruction or variation in the ways students demonstrate learning.

A greater gap appeared between expectations stated as the school's ideal – attention to individual students' needs – and the school's ability to meet those needs. Each group of teachers, as well as Board representatives and administrators, commented that the school is poorly equipped to serve the needs of students with learning, behavior or language challenges. The school has a limited number of staff to service its population of English language learners and identified special needs students. It has recently hired a Dean of students to address students with persistent behavior

concerns. Board members lamented the lack of space and financial resources to provide more focused attention to students with different support needs. At the present time the community of staff and leaders at Our World Neighborhood are faced with the challenge of matching practices to ideals with limited time and resources.

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

- 1. Our World Neighborhood Charter School has made varied progress toward the targets comprising the unique design of its program: extended day and year; disruption-free morning for ELA; Spanish instruction for all students; pre- and post-testing; extensive technology; and extensive parent and community volunteer program.**

In the *2003 Accountability Progress Report*, O.W.N. defines each of the areas listed above as an important characteristic of the school. In its *Accountability Plan*, only two aspects are included as targeted measures for evaluation purposes: positive responses on annual parent surveys and high levels of parent involvement. The school has made varied progress toward demonstrating positive impact from each of these features,

Extended day and year: O.W.N. begins instruction two weeks prior to the start of the New York City public schools. According to school leaders, the school experienced high rates of absenteeism during the early start weeks since transportation was not available through the district. Since this was the first year the school opened early (the opening of school for 02-03, the first year of operation, was delayed by renovation work), the longer school year has not yet had an impact. In addition, the high absentee rate lowers the expectation that the longer year will increase learning time for students until transportation issues are resolved.

The school day at O.W.N. is scheduled to begin at 7:55 a.m. However, during the two days on site, the inspectors noticed a number of students arriving after the official starting time, some as late as 8:30 am. Teachers described the situation as 'typical' and several noted on their daily agenda that they plan 'morning work' for the first half hour, beginning focused instruction after the arrival of most students. If the high rate of tardiness observed during the inspection is typical, there is little likelihood that the earlier starting time will provide the additional learning opportunities implicit in the program's design.

Disruption-free morning for ELA: Due to a problem with scheduling for the gym classes, O.W.N. was unable to maintain its "disruption free morning" for ELA instruction. In addition to restricting the schedule for ELA, staffing problems limit the ability for the school to schedule common planning time for all teachers in a grade.

Spanish for all students: the school has successfully scheduled all students for Spanish instruction beginning with kindergarten.

Pre- and post-testing: The school has administered the ITBS at the beginning and end of each year of operation, providing pre-and post-test results for both continuing students and new

enrollees. As presented in its *2003 Accountability Progress Report* and discussed in section 1 of this report, students demonstrate near or above average achievement as measured with that assessment. Progress over time is mixed, with some groups improving and others declining during the course of their attendance at O.W.N. With only one year of data to review, inferences about the impact of the school's programs on student achievement are as yet unreliable. The school has not presented its pre and post assessment results by specific cohort group (continuing students only) and the success of efforts to meet specified improvement targets cannot be determined with reliability.

Extensive technology: In each class visited by the inspection team, computers were available and in many cases were in use by students. The Success Maker program was in use in at least six classes. Teachers and school leaders explained that the program has been available since the fall. To date, the school has not begun making use of the progress reports available from the program. Some teachers explained they had not yet learned how to access the information for either individual students or whole class summary. Based on the early stage of implementation of the technology tools, the goal proposed by the O.W.N. charter of using technology to make instructional planning more efficient for teachers has not yet been realized.

Extensive parent and community volunteer program: While the three parents attending the focus group affirmed they are welcome volunteers at the school, there is no systematic collection of volunteer information available for review to judge whether these parents are representative of the larger population. It is noted in Part II of this report that the school has omitted a report of its progress toward its efforts to achieve "70 percent attendance at conferences, 2 percent participation in parent teacher organization meetings, and a 10 percent volunteer rate for parents in classrooms" (*2003 Accountability Plan, page 6*). Until the evidence is gathered and presented by the school, a judgment about achievement of this unique aspect cannot be made.

PART II: SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN: ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERALL PROGRESS REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS:

The *O.W.N. Accountability Progress Report* includes several pages of information labeled “Background.” It is unclear to the reader how the data provided in the “Background” section relates to the required (or optional) Accountability Plan goals and measures. To make the document a meaningful presentation of the school’s progress toward required goals, the format should present performance toward the required goals first, with presentation of optional goals following. Clearly label the required goals, measures and progress and their relationship to the approved accountability plan.

I. ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS

Goal 1: All students attending the Our World Neighborhood charter School will become proficient readers of the English Language as demonstrated by the following measures:

Measure 1: Cohorts of students will show an annual increase of 3.0 NCE points in the Reading subsections of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills based on the spring testing cycle.

Measure 2: Sixty percent of fourth grade students who have been OWN students for at least two years will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State English Language Arts examination.

Measure 3: A higher proportion of OWN students in the Fourth and Eighth Grades who have been enrolled for at least two years, will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State English Language Arts Examination than comparable students in District 30.

Goal 2: All students attending the Our World Neighborhood Charter School will become proficient in the use of Mathematics as demonstrated by the following measures:

Measure 1: Cohorts of students will show an annual increase of 3.0 NCE points in the Mathematics subsections of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills based on the spring testing cycle.

Measure 2: Sixty percent of fourth grade students who have been OWN students for at least two years will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.

Measure 3: A higher proportion of OWN students in the Fourth and Eighth Grades who have been enrolled for at least two years, will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics Examination than comparable students in District 30.

Goal 3: All students attending the Our World Neighborhood Charter School will become proficient in the use of Science as demonstrated by the following measures:

Measure 1: Sixty percent of fourth grade students who have been OWN students for at least two years will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.

Measure 2: A higher proportion of OWN students in the Fourth and Eighth Grades who have been enrolled for at least two years, will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State Science Examination than comparable students in District 30.

Goal 4: All students attending the Our World Neighborhood Charter School will become proficient in their understanding of Social Studies as demonstrated by the following measures:

Measure 1: Sixty percent of fifth grade students who have been OWN students for at least two years will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.

Measure 2: A higher proportion of OWN students in the Fifth and Eighth Grades who have been enrolled for at least two years, will score on or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies Examination as compared with students in District 30.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Include the correct target from the approved accountability plan in the yearly progress report. The 2003 report mentions “50%” as the target throughout, whereas the approved plan cites “60%.”
2. Report the performance of cohorts of students, as defined in the *O.W.N. Accountability Plan*, on the measures specified in the plan. For example, the *2003 Progress Report* describes the performance of students sorted by classroom teacher rather than sorting by specific set of continuing students (cohort). Also, the *2003 Progress Report* provides information on the NYS ELA Assessments but not the mathematics test, except by disaggregated group.
3. Format the tables of results to allow the reader to see the comparisons indicated in the measure, i.e, compared to District 30 students. For example, the *2003 Progress Report* indicates the percentage of O.W.N. students at each performance level on the NYS ELA assessment, but provides only the “level 3 + level 4” total for District 30. The reader is not provided information about the “n” for O.W.N. or for District 30. In the letter from CSI accompanying the approved Accountability Plan, the school is advised to use the ‘similar schools’ for comparison as identified by New York State.

4. Provide the reader an explanation for the different numbers of students who took the ITBS language and math tests as reported in the *2003 Progress Report*.
5. The O.W.N. Accountability Plan calls for increases of 3 NCE points per year for each cohort of O.W.N. students enrolled for two or more years on the language total and mathematics total. On the 2003 Progress Report, only ‘core total’ NCEs are presented.
6. While it may be of use internally to disaggregate test results by teacher, it is not a measure defined in the approved accountability plan. Respect the privacy of teachers by deleting their names from public documents.
7. The statistics presented in the male/female disaggregation charts in the *2003 Progress Report* are misleading. There is no significant difference in the performance of males and females when the percentage of students of each gender within the fourth grade population is taken into consideration. The percentages reported in the progress report appear to indicate otherwise.
8. If the school is going to report results disaggregated by ethnicity, there should be a clear discussion of the interpretation O.W.N. staff and leaders make of the differences revealed by the disaggregation. The *2003 Progress Report* offers no conclusions about the differences suggested by the charts and graphs, nor does it offer an analysis of the reasons for disparity in achievement.
9. Reporting results by teacher is misleading if only one measure, taken at the end of the school year, is used. The reader has no indication of the variability of students in each class at the beginning of the school year, a major factor in determining the differences in impact of each teacher. Again, while sorting results by teacher may be a valuable internal tool, it is respectful of teachers to disguise their identity for public documents.
10. In 2004, O.W.N. will be able to report the results for students enrolled for two or more years for the first time. The *2004 Progress Report* should clearly distinguish and report the results for the continuing students as well as results for the fourth grade class as a whole.

II. ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY GOALS

Goal 1: By the end of the initial three year charter period (sic), the school will demonstrate that its students have exhibited positive behavior related to academic success.

Measure 1: For each year of school operation, average daily attendance will improve compared to the previous year, until it exceeds 90 percent of the average daily enrollment by the end of the third year of the charter.

Measure 2: For each year of school operation, the school will have fewer total reportable incidents than the average for all schools with the same grade configuration in the NYC schools.

Measure 3: Each year, at least 75 percent of the non-graduating student body will return to the school the following September, excepting those students whose residence has been moved.

Goal 2: By the end of the initial three year charter period, the school will demonstrate that it has strong market accountability.

Measure 1: Each year, the school will have at least enough students seeking admission to the school to have 90 percent of the maximum number of students allowed by the charter enrolled at the beginning of the school year.

Measure 2: Student attendance will be at least 85 percent of the enrollment throughout the charter period.

Measure 3: By the third year of school operation, the school will have a waiting list of students seeking admission.

ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS

1. To report average daily attendance, provide a chart for each month or quarter showing enrollment and attendance so the reader can corroborate the school's reported results.
2. To compare reported incidents of misbehavior with District 30 schools, provide raw data in table format to allow the reader to corroborate the school's claims. The *2003 Progress Report* indicates that "statistics were not calculated for the first year of operation," an omission that is not advisable when preparing for charter renewal.
3. To compare average daily attendance with that of NYC schools with "similar grade configuration," clearly identify the schools and their attendance information at several points throughout the year as well as the summary information at the end of the school year, if available.
4. Calculations of continuing students should be clear and convincing to the reader. O.W.N. should report the number of students in each grade at the end of June, and list the re-enrolling students for August/ September. Aggregate enrollees must be separated into re-enrolling and new entrants. It would enhance the school's claim of market interest if it would include a summary of reasons for student withdrawal or departure both during the year and over the summer.
5. To provide evidence of enrollment levels, it would help the reader if the school would provide actual enrollment for the school's Aug./ Sept. start and every month or quarter of the school year, along with waiting list by grade for the same time periods.

III. UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREA GOALS

Goal 1: By the end of the initial three year charter period (sic), the school will demonstrate that the parents of the students at the school are satisfied with the school's administration and educational program.

Measure 1: In a third party survey of parents of students who attend the school, at least 80 percent of the parent who return the survey will indicate satisfaction with the school's administration and educational program. Parent satisfaction will be determined by an average satisfaction rate of 7.5 out of 10 on a scale of 1- 10.

Measure 2: Success in the area of parent involvement will be determined by a rate of 70 percent attendance at conferences, a 2 percent participation rate in Parent Teacher Organization meetings, and a parent volunteer rate in classrooms of 10 percent of the parents will volunteer for more than one hour each quarter.

UNIQUE PROGRAMMATIC AREA GOALS—RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The school's proposed measure of 80 percent of respondents rating the school 7.5 or better on a survey scaled from 1-10 is complex to analyze. The *2003 Progress Report* offers only average ratings on key measures, showing a range of approval averages from 6.5 to 8.92. However, the school does not report what the range of scores was among the respondents. For example, if 100 respondents replied, and 80 of them scored 7 on each item, while 20 scored the school a 10, the average score would be 7.6. However, 80 percent would have rated the school LESS than 7.5, the minimum satisfaction target set by the school. O.W.N. leaders should consider revising the phrasing or the reporting of this measure, including using a median rather than an average of responses to allow the reader to make some judgments about the range of scores the school earned from its stakeholders.
2. Parent satisfaction survey results reviewed by the inspectors also included narrative responses which should be reported in summary form for the reader to provide a comprehensive picture of parent support for the school.
3. The *2003 Progress Report* omits any reporting of progress on measure 2 of its accountability plan. This omission is inadvisable in future progress reports. The *2004 Progress Report* should include number of parents, number of attendees at conferences, number participating in PTO meetings, and the number of hours and type of work provided by volunteers. The school should match the measures it reports to the measures defined in the accountability plan (i.e., hours per quarter).

ADDITIONAL GOALS FOR O.W.N. CHARTER SCHOOL

“Global student goals and outcomes.

“All students attending the Our World Neighborhood Charter School will be:

Goal 1: Self-directed individuals who

- Demonstrate life long learning skill
- Live a healthy lifestyle
- Demonstrate goal-directed behavior
- Accept responsibility for their behavior
- Demonstrate honesty and integrity
- Exercise high standards of attendance and punctuality

Measures:

- Increased graduation and promotion rates over district averages
- Increased student achievement
- Decrease in office referral from year to year

Goal 2: Effective thinkers and problem solvers who when presented with a problem actively find solutions by

- Thinking analytically and creatively
- Using inductive and deductive reasoning
- Examining issues from a wide variety of perspectives
- Identifying problems and employ appropriate strategies toward their solution
- Knowing how to locate, evaluate and apply information needed to solve a problem
- Using a scientific method of inquiry
- Using technology for production and problem solving

Measures:

- Increased performance on norm referenced assessments (ITBS)
- Evaluation of student projects and portfolios via the use of rubric assessments

Goal 3: Involve community members who:

- Demonstrate good citizenship
- Respect the rights and contributions of all people
- Take the initiative to improve local and global environments

Measures:

- Decrease in trend of student referrals to the office
- Increase in student attendance from year to year.”

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR GLOBAL STUDENT GOALS AND OUTCOMES

1. If the school wishes to include these additional measures, it should thoroughly and clearly report performance toward these targets. Goal 1 has clear measurable targets which can be presented in tabular form with comparisons to the sending district results.

2. Goal 2 measures are indirectly aligned with the measures listed. For example, use of the scientific method of inquiry cannot be measured with the ITBS, a multiple choice assessment. The school has not employed a coherent set of rubric assessments with which it can track student progress.
3. Goal 3 measures are similar to those in the accountability plan and can be presented in tabular form in the school's progress report.

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 the needs of diverse students?	Class visits, interviews, data review, Accountability Plan Progress Report
	Do the school's standards reflect the implementation of high academic expectations?	Review of curriculum documents, student work samples ; confirmation of implementation by class visits
Organizational Viability	Are students and parents satisfied with the work of the school?	Interviews, survey review
	Are systems in place to monitor the effectiveness of the academic program and to modify it as needed?	Personnel evaluation policies, minutes and agendas of board, staff meetings
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

APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR OUR WORLD NEIGHBORHOOD CHARTER SCHOOL

I. Academic Program Goals

Goal 1: All O. W. N students will become proficient readers	
Proposed Measures	Recommendations for the school to consider:
annual increase 3 NCEs on ITBS reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • use the correct percentage in progress report (60% vs 50%) • report actual cohorts of students who are continuing students at O.W.N. • aggregate scores by grade level not by teacher • format tables to allow clear presentation of comparisons with district • explain differences in numbers of students tested in language and math • present results on ITBS for reading subtest
60% O.W.N. score above Level 3 on NYS ELA	
higher proportion of O.W.N. student score above Level 3 on NYS ELA than District 30	
Goal 2: All O.W.N. students become proficient in the use of mathematics	
Proposed Measures	Recommendations for the school to consider:
annual increase 3 NCEs on ITBS math	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • present actual results for continuing cohorts of students • present results for math subtest not only “total battery” • explain disparity in achievement if scores disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, etc.
60% O.W.N. score above Level 3 on NYS Math	
higher proportion of O.W.N. student score above Level 3 on NYS Math than District 30	
Goal 3: All O.W.N. students become proficient in the use of science	
Proposed Measures	Recommendations for the school to consider:
60% O.W.N. score above Level 3 on NYS Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on all tests, report the results for all students tested in the grade as well as for continuing students (cohort)
higher proportion of O.W.N. student score above Level 3 on NYS Math than District 30	
Goal 4: . All O.W.N. students become proficient in the understanding of social studies	
Proposed Measures	Recommendations for the school to consider:
60% O.W.N. score above Level 3 on NYS Social Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • on all tests, report the results for all students tested in the grade as well as for continuing students (cohort)
higher proportion of O.W.N. student score above Level 3 on NYS Math than District 30	

II. Organizational Viability Goals

Goal 1: Demonstrate that students have exhibited positive behavior related to academic success	
Proposed Measures	Recommendations for the school to consider:
average daily attendance improve yearly until exceeds 90%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide attendance tables monthly as well as yearly calculations to show trends/ patterns in attendance • do not omit required measures in the progress report without compelling reasons • provide the reader complete enrollment information for June and re-enrollees in September to corroborate calculations presented in the progress report • provide information on reasons for students withdrawal
fewer reportable incidents than comparable NYC schools	
at least 75% will re-enroll (except graduating and moving out of area)	
Goal 2: Demonstrate that O.W.N. has strong market accountability	
Proposed Measures	Recommendations for the school to consider:
enroll 90% of maximum allowed by charter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • budget is built on 100% enrollment; consider adjusting this target to be prepared for shortfalls • raise attendance target to meet or exceed District 30/ Region 9
attendance at least 85% of enrollment	
waiting list by the third year of charter	

III. Unique Programmatic Area Goals

Goal 1: Demonstrate parents are satisfied with administration and educational program	
Proposed Measures	Recommendations for the school to consider:
80% survey respondents rate O.W.N. 7.5 (of 10) on administration and educational program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • set valid target for response rate • restate target to allow easier calculation • provide detail on range of responses to key survey items
70% parent attendance at conferences 2% participation in PTO 10% parent volunteer rate in classrooms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gather data and report on <i>all</i> measures listed in Accountability Plan; do not omit without compelling reason • explain reasons for not meeting target and action steps to better attain your proposed levels of participation