Office of Charter Schools

Quality Review Report

Ross Global Academy Charter School

84M355

52 Chambers Street
New York, NY 10007

Board Chair: Courtney Sale Ross

Dates of review: May 20 & 21, 2008

Content of the report

Part 1: The School Context

Information about the school

Part 2: Overview

What the school does well
What the school needs to improve

Part 3: Main Findings

Progress made since the last review
Overall evaluation
RGA's performance on Office of Charter School's (OCS) evaluation criteria

Part 4: School Quality Criteria Summary

Part 1: The school context

Information about the school

During the 2007-08 school year, Ross Global Academy ("RGA") was an elementary-middle school with 210 students from kindergarten through grade 2 and grades 6 through 7. The school population comprises 25% Hispanic, 48% African American, 16% Asian, 3% White and 7% students from other origins. The student body includes 10% special education students. Boys and girls are equally represented. The average attendance rate for the school year 2007-2008 was 91% per data reported in June by the school. The school is in receipt of Title 1 funding.

The school is in its second year of existence. There has been high turnover of the school's staff, including five school leaders, since charter approval. The principal who was in place at the time of the visit became leader of the school prior to the previous Quality Review conducted in May '07 that was followed by an abbreviated follow-up visit at the school. The school will have its first grade 3 and grade 8 in September 2008. The Quality Review also constituted the New York City Department of Education's ("NYCDOE") review of compliance with the charter regulations.

To provide context to this one day snapshot, it is important to note that the visit occurred shortly after the board had told the principal that she would be terminated at the end of the school year. This was a tumultuous period for the school and the observers were likely influenced to some extent by the distraction of leadership and the staff. To gain a complete view of the school, it is important to also evaluate the school's progress report, reflecting academic achievement, as the NYCDOE would do in making renewal decisions.

Part 2: Overview

What the school does well

- Committed teachers put forth enormous effort in their individual classrooms.
- Board members and school leaders communicate a school vision centered on positive learning experiences and academic success.
- Parents appreciate the care that individual teachers show for their children.
- The core curriculum is interesting and broad, and establishes links between subjects, which enhances student learning.
- A range of specialist classes such as music, theatre, dance, and art provide outlets for student creativity.
- Extended activities include a program for the arts.
- Dedicated teachers collect anecdotal evidence to make their teaching more effective.

What the school needs to improve

- The school did not share evidence of a detailed document outlining how it plans to achieve its vision, showing priority goals with clear action plans, delegated responsibilities, measurable success criteria and suitable timeframes.
- There was no evidence of a systematic plan for generating, collecting, analyzing, and using data for student and teacher outcomes to establish a clear picture of the school's progress.
- Observations and interviews revealed that teachers do not make effective use of a well-organized range of student information to plan for new learning.
- High expectations regarding student behavior and achievement, and clear procedures for behavioral support were not evident in the larger school community during the visit.
- Roles and responsibilities for staff are not clearly defined, resulting in the use of inappropriate channels of communication and a lack of trust and respect among staff, creating a negative climate for teaching and learning.
- The review team did not find evidence of school procedures and levels of professional conduct being adhered to consistently.
- There are no systems in place to address chronic staff attrition.
- The school currently lacks effective communication between the school leadership and the board of trustees.
- Evidence of consistency in board oversight is lacking.

Part 3: Main findings

Progress made since the last review.

The school leadership and board had addressed several items such as the creation of initial systems for tracking student data and a stabilized school culture noted in last year's review by implementing initial systems by October 2007 when NYCDOE conducted an abbreviated follow-up visit at the school. However, much of the progress observed in October 2007 was not observed during the May 2008 school quality review due to changing dynamics among staff, leadership, and the RGA board of trustees.

Overall Evaluation

The Ross Global Academy Charter School ("RGA") prides itself on an interdisciplinary curriculum framework which uses cultural history as the foundation for teaching. This curriculum model is being executed in different ways across the school. A rich array of specialist classes are provided to help support this curriculum model, and students participate in music, dance, art and theater classes daily. These courses appear to engage the students enrolled in them, and seem to excite students about being in school. Teachers are faced with the challenge of incorporating the cultural history components into their teaching of New York State standards to students who often need remediation before they meet grade level standards. As a result, the curriculum is not coherent as a whole-school model since teachers are faced with the dual challenge of teaching and assessing basic skills while trying to integrate and develop a rich, interdisciplinary curriculum that is sometimes difficult to access for students who are reading below grade level. Teachers feel that they have not received the proper professional development and time to create a scope and sequence that ensures appropriate integration of the cultural history component with the skills, standards, and flexibility required for students with special needs.

An effective special education team is in place to ensure that students' needs are met through a student study team which meets frequently, regularly reviews Individual Education Plans ("IEPs"), and works in liaison with the Committee on Special Education to ensure proper placement of all students according to their IEPs. However, this work is somewhat hindered by the lack of frequently collected objective data to measure progress. This is the case across the school. Teachers administer assessments and track progress on grade level teams or for their individual classes, but this is not consistent, and there is no clear format for school leadership to view progress across the school or by groups of students. The lack of consistent data collection and meaningful use of data is one of the biggest obstacles facing the school, since without clear and objective data, goal-setting and strategic planning cannot be accomplished.

A lack of collegiality among some members of the faculty has also burdened the school significantly. This was evidenced during the visit through interviews with staff who felt uncomfortable speaking in front of the larger group of teachers. At least six teachers requested separate interviews because of this, and some expressed anxiety about other staff, leadership and the board finding out that they were interviewing separately with the review team. Staff attrition is another major issue that has created challenges for this school. The attrition rate for teachers/instructional staff in 2006-07 was 82% and 75% (based on figures provided by RGA) in the 2007-08 school year. More specifically, all five of the lower school teachers and the lower school literacy specialist left at the end of the year, and the school's fourth principal was also to depart at the end of the year. However, according to the RGA board, high teacher attrition rates are evident in many New York City schools that serve high-poverty, high-needs students and that 29% of teachers were

not invited back and another 29% of the non-returning teachers left to enroll in full-time graduate programs.

Currently, the school is in a tenuous position as it enters its third year of operation. With the addition of two new grades and movement of the upper school to a second campus, the school has been presented with the task of replacing many positions as it also fills a number of newly created positions. The school will be serving both a third grade and an eighth grade for the first time, in two separate campuses. Effective board oversight and communication between the board and principal will be crucial for the school to move forward and focus completely on student learning and progress.

While presiding over staff attrition, inconsistent instructional practices, lack of student performance data at the board level, the RGA board did not provide the most consistent oversight to the school. For example, while the board did not have a dashboard in place for monitoring student progress and performance at the time of the visit, the board was also getting involved in more micro school-level matters, such as the monitoring of each teacher's contact with families, a task which might be left up to school leadership instead. With minor reservations on the school's financial condition (but good internal controls), the school displays a satisfactory financial outlook.

Parent engagement efforts have helped create a fair rate of satisfaction among families that are committed to the future success of the school.

ROSS GLOBAL ACADEMY'S PERFORMANCE ON OFFICE OF CHARTER SCHOOL'S ("OCS") EVALUATION CRITERIA

Quality Statement 1 – Gather Data: School leaders and faculty consistently gather and generate data and use it to understand what each student knows and is able to do and to monitor the student's progress over time.

This area of the school's work is underdeveloped with proficient features.

As a small school, most members of staff know students well. Parents appreciate that their children are perceived as individuals, known personally by many teachers and, as a result, are happy to come to school. Teachers make good efforts to plan learning that meets students' academic needs and personal interests. They care about students and want to teach them effectively. However, with a growing population, the school has given too little attention to understanding the performance of individual students through regular data collection. During the school visit, no one was able to provide examples of data that demonstrate a clear picture of student performance and progress across the school. Some teachers had data charts and item analyses of their individual classes which were shared with the review team when individual teachers sat down with the review team; however, this was not available in an accessible manner for the whole school, and the practice of maintaining and analyzing this data varied by teacher. The main intake grade is Kindergarten, but many students also enroll in grades 1, 6, and 7. The principal, school leadership team, and board have neglected the importance of knowing and understanding students through the regular collection and collation of data about their prior experiences, social contexts, past achievements and personal interests. During the visit, the board reported that it had not requested quantitative data on student performance throughout the year nor did it have a regular system or dashboard for reviewing this data on a regular basis. Teachers do not feel that they have access to a general overview of each student that gives them a clear picture of their starting points for learning, and they expressed that the school is lacking the urgent support mechanisms for students' learning and behavioral needs. Teachers are unable to provide this support effectively because there is insufficient information about students' current levels of achievement, specific needs and gaps in learning. Leaders carry out some analysis of State test results. While the analysis has demonstrated that the school is on track to meet a number of its charter goals, realistic year-to-year strategic goals have not yet been set forth. However, limited action is taken to devise whole school goals with the aim of remedying the issues identified by the analysis.

Since the last Quality Review, leaders have taken some steps to compile assessment information. Teachers administer baseline assessments and the school uses ECLAS diagnostics three times per year. Some teachers in the upper school use a tracker for item analysis of the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), which was used as practice for the New York State English Language Arts exam, but this work was self-initiated by those teachers and not part of a whole school initiative. However, leaders do not analyze this data thoroughly enough, nor do they collate information suitably, making it easily accessible to teachers when they plan for future learning. The substance of most data collated about students is anecdotal such as the use of running records or observational data on student acquisition of reading skills through observed activities. While this "soft data" has an important place in the school, it is not substantial enough to inform regular updates on where the school currently stands in its effectiveness. Where data exists, teachers use it sporadically and without conviction, because there has been virtually no training and guidance on how to make sense of it in a practical way. Board members have been satisfied with "big picture" reporting from the administration, but have not requested specific data nor have they created a dashboard for looking at performance and progress.

In the context of the school's unstable history of high staff and leadership attrition, this is an inadequate measure of progress because it means that with every staff change, adults must start from scratch to determine students' strengths and weaknesses by class and as a school. While there are pockets of proficient practice and a wealth of positive intentions to make a difference to student outcomes, the school's lack of consistent data generation, analysis and use could have serious consequences for student gains.

Quality Statement 2 – Plan and Set Goals: School leaders and faculty consistently use data to understand each student's next learning steps and to set suitably high goals for accelerating each student's learning.

This area of the school's work is underdeveloped with proficient features.

Academic support teachers use IEPs to devise goals for students at most risk of underachieving. For this reason, in most cases, special education students receive an appropriate level of support. When whole school goals are established, leaders do not always share them effectively with all staff, resulting in confusion among teachers as to what curricular priorities should be emphasized. In an interview with teachers, one said, "There are two visions here: RGA as a Ross school and RGA as a standards-based school." Even so, teachers try hard to set pertinent goals for students to improve overall school performance. According to the teachers, it is a hard task since they have little information on which to base their targets for future learning and have limited access to whole school data. Internal academic performance goals, where they exist, are therefore Not based on specific performance targets for grade levels or groups of students at multiple points throughout the year. And while the board has a thorough set of annual goals for the school, these are not translated at the school level to meaningful interim benchmarks to drive actionable lesson planning and interventions. Levels of challenge are not always appropriate and expectations are inconsistent across classrooms. Teachers have little opportunity to work collaboratively to devise realistic goals. The consequence of this is that students who need supportive intervention for academic and behavioral needs do not always receive it. A student study team is in place to discuss students whose academic performance or behavior present concerns. While there is a commitment to working collaboratively to meet student needs, the time is not organized in such a way to allow for clear, individualized student goal-setting.

Parents have mixed views about the school and its relationship with them. They feel that the past year has seen the school grow from "zero culture to a culture." Many say that there is now an open door policy. However, others feel that there is still some resistance to their full involvement. Some mentioned that their children are, "not where they would like them to be academically." Others feel that teachers give them clear information about what their children need to do to improve. In general, they feel that teachers communicate well with them, but what information and how they communicate it is inconsistent. The school lacks a full program of appropriate procedures for sharing information with parents and encouraging their contributions and participation. The principal established a parent coffee hour this year for parents to engage in the school community on Saturdays, but there are not many other clear systems in place for these home to school exchanges. Teachers make efforts to relay important information in the way they feel best, such as frequent notes and phone calls home, and parents really appreciate this. In relation to other issues that all parents should know about, the school does not always send information in the best way to make sure that it reaches every home in good time. For example, several parents interviewed during the visit had not received notice that the principal would not be returning the following year because the message had only officially been communicated to families through email, a source of information that not all parents may have access to. Parents look forward to stability in the future, expressing their

concerns that it could be daunting to get to know "yet another leader." However, some parents also expressed that they were ready for the change.

Quality Statement 3 – Align Instructional Strategy to Goals: The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions and resources, and effectively engages students around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning.

This area of the school's work is underdeveloped with proficient features.

The cultural history curriculum ideas imported from the Ross School are the foundation for what should be an interesting curriculum. Planning for motivating and engaging learning is central to the school's vision. The school attempts to create a curriculum that has relevant links between subjects, develops skills and knowledge through many practical activities, promotes social and personal growth and provides well for artistic and creative learning. The school successfully provides regular art and dance sessions. Older students talk positively about the good understanding they gain when subjects have meaningful links. Classroom bulletin boards show evidence of the good work students do. However, little data gathering is conducted to determine whether all students are ready to learn in such a way, or whether they have the skills to access such a curriculum. Teacher anecdotals and baseline evidence of student performance indicate that some students need support to learn the basics of reading and writing, even in upper grades. During classroom observations on the visit, it became evident that in some classes where management was weaker, some students also lack well-established learning habits, good levels of concentration or a clear understanding of behavioral norms for classrooms. None of these very real issues seemed to receive the serious consideration necessary to make the ideas behind the cultural history curriculum meet the needs of all students.

School leaders have required that teachers devise curriculum content independently. Many of them have had no prior teaching experience and this task has been onerous on top of day-to-day classroom responsibilities. At the time of the review, teachers stated that there was no certainty that planning is accurate and aligned to State Standards and no monitoring to check that the curriculum is progressively developmental through grades. Moreover, the principal and the board do not have an overview of student progress to confirm that the curriculum meets students' needs effectively and helps them to make progress. Most importantly, teachers have very limited information about students to begin to plan lessons that are right for them. Nevertheless, teachers persevere to provide a stable classroom environment and do their best to engage students in learning.

It is obvious that adults in the school care about the students. Teachers have supportive groups within the staff and want to work together. However, due to the timing of the visit and surrounding circumstances of the principal's planned departure, there is a tangible feeling of anxiety at the school that leads teachers to feel uncertainty. As one teacher said during an interview, "There is an in group and an out group here." If teachers support ideas that the principal may have, they are certain they will displease board members, or that their comments will be passed back to the board via inappropriate channels. When there are direct communications between board members and teachers, this breeds suspicions that make it difficult for teachers to communicate openly with each other and school leaders. Some teachers expressed that the underlying problems at the school were a result of the conflicting agendas of adults in charge, rather than fundamental differences about the school's vision and mission. According to teachers, there is confusion about roles, lack of professional respect at various levels and forgetfulness about adults being good role models for students through their conduct with each other.

Quality Statement 4 - Align Capacity Building to Goals: The development of leadership, teachers and other staff capacity is aligned to the school's collaboratively established goals for accelerating the learning of each student.

This area of the school's work is underdeveloped with proficient features.

The principal has a solid understanding of where teachers have strengths. She is equally aware of what aspects of their work require further improvement. She formulates her evaluations on strong pedagogical understanding and a growing awareness of students' academic needs. The developments she sees as main priorities for each teacher's growth are very appropriate. However, teachers are not fully aware of where they need to improve because the procedures for lesson observation, feedback and follow-up discussions are not well established. While lesson observations are conducted both formally and informally, teachers expressed mixed feelings on the usefulness of feedback they received from them. There are virtually no opportunities for teachers to observe each other's lessons or to work collaboratively to improve their practice. New teachers feel that leaders care about them personally, but do not help them to make as much professional progress as they would have hoped. The principal regrets that, for various reasons, this is a true picture. Promised links with the Ross Institute as a provider for training and support have not been realized until very recently when a new staff member was hired to support the transition in leadership. This was due, in part, to some resistance from the principal to being supported by the Institute because of what she saw as competing professional development priorities. Leaders and the Board have failed to fully consider all of the professional development options that may have been useful to the school in its given context and with its current student population.

The school is sited on the first floor of the historic landmark building, Tweed Courthouse. There are classrooms along various hallways adjacent to offices and there are no common spaces, no gym and limited outside space for recess. Movement between classrooms is very challenging, since expectations for behavior in public areas are not clearly communicated and supervision for students during these periods is inconsistent and often lacking. Many classrooms are shared learning areas. While they are attractive, sound travels easily and during lessons observed, sounds from adjoining areas frequently distracted students. While the creation of a Code of Conduct and Safety Plan were both cited by the principal as some of the school's major accomplishments this year, the application of this Code was not observed to be entirely consistent. The school has said, however, that as a result of these new systems, the rate of student suspensions had decreased significantly. Reviewers observed that outside of the classroom, there are few support structures for students who have difficulties in maintaining good levels of conduct and control. This creates extra pressure for teachers who struggle to manage behavior issues within their own classrooms and in the hallways.

Quality Statement 5 - Monitor and Revise: The school has structures for evaluating each student's progress throughout the year and for flexibly adapting plans and practices to meet its goals for accelerating learning.

This area of the school's work is underdeveloped.

The vision for the school's future is commendable. Board members and the principal share a common aim to provide a unique education for students that enables them to reach their full academic potential and make a valuable contribution to society. However, the route that the school takes to realize this vision is extremely confused. There is no evidence of clear action planning to move the school forward from its current situation. Following a

very unsettled first year, the school remains without documented priority goals, measurable success criteria or schedule for internal evaluation and review. At the time of the visit, it was unclear whether or not a formal strategic plan had been developed and was used as a working document between the leadership and board. Without this clearly constructed plan, there are no agreed measures for accountability and no benchmarks for success or failure. Board members have met with the principal, but have done little to undo the broad-brush presentation of the school. They have a limited understanding of how students are progressing, of what test results really indicate or of the quality of teaching and learning. The school's vision, therefore, is still far from realization, despite positive success on NYS assessments last year and the school having met a number of charter goals.

Quality Statement 6 - Monitor Effectiveness: The charter school board is proactive and diligent in undertaking its administrative responsibilities.

This area of the school's work is proficient.

The Board is responsible for the overall direction and fiscal well-being of the school. As such, the Board has the authority and duty to adopt policies and by-laws that are necessary to meet its statutory responsibilities and produce optimal academic results. Those administrative and daily operational responsibilities shall be delegated to principals, senior management/administrators, and board appointed officers to manage the school within the established policies. The principal /senior administrators, and board appointed officers should then be held accountable for performance.

Although the RGA board has provided oversight to the school and the school leader, the level of oversight has not been very consistent overtime. During the visit, the board was unable to share any academic dashboard that it uses to monitor academic progress at the school level, but rather relied on principal's report at board meetings. The school's board of trustees consists of financial, education, management and legal expertise. Although RGA board members may have served on other governing boards, few board members, if any, attend training sessions aimed at improving charter school board effectiveness. Accountability may be better shared collectively across the board members if they receive training in areas including board self-assessment, board roles and responsibilities, strategic planning, committee structure and roles, legal and fiduciary oversight, effective board meeting, and school leader recruitment and evaluation. According to the RGA board minutes, the board chair and board treasurer were in attendance 4 times (50%) and 5 times (62.5%) respectively for the past 8 conducted board meetings.

At the time of this report writing, RGA has witnessed five (5) different school leaders (Mr. Jon Drescher, Mr. Frank Marchese, the late Mr. Robert Durkin, Dr. Stephanie Clagnaz and newly appointed principal Ms. Julie Johnson), in the past two years. Positively, however, Dr. Clagnaz was the school leader for a period of approximately 17 months. This high turnover at RGA has heightened OCS' level of concern regarding leadership.

Based on data provided by RGA, for the past two consecutive school years teacher attrition rate (82% in 06-07; 75% in 07-08), has been generally higher than in most charter schools. According to some teachers, the majority of school staff and teachers operate under the 'fear' that minor dissent may lead to termination by the school's board of trustees. In addition, this claim was also manifested by the principal towards staff with whom relationships had soured. Some staff members, but not all, expressed that the board has little, if any, legitimacy...Several conversations with staff revealed that some view the board as a body controlled solely by the board chair without any challenges by other board members. The board has set high expectations for school leaders and all members of the RGA school community, which is considered a good governance practice.

However, there are concerns among staff members regarding the board's ability to correlate goal setting with pragmatic expectations that can be achieved in a reasonable timeframe.

Quality Statement 7 – Maintain Financial Viability: The Charter School and its Board maintain financial viability and control over the course of the academic year.

This area of the school's work is proficient.

A charter school shall be able to operate with an annual budget that reflects the expected revenue and expenses for the fiscal year. Since the revenue stream for charter schools tends to be based upon the number of students served (per pupil revenue) and the State and Federal grants (Title funding, etc.), a continued and growing negative net balance poses a threat to a school's stability and its ability to fulfill its short and long-term financial obligations. In the end, it is worth noting that a school may implement and practice the best internal controls (procurement, check signing, balanced budget, etc.), and still end up in a difficult financial condition.

The RGA board has been proactive in contracting an audit firm and producing the school's financial statements in reasonable period. The school maintains necessary financial documents to facilitate decision-making at all levels. RGA's audited financial statements for fiscal year ended June 30, 2008 cast a satisfactory financial position of the school with liquid assets totaling over $150,125. The balance sheet also shows the school having current liabilities of $235,719 in short-term financial obligations. While compared to 8 NYCDOE authorized charter schools' (opened same year as RGA) financial condition, RGA is only better than one other charter school that ran a net deficit of $221,166 operating from a private facility and is on probation for other violations. However, the school has made progress from previous fiscal year where it faced a net asset deficiency of over $1 million and this fiscal year, it had a net asset surplus of $82,535. The school also made progress on percentage spent on educational activities while compared to the school's total expenses. The Ross Institute donated $636,528 this school year and had made similar donation of $681,040 prior year as well. The partnership agreement executed between Ross Global Academy and Ross Institute in 2006 allowed for a line of credit up to $632,500 during the first two years of school's operation. The school provided the annual site visit team with a cash flow analysis projecting out until June '09. According to the cash flow projection, the school is expected to finish the '08-'09 fiscal year with a surplus of over $284,000.

During the visit, the school officials and a business consultant who supports finance and operations were interviewed on the procurement process, check signing, inspection of three randomly selected paid invoices, random human resource files (three teachers, two non-teaching staff) and fingerprinting (all staff hired since previous year school visit). The school is following its adopted financial policies. Paid invoices had the right purchase order approvals, order and receiving of goods, presence of packing slips and invoices along with proof of payment with proper signatories.

The teacher and staff files were kept in proper condition with fingerprint clearance, W-4, I-9, formal classroom observations, and proper identification.

Quality Statement 8 – Integration of Parents and the Community: The Charter School has adequate structures to integrate parents and community partners with the school.

This area of the school's work is proficient.

Parent engagement is one of the cornerstones in measuring parent satisfaction, initial and ongoing expectations, student academic improvement, and true parental inputs in choices made by the school. Parent engagement in charter schools tends to come in all forms: Parent Teacher Association (PTA), Parent Advisory Committee/Councils (PAC), Parent Association, parental involvement at board level, etc. While none of these vehicles represents the perfect solution for increasing parental involvement, all schools are expected to make good faith efforts to stimulate parental participation in creating a community that shares the school's vision and ongoing strategic direction.

The level of parent engagement at RGA has varied this year due to turnover in the Parent Association (PA), which exists for parents to voice their concerns. There is also a seat on the board of trustees reserved for a parent; however, that seat is now vacant. Every six weeks, parents are invited to a Parent Coffee Hour with the principal to discuss what is happening at the school and ask questions. This occurs on a Saturday when children are in Saturday classes. Parents receive other information from the school through emails, the school's website, phone calls from teachers, or backpack notices. However, none of these forms of communication is consistent or used as a school-wide approach to communicating with families, and information-sharing methods vary by teacher. The school uses its website as a primary means of informing parents about board meetings, and most are aware of the time and location of these meetings. Most major school communications are sent home in English, Spanish, and Chinese.

Part 4: School Quality Criteria Summary

CHARTER SCHOOL NAME: ROSS GLOBAL ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL (M355)	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇

Quality Statement 1 – Gather Data: School leaders and faculty consistently gather and generate data and use it to understand what each student knows and can do, and to monitor the student's progress over time.					
To what extent do school leaders and faculty gather, generate, and utilize data to provide . . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
1.1 an objective, constantly updated understanding of the performance and progress of each student, classroom, grade level?		X			
1.2 an objective, constantly updated understanding of the performance and progress of special education students?		X			
1.3 an objective, constantly updated understanding of the performance and progress of English language learners? **NA**					
1.4 an objective, constantly updated understanding of the performance and progress of ethnic groups, gender groups and all other categories of interest to the school?	X				
1.5 a measurement of performance and progress based on the school's own past performance, and among students, classrooms, grades and subject areas?	X				
1.6 a measurement of performance and progress that demonstrates that the charter school is at least meeting the State's student performance standards for all other schools?			X		
1.7 training, management systems and structures that support teachers in the use of school data to inform planning and instruction and to track the progress of students?		X			
Overall score for Quality Statement 1		X			

Quality Statement 2 – Plan and Set Goals: School leaders and faculty consistently use data to understand each student's next learning steps and to set suitably high goals for accelerating each student's learning.					
To what extent do school leaders and faculty. . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
2.1 engage in collaborative processes to set rigorous, objectively measurable goals for improvement, and to develop plans and time frames for reaching those goals?	X				
2.2 focus on each student, classroom, grade level, academic subject and group of students whose performance or progress has been identified by the school as a particular focus area?		X			
2.3 identify and improve the performance and progress of those students in greatest need of improvement?		X			
2.4 share whole school goals with all members of the school community to rigorously improve the performance and progress of students?	X				
2.5 convey consistently high expectations to students and their parents/caregivers?		X			
2.6 regularly provide students and their parents/caregivers with information about the goals set for each student, and about each student's progress and performance, and how they can improve?		X			
2.7 invite and enable parents/caregivers to provide useful information to teachers and the school about the learning needs and capacities of their children?		X			
2.8 implement a comprehensive special education program that complies with applicable governing laws?			X		
2.9 implement a comprehensive program for English Language Learners that complies with federal law? **N/A**					
Overall score for Quality Statement 2		X			

Δ	**Underdeveloped**
➢	**Underdeveloped with Proficient Features**
✓	**Proficient**
+	**Well Developed**
◇	**Outstanding**

Quality Statement 3 – Align Instructional Strategy to Goals: The school aligns its academic work, strategic decisions and resources, and effectively engages students, around its plans and goals for accelerating student learning.					
To what extent do the school leaders. . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
3.1 select core curricular approaches that facilitate and provide meaningful interim data about progress towards goals and focus on raising the achievement of students?		X			
3.2 provide a broad and engaging curriculum, including the arts, to enhance learning both within and outside the school day?			X		
3.3 hold teachers accountable for the progress and learning of the students in their charge, for making instruction interesting and compelling, and for creating a positive, safe and inclusive learning environment?		X			
3.4 ensure that teachers use school, classroom and student data to plan for and provide differentiated instruction that meets the specific needs of all the students in their charge?	X				
3.5 make staffing and scheduling decisions strategically, based on data, to meet the school's academic goals for all?		X			
3.6 ensure that there is an environment of mutual trust and respect between all staff and students to support personal and academic development?	X				
3.7 ensure that there are effective and consistently applied procedures to encourage and monitor student attendance and tardiness and report actual attendance data?			X		
3.8 ensure that their charter high school meets the defined graduation standards as determined by NYCDOE (where applicable)? **NA**					
3.9 ensure that the time given over for instruction is at least equivalent to that required in other public schools?			X		
3.10 ensure that discipline policies, including those for suspension and expulsion, are documented and filed with the CSO?			X		
Overall score for Quality Statement 3		X			

Quality Statement 4 – Align Capacity Building to Goals: The development of leadership, teachers and other staff capacity is aligned to the school's collaboratively established goals for accelerating the learning of each student.					
To what extent do the school leaders. . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
4.1 use frequent observations of classroom teaching by the principal and other available information to develop a differentiated strategy for improving the quality of each teacher's instruction?		X			
4.2 make professional development decisions strategically, based on data, to help meet the improvement goals of students and teachers?	X				
4.3 provide frequent opportunities for teachers to observe each other's classroom instruction and to meet together in teams to plan, share effective practices, and evaluate one another's instruction in an open and reflective professional environment?	X				
4.4 develop effective procedures for the induction and support of teachers who are new to the profession or the school?	X				
4.5 align youth development, guidance/advising and other student support services around stated academic and personal development goals?		X			
4.6 consistently implement clear procedures that enable the school to run smoothly, encourage effective student learning, and effectively address discipline related incidents?		X			
4.7 create effective partnerships with outside entities that support the academic and personal growth of the students?		X			
Overall score for Quality Statement 4		X			

Quality Statement 5 – Monitor and Revise: The school has structures for monitoring and evaluating each student's progress throughout the year and for flexibly adapting plans and practices to meet its goals for accelerating learning.					
To what extent do. . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
5.1 the school's plans for improving student outcomes include interim goals that are objectively measurable and have suitable time frames for measuring success and making adjustments?	X				
5.2 the school's plans for improving teacher outcomes include interim goals that are objectively measurable and have suitable time frames for measuring success and making adjustments?	X				
5.3 teachers and faculty use periodic assessments and other diagnostic tools to measure the effectiveness of plans and interventions for individual and groups of students in key areas?		X			
5.4 teachers and faculty use the information generated by periodic assessments and other progress measures and comparisons to revise plans immediately in order to reach stated goals?	X				
5.5 school leaders track the outcomes of periodic assessments and other diagnostic measures and use the results to makes strategic decisions to modify practices to improve student outcomes?	X				
5.6 school leaders and staff use each plan's interim and final outcomes to drive the next stage of goal setting and improvement planning?	X				
5.7 the principal and school community have a clear vision for the future development of the school and implement procedures and systems to effect change?	X				
Overall score for Quality Statement 5	X				

Quality Statement 6 – Monitor Effectiveness: The Charter School Board is proactive and diligent in monitoring its effectiveness and in undertaking its administrative responsibilities.					
To what extent does the Board . . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
6.1 ensure effective, broad outreach to create a student body that is representative of the school's Community School District?			X		
6.2 manage any conflict of interest within the governing body and throughout the school?			X		
6.3 publish a schedule of regular board meetings that is easily accessible to the general public?			X		
6.4 ensure that accurate minutes from Board meetings are maintained and published?			X		
6.5 ensure that proposed contracts with EMOs and CMOs are submitted punctually to the CSO for review?		X			
6.6 hold EMOs, CMOs and school leadership accountable in their positions?				X	
6.7 ensure that teachers are provided with high quality professional development opportunities to further build on their professional expertise?		X			
6.8 respond to parent, staff and student concerns/complaints?			X		
6.9 provide ongoing training for board members so that they are able to fulfill the duties of their positions?		X			
Overall score for Quality Statement 6			X		

Quality Statement 7– Maintain Financial Viability: The Charter School and its Board maintain financial viability and control over the course of the academic year.					
To what extent does the school and its Board . . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
7.1 ensure that an independent auditor is appointed to undertake an annual financial audit, which is submitted to the CSO along with any other relevant documentation?			X		
7.2 comply with the adoption of an annual budget for the upcoming school year, which is submitted to the CSO for review?			X		
7.3 maintain an accurate balance sheet, statement of activities, year-to-date expense report and statement of cash flow?			X		
7.4 implement procedures that provide adequate internal control measures to detect and prevent financial fraud, such as bank reconciliation, revenue recognition and travel reimbursement?			X		
7.5 satisfy the requirement to maintain adequate liability insurance filed with the CSO?			X		
Overall score for Quality Statement 7			X		

Quality Statement 8 – Integration of Parents and the Community: The Charter School has adequate structures to integrate parents and community partners with the school.					
To what extent does the school . . .	Δ	➢	✓	+	◇
8.1 maintain a functioning parent organization?			X		
8.2 provide special events for parents to meet, to discuss school-related issues and to socialize?			X		
8.3 ensure that parents are informed of the time and location of Board meetings that are open to the public?			X		
8.4 ensure that newsletters are sent home in all predominant languages to encourage parent participation and eliminate language barriers?			X		
8.5 ensure parents are aware of appeals procedures should a conflict arise with any aspect of the school?			X		
8.6 understand each student's progress during their time in the school?			X		
Overall score for Quality Statement 8			X		