

I. SCHOOL INFORMATION AND COVER PAGE

Created Wednesday, July 24, 2013
Updated Thursday, August 01, 2013

Page 1

1. SCHOOL NAME

(Select School name from dropdown menu; BEDS # appears first)

331300860810 COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP C

2. CHARTER AUTHORIZER

SUNY-Authorized Charter School


3. DISTRICT / CSD OF LOCATION

NYC CSD 13

4. SCHOOL INFORMATION

PRIMARY ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER	FAX NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
241 Emerson Place Brooklyn, NY 11205	718-399-3824		nbledman@bwcf.org

4a. PHONE CONTACT NUMBER FOR AFTER HOURS EMERGENCIES

4a. PHONE CONTACT NUMBER FOR AFTER HOURS EMERGENCIES Contact Name	Melanie Bryon
4a. PHONE CONTACT NUMBER FOR AFTER HOURS EMERGENCIES Title	LS Director
4a. PHONE CONTACT NUMBER FOR AFTER HOURS EMERGENCIES Emergency Phone Number (###-###-####)	

5. SCHOOL WEB ADDRESS (URL)

www.cpcsschool.org

6. DATE OF INITIAL CHARTER

2000-01-01 00:00:00

7. DATE FIRST OPENED FOR INSTRUCTION

2000-08-01 00:00:00

8. TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN 2012-13 (as reported on BEDS Day)

(as reported on BEDS Day)

9. GRADES SERVED IN SCHOOL YEAR 2012-13

Check all that apply

• K

• 1

• 2

• 3

• 4

• 5

• 6

• 7

• 8

10. DOES THE SCHOOL CONTRACT WITH A CHARTER OR EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATION?

Yes/No	Name of CMO/EMO
Yes	Beginning with Children Foundation

10a. Please provide the name and contact information for each of the following individuals who are management level personnel associated with the CMO.

	Name	Work Phone	Alternate Phone	Email Address	Contact this individual also in emergencies
CEO (e.g., network superintendent)	Denniston Reid	██████████	██████████	██████████	Yes
CFO (e.g., network CFO)	Geraldeen Licurse	██████████		██████████	No
Compliance Contact	Geraldeen Licurse	██████████		██████████	Yes
Complaint Contact	Martin Ragde	██████████		██████████	

11. FACILITIES

Will the School maintain or operate multiple sites?

Yes, 2 sites

12. SCHOOL SITES

Please list the sites where the school will operate in 2013-14.

	Physical Address	Phone Number	District/C SD	Grades Served at Site	School at Full Capacity at Site	Facilities Agreement
Site 1 (same as primary site)	241 Emerson Place Brooklyn, NY 11205	718-399-38 24	CSD 13	K-4	Yes	DOE space
Site 2	114 Kosciuszko Street Brooklyn, NY 11216	718-636-39 04	CSD 13	5-8	Yes	DOE space
Site 3						

12a. Please provide the contact information for Site 1 (same as the primary site).

	Name	Work Phone	Alternate Phone	Email Address
School Leader	Melanie Bryon	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Operational Leader	Fohat Aird	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Compliance Contact	Natalie Bledman	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]
Complaint Contact	Martin Ragde	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]

12b. Please provide the contact information for Site 2.

	Name	Work Phone	Alternate Phone	Email Address
School Leader	Keisha Rattray	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]
Operational Leader	Fohat Aird	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Compliance Contact	Natalie Bledman	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]
Complaint Contact	Martin Ragde	[REDACTED]		[REDACTED]


14. Were there any revisions to the school's charter during the 2012-2013 school year? (Please include both those that required authorizer approval and those that did not require authorizer approval).

No

16. Our signatures below attest that all of the information contained herein is truthful and accurate and that this charter school is in compliance with all aspects of its charter, and with all pertinent Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and rules. We understand that if any information in any part of this report is found to have been deliberately misrepresented, that will constitute grounds for the revocation of our charter. Check **YES** if you agree and use the mouse on your PC or the stylus on your mobile device to sign your name).

• Yes

Signature, Head of Charter School

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Melanie". The letters are cursive and fluid.A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Eason". The letters are cursive and stylized.

Signature, President of the Board of Trustees

Thank you.



**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP
CHARTER SCHOOL**

**2012-13 ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN
PROGRESS REPORT**

Submitted to the SUNY Charter Schools Institute on:

September 16, 2013

By

the Beginning with Children Foundation
and School Leaders

Melanie Bryon (Lower School) and Keisha Rattray (Middle School)

Community Partnership Charter School – Lower School
241 Emerson Place
Brooklyn, NY 11205
(718) 399-3824

Community Partnership Charter School – Middle School
114 Kosciuszko Street
Brooklyn, NY 11216
(718) 636-3904

The Beginning with Children Foundation (BwCF) and the CPCS school leaders, Melanie Bryon and Keisha Rattray, prepared this 2012-13 Accountability Progress Report on behalf of the CPCS Board of Trustees:

Trustee's Name	Board Position
Martin J. Ragde	Audit, Finance (Chair), Director / School Review Committees (Chair)
Clare Cusack	Audit, Finance Committee, Director / School Review Committee
Amy Kolz	Audit, Director/School Review Committee, Academic
Kiisha Morrow	Legal, Academic
David S. Stutt	Treasurer, Audit, Finance, Community Outreach (Chair), Nominating Committee (Chair)
Bianca Wheeler	Nominating Committee, Community Outreach
Joanna White-Oldham	Director / School Review Committee, Community Outreach
Melanie Bryon	Non-voting member <i>ex officio</i> as Director of CPCS LS
Keisha Rattray	Non-voting member <i>ex officio</i> as Director of CPCS MS

Melanie Bryon has served as the CPCS Lower School leader since January 2005.

Keisha Rattray has served as the CPCS Lower School leader since August 2010.

INTRODUCTION

Community Partnership Charter School (CPCS) was founded in 2000 by a group of parents in Fort Greene, Brooklyn and the Beginning with Children Foundation (BwCF). At CPCS, families, educators, and community members join together in creating a strong academic base in which students learn to read, write, and perform mathematically at levels that exceed citywide averages. Students are expected to achieve these high levels in an environment that values kindness and respect. The school served approximately 420 students in grades K-8 during the 2012-13 school year. Since the 2009-10 school year, CPCS has added an additional grade each year and expanded to a K-8 school at the start of 2012-13.

School Enrollment by Grade Level and School Year

School Year	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
2009-10	52	51	52	52	52	39	-	-	-	298
2010-11	50	49	48	52	52	46	33	-	-	330
2011-12	48	51	48	50	53	49	50	29	-	378
2012-13	50	49	49	51	52	52	49	42	26	420

ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

Goal 1: English Language Arts

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

Background

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

In the 2011-12, our core ELA instructional program was a Reader's/Writer's Workshop grounded in the work of Lucy Caulkins, Irene Fountas and Gay Su Pinnell. It included the components of Balanced Literacy and a wide range of teaching materials necessary to meet the needs of a diverse student body.

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

CPCS used a balanced literacy approach providing targeted support and explicit instruction in grammar, decoding and comprehension. Every day, students received at least 120 minutes of literacy instruction using a workshop model. During Reading Workshop, students read authentic texts and respond in authentic ways. We insisted that each student asked and answered the questions, "What have you learned today about yourself as a reader and learner?" and "How has this strategy helped you understand what you have read and will read in the future?" We believed it was through knowing what they knew, and how and when to access such knowledge, that students would be successful readers and learners.

The Reading Workshop components were the Mini-Lesson, Independent Reading/Guided Reading, and the Share. Other components of the framework including Read Aloud, Word Work, and Shared Inquiry happen outside of the Reading Workshop. Teachers also supplemented instruction with programs such as *Text Talk* from Scholastic to support shared reading, *Junior Great Books* to promote inquiry, and *Wordly Wise* to enhance vocabulary knowledge. This was done during the literacy block. This year we were working on adding literacy throughout the day, during morning meeting and during a new intervention block, 4-5 times a week.

In grades 3-5, classes were partially departmentalized, with a dedicated ELA teacher in each grade who taught the Literacy Workshop. The same pattern of balanced literacy was in place as in the lower

grades, with additional time for guided reading focused on reading comprehension, independent reading, and direct instruction in vocabulary. Teachers continue to use leveled books to support independent reading. Teachers introduced a great range of content reading and used the *Wordly Wise* vocabulary program to supplement classroom learning.

Writing was taught as a process that students must engage in to develop necessary skills. Writer's Workshop, based on the work of Lucy Caulkins, was taught by the ELA teacher daily as part of the literacy block. Process instruction was balanced with direct skill instruction that related to the authentic writing project in which students were engaged. This ensured rigorous instruction for all students while providing rich, process-based opportunities for children to develop holistically.

Each unit of study was based on a genre and followed the writing process. The daily Writer's Workshop paralleled the Reading Workshop and started with a 10 to 15 minute teacher-led mini-lesson, with succinct but explicit instruction intended to help move children forward in their writing. Students learned grammar and punctuation skills through explicit instruction aimed at helping them to create meaningful texts. These skills were best learned when students write daily in authentic and personally meaningful ways. After the mini-lesson, children spend 30 to 40 minutes writing independently. During this independent work, teachers conferred with students one-on-one or in small groups, drawing on recent writing assessment data. Students were encouraged to share their work and thinking at the end of each workshop period. In all grades, students' writing was honored at the end of each unit with a Writer's Celebration. Opportunities to support writing were integrated throughout the school day.

At morning meeting, teachers in grades K-2 employed shared and modeled writing to introduce and practice writing skills. Students in grades 3-5 edited passages to reinforce writing conventions. Students also were encouraged to write throughout the day in other disciplines. For example, students kept reading journals and science and social studies logs; they labeled block buildings and wrote letters to friends and teachers.

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

Last year, the school also administered two ELA mock state exams created by Rally and continued to administer internally-created interim assessments modeled on state standards for tracking student progress in literacy. With the support of the BwCF Research Team, the school used the PowerSchool Studio program to score assessments and generate reports that allowed teachers to view and analyze student mastery by standard and item and identify skill areas where greater focus was needed on the individual, class or school level.

Small group instruction (SGI) within the school day is a hallmark of CPCS’s interventions to help struggling students. This year in the middle school, SGIs were formed four times a week to address academic concerns that teachers had with specific students. Teachers based the creation of the groups on information they gathered through assessments, such as STEP, interim assessments and unit tests and quizzes, as well as anecdotal records. The small groups, consisting of five to ten students across grades, were led by a teacher and focused on specific skill building goals.

In 2013, CPCS will utilize the Journeys Common Core literacy program developed by Houghton Mifflin. Journeys embeds Common Core based instruction into every unit and lesson and is a comprehensive program that provides the resources needed to plan, teach and engage, as well as assess our students. Please see further discussion of the program in the Action Plan below.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure (G1.1)

Each year, 75 percent of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will achieve proficient scores on the NYS ELA exam.¹

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program English language arts assessment to students in grades 3 through 8 in April 2013. Each student’s raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

**2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested ²			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	51	0	0	0	51
4	52	0	0	0	52
5	52	0	0	0	52
6	49	0	0	0	49
7	41	0	0	0	41
8	26	0	0	0	26
All	271	0	0	0	271

¹ Because of the state’s new 3-8 testing program, aligned to its high school college and career readiness standards, the Institute is no longer using Time Adjusted Level 3 cut scores. Please report results for previous years using the state’s published results for scoring at proficiency.

² Students exempted from this exam according to their Individualized Education Program (IEP), because of English Language Learners (ELL) status, or absence for at least some part of the exam.

Results

Performance on 2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	17.6	51	19.1	47
4	23.1	52	25.6	43
5	23.1	52	24.5	49
6	20.4	49	25.6	39
7	31.7	41	32.4	37
8	30.8	26	30.8	26
All	23.6	271	25.7	241

The overall percent of students in at least their second year achieving proficiency, in each grade, fell significantly short of the absolute measure goal.

Evaluation

The school did not meet the measure. Our drop in overall proficiency matched the forecasts of the New York State Education Department. However, there were particular areas of concerns for performance in grades 3-6. We looked closed at curriculum and instruction and we have made significant changes both in personnel and program for the next school year. As discussed above, we have changed our curriculum K-6 and our curricular approach Kindergarten through eighth grades to ensure alignment with Common Core State Standards.

Additional Evidence

English Language Arts Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	54.2	48	58.1	43	19.1	47
4	46	50	52.9	51	25.6	43
5	52.8	36	57.8	45	24.5	49
6	56.5	23	61.9	42	25.6	39
7	-	-	60.7	28	32.4	37

8	-	-	-	-	30.8	26
All	51.6	157	57.9	209	25.7	241

In 2011-12, CPCS demonstrated progress towards charter goals over the previous year. A new baseline for student performance, relative to common core standards, was established with the NYS testing in 2013. We have begun to reshape our approach to literacy instruction, as detailed below in our Action Plan, to ensure a return to our tradition of continuous improvement.

Goal 1: Absolute Measure (G1.2)

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

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in English language arts. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the current year’s English language arts AMO. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.³

Results

Due to the implementation of the new 3-8 state testing program, NYSED has not yet recalibrated the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in ELA and math. Therefore, we are not able to report on the results for this measure.

Evaluation

The State Education Department has not recalibrated the AMO to align with the new English Language Arts 3-8 testing program

Goal 1: Comparative Measure (G1.3)

Each year, the proficiency rates of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will exceed the proficiency rates of students from District 13 in NYC on the NYS ELA exams.

Method

³ In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

Tested students enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in District 13, CPCS’s home district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for all students at the corresponding grades in District 13.⁴

Results

**2012-13 State English Language Arts Exam
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	19.1	47	28.8	1118
4	25.6	43	26.1	1040
5	24.5	49	27.6	988
6	25.6	39	17.9	925
7	32.4	37	17.9	974
8	30.8	26	19.5	1028
All	25.7	241	23.2	6073

Evaluation

This measure was met. The average proficiency of CPCS students was 25.7 compared to 23.2 of the district. Furthermore, students in their second year in grades 6-8 exceeded the aggregate performance of their peers in the district. However our performance in grades 3-5 trailed the district average.

Additional Evidence

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	54.2	45.3	58.1	47.5	19.1	28.8

⁴ Schools can acquire these data when the State Education Department releases its Access database containing grade level ELA and math test results for all schools and districts statewide. The SED announces the release of the data on its [News Release webpage](#).

4	46.0	50.9	52.9	50.3	25.6	26.1
5	52.8	45.9	57.8	52.0	24.5	27.6
6	56.5	36.6	61.9	37.7	25.6	17.9
7	-	-	60.7	35.7	32.4	17.9
8	-	-	-	-	30.8	19.5
All	51.6	44.5	57.9	44.5	25.7	23.2

As discussed above CPCS outperformed its home district this year. However, this year the gap between the aggregate performance of the district and CPCS is a narrow 2.5%.

Goal 1: Comparative Measure (G1.4)

Each year, CPCS will exceed its expected level of performance on the NYS ELA exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis performed by CSI controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.⁵

Method

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2012-13 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2011-12 results (using free-lunch eligible percentage), the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

2011-12 English Language Arts Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		48	58.4	55.1	3.3	0.23
4		53	52.9	59	-6.1	-0.45

⁵ The Institute will begin using *economically disadvantaged* instead of *eligibility for free lunch* as the demographic variable in 2012-13. Schools should report previous year’s results using reported free-lunch statistics.

5		47	57.4	56.9	0.5	0.03
6		48	56.3	53.4	2.9	0.2
7		29	58.6	49.2	9.4	0.59
8						
All	46.00%	225	56.5	55.3	1.2	0.07

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
<i>Slightly higher than expected</i>

Evaluation

Although the effect size was positive, this measure was not met. The measure was exceeded in sixth grade, but not in the other grades or the school as a whole. The analysis using last year's data shows an effect size of 0.07 for the six grades combined.

Additional Evidence

The chart below shows comparative data for ELA for CPCS students during the past three years. While this year's result continues to show a positive effect size, it also indicates a decrease consistent with the statewide efforts to establish a new baseline for student performance.

English Language Arts Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2009-10	3-5	55	141	53.9	48.9	0.38
2010-11	3-6	57	185	50.3	48.8	0.09
2011-12	3-7	46	225	56.5	55.3	0.07

Goal 1: Growth Measure (G1.5A)

Each year, the proficiency rates of grade-level cohorts on the NYS ELA exams will reduce by one-half the difference between 75 and the proficiency rates on the previous year's NYS ELA exams. If 75 percent or more of the grade-level cohorts obtained proficient scores the previous year, their results will increase in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12. It includes all current students

in grades 4-8 who repeated the grade. These students are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students taking a state exam in both years.

Results

2012-13 Grade	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Goal Achieved?
		2011-12	Target	2012-13	
4	43	58.14	66.57	25.58	NO
5	49	48.98	61.99	24.49	NO
6	39	58.97	66.99	25.64	NO
7	38	63.16	69.08	34.21	NO
8	26	61.54	68.27	30.77	NO
All	195	57.44	66.22	27.69	NO

Evaluation

CPCS did not meet the measure for any of the five cohorts. The collapsed proficiency rate for all five cohorts combined decreased by 29.75. This new proficiency rate represents the new benchmark for proficiency based on NYS common core assessments.

Goal 1: Growth Measure (G1.5B)
 Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced reading assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same cohort of students from one year to the next on the TerraNova norm-referenced reading test. Each cohort consists of those students who have norm-referenced reading test results for two consecutive years the school. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in the first year and the 50th NCE in the second. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. For the 2012-13 school year CPCS administered the TerraNova reading exam to students in grades K-3 in June 2013.

Results

2012-13 Grade	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Goal Achieved?
		2011-12 Avg NCE	Target	2012-13 Avg NCE	
1	44	58.00	58.01	48.45	NO
2	34	47.21	48.61	50.74	YES
3	46	40.85	45.43	50.33	YES
All	124	48.68	48.68	49.77	YES

Evaluation

Two out of three cohorts met the goal. Third grade students showed the largest growth, moving from an average NCE of 40.85 in second grade to an average of 50.33 in third grade. Second grade students showed an increase from an average NCE of 47.21 in first grade to 50.74 in second grade. Unfortunately students in the first grade did not do well on the TerraNova ELA exam, with an average NCE of 48.45, down from 58.00 the prior year. First grade did not meet the targeted achievement level.

Summary of the English Language Arts Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will achieve proficient scores on the NYS ELA exam.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, the CPCS's aggregate Performance Level Index (PLI) on the State English language arts exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the proficiency rates of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will exceed the proficiency rates of students from District 13 in NYC on the NYS ELA exams.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, CPCS will exceed its expected level of performance on the NYS ELA exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis performed by CSI controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.	Achieved
Growth	Each year, the proficiency rates of grade-level cohorts on the NYS ELA exams will reduce by one-half the difference between 75 and the proficiency rates on the previous year's NYS ELA exams. If 75% or more of the grade-level cohorts obtained proficient scores the previous year, their results will increase in the current year.	Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced reading assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.	Approaching (2 out of 3)

CPCS continues to demonstrate strength in its comparative data with regard to cohort measures. It also achieved two out of three proficiency measures related to TerraNova in Kindergarten through third grades. However, the school did not meet the absolute or growth measures for the NYS exams in grades 3 through 8. As discussed below, the data from our performance on the NYS ELA exams represent a new baseline that informs our strategic planning for ELA curriculum and teacher development going forward.

Action Plan

CPCS has begun a process to fully overhaul its approach to teaching reading. In Kindergarten through 6th grades, we will utilize the Journeys Common Core literacy program developed by

Houghton Mifflin. Journeys embeds Common Core based instruction into every unit and lesson and is a comprehensive program that provides the resources needed to plan, teach and engage, as well as assess our students. The Journeys student text uses the Common Core to engage students and build comprehension skills with materials leveled to ensure all readers receive the proper support and challenge. All Journeys Common Core leveled readers are leveled by consulting author Irene Fountas. These texts apply comprehension skills and strategies from the core lessons and support students at their instructional level. The writing portion of the Journeys Common Core program is a combination of direct writing instruction through common core mini-lessons and student practice utilizing the Common Core Writing Handbook.

All teachers prepared for Journeys Common Core instruction during our Summer Institute where they participated in hands on professional development conducted by Journeys consultants. Teachers were able to delve into the curriculum unit by unit and review all components of the program. Teachers worked in grade groups to prepare grade specific planning and were able to review the texts and all support materials in advance. Teachers were able to take a deep dive into the intervention components and plan for differentiated instruction for below, on and above grade level students.

In the upper grades, literacy teachers have collaborated with literacy consultant Isoke Nia to blend Journeys Common Core into Common Core curriculum mapping that began two years ago and further concretize the common core planning for grades 7 and 8. We have also advanced a master teacher to a fulltime Dean of Literacy position. As such she will work closely with the Ms. Nia to refine the literacy curriculum and oversee its implementation. As the Dean of Literacy she will conduct frequent observations of instruction and provide timely and targeted feedback to help move instruction and increase student learning. The Dean of Literacy will coach teachers, conduct demonstration lessons and provide support in lesson planning.

With the Journeys Common Core Response to Intervention materials CPCS will also overhaul its intervention program for at risk students. Journeys includes a multi-tiered system of support for struggling students. CPCS teachers will address three levels of intervention; Tier I supplements the core curriculum with small group support using leveled readers and guided instruction, Tier II combines the core curriculum and small group instruction for students who are at least one year behind with a Write-In Reader that scaffolds the development of vocabulary, phonics and decoding, and Tier III provides supplemental instruction for students who need intensive intervention. On Tier III teachers utilize a Literacy Tool kit that supports instruction in phonics and word study, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension assesses and prescribes instruction and offers practice and application to ensure mastery. This three tiered intervention system will provide targeted and intensive support to bridge learning gaps for struggling students and improve learning

MATHEMATICS

Goal 2: Mathematics

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

Background

In 2012, CPCS continued to supplement its core curriculum in mathematics with other programs in order to meet the needs of our range of learners as well as to make certain that all of the New York State Mathematics Learning Standards were fully addressed. CPCS continued its implementation of *Investigations in Number, Data, and Space* in grades K-5, and *Connected Mathematics Project 2 (CMP2)* for grades 6 and 7, as its core mathematics programs. These curricula are delivered through a workshop model similar to the language arts delivery system which includes mini lessons, independent practice and summary work. The core programs are supported by a variety of supplementary materials selected to meet the needs of individual students.

CPCS established a systematic approach to Response to Intervention (RTI) where students were identified as needing intervention and were given small group instruction (SGI) for 45 minutes four days a week (two of the sessions were devoted to ELA instruction and two were devoted to math.) By carefully analyzing interim assessment and mock assessment data, CPCS identified the content that most students struggled with, grouped students by similar strengths and struggles, and developed problems based on state exam items. Students' progress during SGI sessions were tracked throughout the year and work was adjusted to meet each student's needs. Concurrently, CPCS used America's Choice *Navigator series* during the math block as well as during small group tutoring after school to help students master basic skills. Screeners were used to identify struggling students and each student was assigned to a module of study based on their individual needs. These modules were co-taught by the math staff developer and the CTT teacher or assistant teacher. Students were given pre- and post-tests and students who did not master the content by the end of the module were given intensive, targeted and often one-on-one support.

An important aspect of CPCS's approach to intervention has been the role of the CTT teachers and the assistant teachers. In grades K-4, every classroom has either a special education teacher or assistant teacher alongside the regular education teacher. In fifth to seventh grades, some classes are designated as CTT classrooms. This staffing structure has allowed CPCS to provide small group instruction and targeted support for all students. All decisions from student grouping to content selection were based on careful analysis of student assessment data.

Similarly, the middle school decided to incorporate two new math curricula in 2012-13 based on the data collected this year. *Envision Math: Common Core* from Pearson will be used in the fifth grade and *Prentice Hall Mathematics: Courses 1, 2, 3* will be used in sixth through eighth

grades. These curricula were chosen to compliment *Investigations in Number, Data, and Space* in fifth grade and *Connected Mathematics Project (CMP2)* in sixth and seventh grades. The goal is to fill in holes in our present curricula in order to prepare students for the demands of the Common Core Math Standards.

Last year we used the *Contexts for Learning Mathematics* series by Catherine Fosnot and colleagues to develop problem solving skills for fourth and fifth grade students. The *Contexts for Learning Mathematics* series was developed by teacher educators, mathematicians, classroom teachers, and researchers from Mathematics in the City at City College and the Freudenthal Institute in the Netherlands to foster a deep conceptual understanding of essential mathematical ideas, strategies and models. CPCS taught units from *Investigating Multiplication and Division* in fifth grade to small groups of students needing remedial support. These units were chosen because the data from our interim assessments showed that students were struggling in these key areas of mathematics.

CPCS also used the *New York State Coach, Empire Edition*, the *New York State Progress Coach, Empire Edition*, and the *Ladders to Success on the New York State Mathematics Test* as part of our daily instruction and during our Saturday Academies to provide students with more problem solving opportunities and help prepare them for the state math test. As much as possible, CPCS used these resources concurrently with the content strand being taught in *Investigations* and *CMP2* instead of in isolation. This allowed students to see the same content in different formats and in different question structures. Moving forward, we will continue to use these supplemental resources to complement our core mathematics to further develop our students' problem-solving and computation skills, as well as allowing our students to see similar content in a variety of formats and contexts.

In addition, we have continued to use the powerful manipulative model, the "Rekenrek." We have used this tool in kindergarten through second grade classrooms and have extended its use to students in third grade as well as with struggling fourth graders. Developed by mathematics education researchers in the Netherlands, the "Rekenrek" is recognized internationally as perhaps the most powerful of all manipulative models for young learners in understanding our base-ten system of numbers. We have seen students' understanding of our base-ten number system grow as well as their facility in acquiring basic addition and subtraction facts.

In grades K-2, students receive 60-minute sessions of math instruction daily by their classroom teacher, as well as additional instruction throughout the day as part of their math routine work. Their math routine work focuses on content such as time and money that our student data has shown to require more instruction and sustained practice over time. Research has shown that these are areas of mathematics that require ongoing practice throughout the year to be most effective.

We have continued to provide departmentalized instruction in third through seventh grades. This allows students to receive 120 minutes of math instruction three times a week and 60 minutes twice each week. The science instruction integrates mathematics skills and concepts,

such as measurement and problem solving, which naturally overlap both subject areas. In the upper grades, CPCS has provided additional targeted opportunities for students to hone their math skills. For example, this year we have piloted small group instruction (SGI) in third through seventh grades. Having piloted SGI last year in fifth and sixth grade, we recognized that targeted, small group instruction was a crucial for both our struggling learners and accelerated students. By implementing SGI in all the testing grades, we were able to meet all students' needs and better prepare them for the state exams. Students were initially grouped according to our assessment data. Careful analysis of this data was used to design predictable tasks and problems to solve and weekly analysis of data collected during daily sessions were used to revise instructional plans.

The math staff developer provided on-going support and feedback to teachers through classroom observations, demonstrations, weekly grade-level meetings and professional development days. School-wide decisions about the math program at CPCS this past year were made by the staff developer and the Director and Middle School Principal based on student data, state and national standards, current research of best practices and classroom observations. This collaboration has led to new initiatives at CPCS.

Realizing the students struggled to approach and solve word problems, the school leaders and math staff developer implemented the Singapore Math model drawing approach. Singapore has consistently ranked in the top three countries in the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), since 1999. This approach, which is a cornerstone of Singapore's curriculum, allows students to graphically represent the relationship between numbers and operations that are needed to solve problems presented in stories. Teachers from first through sixth grade along with specialists and the math staff developer were sent to a full day professional development workshop to learn the method. Workshops were provided to parents learn about the method as well. CPCS plans to continue and extend the work next year as well. We will continue to monitor data to track the efficacy of this method as it relates to student achievement.

Recognizing algebra is a cornerstone for success in technology, science, and engineering – fields that will account for a significant proportion of future jobs, and acknowledging that many students lack the fundamental knowledge and skills to succeed in algebra, CPCS set out to infuse algebraic thinking and reasoning across grades. To this end CPCS sent three teachers and the math coach to a three day intensive professional development conference, “3-8 Institute on Algebra Readiness” in Baltimore, Maryland. Some foci of the Institute were to have teachers explore tasks and instructional techniques, including questioning strategies that support students' development of conjectures and generalizations, learn instructional strategies that provide all students with opportunities to develop strong algebraic reasoning skills, and understand how concepts within multiple domains of the Common Core State Standards for Mathematics (CCSSM) support algebraic reasoning. The work our teachers did at the Institute was brought back to their students and shared with colleagues. CPCS will continue to focus on developing students' algebraic thinking and reasoning.

Data-driven instruction continued to inform all instructional decisions at CPCS. With the continued support of the BwCF Research and Evaluation Team (RET) interim assessment results were processed smoothly and available for teachers within days after assessments were given. These immediate results provided the school leadership with an efficient way to review student progress and identify students in need of intervention. Students in need of intervention were supported by in-classroom grouping, out of classroom tutorials and a Saturday Academy program that was offered to students over eight Saturday sessions from January through May. This year CPCS began to administer two Mock Assessments based on the New York State math exam. These mock assessments from Rally Education® mirrored the content and format of the state exams and provided valuable data on gaps in our mathematics instruction as data was compared both within and across grades. Such data informed both instruction at each grade-level and decisions on a school-wide level. For example, it was noted that graphing data was a challenge for students across grades. This information besought that we look more closely at this and other content that had been taught but not mastered, and led to a revision in our scope and sequence to allow for more ongoing practice with such content.

BwCF provided considerable support and guidance this year in the implementation of PowerSchool Studio, a comprehensive student information system. This system allowed teachers to access student assessment profiles and view comparative exam performance and skills mastery levels for students in all of their classes. The data system also enabled the school to send home detailed reports about student grades and test results, enabling families to provide additional supports with guidance from the school. Math profiles in the PowerSchool database provided historical student assessment data for easy reference by teachers and staff developers. Tracking data in a central location has allowed for a more comprehensive view of student progress and performance, at classroom, grade and school-wide levels. CPCS, with the ongoing support and guidance of BwCF, with continue to expand and refine our use of this powerful data tracking system.

In 2012-13, CPCS has begun to overhaul our approach to teaching mathematics. We will implement *Math in Focus*, (Singapore Math), as its core mathematics program for grades K-8. Teachers have already begun training in use of the curriculum and approaches to teaching the program espouses. We have also established a set of professional development dates and strategies to ensure proper implementation of the program through the year. Student growth and performance will also be monitored through our established metrics and data monitoring and analysis infrastructure. We have reframed our expectations for monitoring progress and the frequency of coaching by academic deans, staff developers and school leaders. There is heightened urgency about coaching teacher responses to student performance data as well as around optimizing student abilities to demonstrate their learning.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure (G2.1)

Each year, 75 percent of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will achieve proficient scores on the NYS Math exam.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program mathematics assessment to students in grades 3 through 8 in April 2013. Each student's raw score has been converted to a grade-specific scaled score and a performance level.

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

**2012-13 State Mathematics Exams
Number of Students Tested and Not Tested**

Grade	Total Tested	Not Tested			Total Enrolled
		IEP	ELL	Absent	
3	51	0	0	0	51
4	52	0	0	0	52
5	52	0	0	0	52
6	49	0	0	0	49
7	41	0	0	0	41
8	26	0	0	0	26
All	271	0	0	0	271

Results

Performance on 2012-13 State Mathematics Exams By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	All Students		Enrolled in at least their Second Year	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	37.3	51	38.3	47
4	40.4	52	44.2	43
5	32.7	52	32.7	49
6	20.4	49	23.1	39
7	31.3	41	32.4	37
8	7.7	26	7.7	26
All	30.3	271	31.5	241

The overall percent of students in at least their second year achieving at proficiency, in each grade, fell significantly short of the absolute measure goal.

Evaluation

The school did not meet the measure. Our drop in overall proficiency matched the forecasts of the New York State Education Department. However, there were particular areas of concerns for performance in grades 5-8. We looked closed at curriculum and instruction and we have made significant changes both in personnel and program for the next school year. As discussed above, we have changed our curricular approach Kindergarten through eighth grades to ensure alignment with Common Core State Standards.

Additional Evidence

Mathematics Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year Achieving Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	75.0	48	79.2	43	38.3	47
4	68.0	50	82.7	50	44.2	43

5	80.6	36	76.6	45	32.7	49
6	69.6	23	65.3	43	23.1	39
7	-	-	82.8	28	32.4	37
8	-	-	-	-	7.7	26
All	73.2	157	76.9	209	31.5	241

In 2011-12, CPCS demonstrated progress towards charter goals over the previous year. A new baseline for student performance, relative to common core standards, was established with the NYS testing in 2013. We have begun to reshape our approach to math instruction, as detailed below in our Action Plan, to ensure a return to our tradition of continuous improvement.

Goal 2: Absolute Measure (G2.2)

Each year, CPCS’s aggregate Performance Index on the NYS Math exams will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in NYS’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Method

The federal No Child Left Behind law holds schools accountable for making annual yearly progress towards enabling all students to be proficient. As a result, the state sets an Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) each year to determine if schools are making satisfactory progress toward the goal of proficiency in the state’s learning standards in mathematics. To achieve this measure, all tested students must have a Performance Level Index (PLI) value that equals or exceeds the current year’s mathematics AMO. The PLI is calculated by adding the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 2 through 4 with the sum of the percent of all tested students at Levels 3 and 4. Thus, the highest possible PLI is 200.⁶

Results

Due to the implementation of the new 3-8 state testing program, NYSED has not yet recalibrated the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) in ELA and math. Therefore, we are not able to report on the results for this measure.

Evaluation

The State Education Department has not recalibrated the AMO to align with the new Mathematics 3-8 testing program

Goal 2: Comparative Measure (G2.3)

Each year, the proficiency rates of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will exceed the proficiency rates of students from District 13 in NYC on the NYS Math exams.

⁶ In contrast to SED’s Performance Index, the PLI does not account for year-to-year growth toward proficiency.

Method

Tested students who were enrolled in at least their second year are compared to all tested students in the home or surrounding DOE school district. Comparisons are between the results for each grade in which the school had tested students and the results for the respective grades in the home district, as well as between the total result of students in at least their second year at the school and the total result for the corresponding grades in the home school district.

Results

**2012-13 State Mathematics Exams
Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level**

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
3	38.3	47	30.3	1132
4	44.2	43	29.7	1049
5	32.7	49	24	995
6	23.1	39	14	927
7	32.4	37	10.1	989
8	7.7	26	11.9	1044
All	31.5	241	20.3	6136

Evaluation

This measure was met. The average proficiency of CPCS students was 31.5% compared to 20.3% of the district, a difference of 11.2%. Furthermore, all students in their second year of testing exceeded the aggregate district performance in grade K through 7 by an average of 12.54%. However, our grade 8 trailed the district average 4.2%.

Additional Evidence

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

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in at Least their Second Year Who Are at Proficiency Compared to Local District Students					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District	Charter School	Local District
3	75	48.7	79.2	54.4	38.3	30.3

4	68	54	82.7	58.1	44.2	29.7
5	80.6	57.6	76.6	60.5	32.7	24.0
6	69.6	42.4	65.3	46.2	23.1	14.0
7	-	-	82.8	47.1	32.4	10.1
8	-	-	-	-	7.7	11.9
All	73.2	50.5	76.9	53.1	31.5	20.3

As discussed above, CPCS outperformed its home district this year. However, for the first time the gap between the aggregate performance of the district and CPCS fell below 20%.

Goal 2: Comparative Measure (G2.4)

Each year, CPCS will exceed its expected level of performance on the NYS Math exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis performed by CSI controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.

Method

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

Given the timing of the state’s release of economically disadvantaged data and the demands of the data analysis, the 2012-13 analysis is not yet available. This report contains 2011-12 results (using free-lunch eligible percentage), the most recent Comparative Performance Analysis available.

Results

2011-12 Mathematics Comparative Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Percent of Students at Levels 3&4		Difference between Actual and Predicted	Effect Size
			Actual	Predicted		
3		48	79.2	60.8	18.4	1.17
4		52	82.7	68.8	13.9	0.93
5		47	76.6	66.2	10.4	0.63
6		49	65.3	62.9	2.4	0.13
7		29	82.8	62.1	20.7	1.14

8	48	79.2	60.8	18.4	1.17
All	225	76.9	64.4	12.5	0.77

School's Overall Comparative Performance:
<i>Higher than expected to a medium degree</i>

Evaluation

The measure was met. The analysis using last year's data shows an effect size of 0.77 for the six grades combined, which was higher than expected to a medium degree.

Additional Evidence

The chart below shows comparative data of math for CPCS students during the past three years.

Mathematics Comparative Performance by School Year

School Year	Grades	Percent Eligible for Free Lunch	Number Tested	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
2009-10	3 - 5	55	141	63.8	56.9	0.4
2010-11	3 - 6	57	185	70.8	57.9	0.72
2011-12	3 - 7	46	225	76.9	12.5	0.77

Goal 2: Growth Measure (G2.5A)

Each year, the proficiency rates of grade-level cohorts on the NYS Math exams will reduce by one-half the difference between 75 and the proficiency rates on the previous year's NYS Math exams. If 75 percent or more of the grade-level cohorts obtained proficient scores the previous year, their results will increase in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same group of students from one year to the next and the progress they are making towards the absolute measure of 75 percent of students performing at or above proficient. Each grade level cohort consists of those students who took the state exam in 2012-13 and also have a state exam score in 2011-12. It includes all current students in grades 4-8 who repeated the grade. These students are included in their current grade level cohort, not the cohort to which they previously belonged. In addition, the school examines the aggregate of all cohorts to determine the growth of all students taking a state exam in both years. CPCS used 2011-12 and 2012-13 scale scores to conduct this analysis.

Results

2012-13 Grades	Cohort Size	Percent Performing At or Above Level 3			Goal Achieved?
		2011-12	Target	2012-13	
4	43	81.40	81.41	44.19	NO
5	49	79.59	79.60	32.65	NO
6	39	79.49	79.50	23.08	NO
7	38	73.68	74.34	34.21	NO
8	26	84.62	84.63	7.69	NO
All	195	79.49	79.50	30.26	NO

Evaluation

CPCS did not meet the measure for any of the five cohorts. The collapsed proficiency rate for all five cohorts combined decreased by 49.23. This new proficiency rate represents the new benchmark for proficiency based on NYS common core assessments.

Goal 2: Growth Measure (G2.5B)

Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced math assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.

Method

This measure examines the change in performance of the same cohort of students from one year to the next on the TerraNova norm-referenced math test. Each cohort consists of those students who have norm-referenced reading test results for two consecutive years the school. It includes students who repeated the grade. The criterion for achieving this measure is for the cohort to reduce by half the difference between average NCE in the first year and the 50th NCE in the second. If a cohort has already achieved an average NCE of 50, it is expected to show some positive growth in the subsequent year. For the 2012-13 school year CPCS administered the TerraNova math exam to students in grades K-3 in June 2013.

Results

2012-13 Grades	Cohort Size	Average NCE			Goal Achieved?
		2011-12	Target	2012-13	
1	43	50.28	50.29	54.28	YES
2	34	48.53	49.27	42.91	NO
3	46	34.52	42.26	50.11	YES
All	123	43.9	46.95	49.58	YES

Evaluation

Two out of three cohorts met the goal. Third grade students showed strong growth, moving from an average NCE of 34.52 in second grade to an average of 50.11 in third grade. First grade students showed an increase from an average NCE of 50.28 in kindergarten to 54.28 in first grade. Unfortunately students in the second grade did not do well on the TerraNova math exam, with an average NCE of 42.91, down from 48.53 the prior year. Second grade did not meet the targeted achievement level.

Summary of the Mathematics Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75 percent of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will achieve proficient scores on the NYS Math exam.	Did Not Achieve
Absolute	Each year, CPCS’s aggregate Performance Index on the NYS Math exams will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in NYS’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.	N/A
Comparative	Each year, the proficiency rates of CPCS students in grades 3 through 8 who are enrolled in at least their second year will exceed the proficiency rates of students from District 13 in NYC on the NYS Math exams.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, CPCS will exceed its expected level of performance on the NYS Math exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to a small degree) according to a regression analysis performed by CSI controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.	Achieved
Growth	Each year, the proficiency rates of grade-level cohorts on the NYS Math exams will reduce by one-half the difference between 75 and the proficiency rates on the previous year’s NYS Math exams. If 75 percent or more of the grade-level cohorts obtained proficient scores the previous year, their results will increase in the current year.	Did Not Achieve
Growth	Each year, on the TerraNova national norm-referenced math assessment, all grade-level cohorts of students (in grades K-3) will reduce by one half the gap between their average NCE in the previous year and an NCE of 50 in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show a positive gain in the current year.	Approaching (2 out of 3)

CPCS continues to demonstrate strength in its comparative data both with regard to effect size and cohort measures. It also achieved two out of three proficiency measures related to TerraNova in Kindergarten through third grades. However, the school did not meet the absolute or growth measures for the NYS exams in grades 3 through 8. As discussed below, the data from our performance on the NYS Mathematics exams represent a new baseline that informs our strategic planning for math curriculum and teacher development going forward.

Action Plan

CPCS will implement *Math in Focus*, (Singapore Math), as its core mathematics program for grades K-8. *Math in Focus* is especially strong in developing conceptual understanding. It differs from the original *Singapore* series in that it is also aligned with the NCTM (National Council of Teachers of Mathematics) standards as well as with the Common Core Standards. However, unlike most

programs aligned with the NCTM standards, it does not try to teach every concept every year. Instead, it focuses on fewer topics but teaches them to mastery. The scope and sequence is advanced. A major focus is upon preparing students for success in algebra. Consequently, algebraic thinking and expressions are introduced early and used frequently throughout the series.

Throughout the series, concepts are taught moving through a sequence of concrete to pictorial to abstract. Concrete learning happens through hands-on activities with manipulatives such as counters, coins, number lines, or *Base Ten Blocks*[™]. Pictorial learning uses pictures in student books, drawings, or other forms that illustrate the concept with something more than abstract numbers. The abstract stage is the more familiar way most math problems are taught and practiced with numbers and symbols. Lessons at all levels follow the same progression. A lesson begins with the teaching presentation. Next, the teacher walks students through guided practice. Then students do independent practice. Lessons concentrate on a single concept rather than providing continual practice on previously-learned concepts. The goal of *Math in Focus* is to teach concepts so thoroughly that frequent review is unnecessary.

All teachers prepared for Math in Focus instruction during our Summer Institute. Teachers participated in interactive professional development facilitated by Math in Focus trainers. Teachers reviewed all components of the program and began grade level planning of instruction. Teachers were able to preview all supplemental materials and intervention resources.

The entire presentation in *Math in Focus* really challenges students to think much more deeply about mathematics than do most other programs and because of its quality, the Singapore Syllabus was an important resource for the developers of the Common Core State Standards.

CPCS is revamping the Mathematics Response to Intervention (RtI) program to also include a three-tiered approach to differentiation and intervention. Math in Focus is aligned to this structure and provides resources to support struggling students at all three levels. The goal of math RtI is to reach students whose needs are not being met by the core curriculum without needlessly separating or isolating them from their peers. *Math in Focus, Singapore Math*, aligns with these recommendations.

Math in Focus adapts instruction to the needs of individual learners through scaffolding, the systematic sequencing of prompted content, and support to optimize learning. The ultimate goal of scaffolding is to gradually remove the supports as the learner masters the task. *Math in Focus* uses this approach to introduce new concepts and increasingly difficult problems. Scaffolding is apparent in the concrete–pictorial–abstract approach that appears throughout the program and in the sequencing of the word problems that go from one step to two step to multistep. Teachers can easily individualize instruction to meet RtI Tiers I, II and III.

Math in Focus intervention resources include Transition Guides to help transition students into the *Math in Focus* program, English Language Learner supports with specific suggestions for facilitating instruction for English Language Learners, Reteach lessons that provide more exposure to concepts for students who need more time to master new skills or concepts, Extra Practice for on-level Students with pages that correlate directly to the Workbook practices and Enrichment exercises of varying complexity to provide advanced students opportunities to extend learning.

Extra Practice and Reteach opportunities are provided for every lesson. These can be implemented on a whole-class basis for RtI Tier I, on a small-group basis for Tier II, or in individual settings for Tier III modifications. *Math in Focus* Teacher's Editions provide tips for helping struggling students at point of use and reference additional Reteach and Extra Practice pages for additional support.

With the emphasis on problem-solving, the focus on algebra, differentiated approach and the increased focus that Singapore Math places on computational fluency, we believe our students will receive balanced and robust mathematical instruction that will lead to student success.

SCIENCE

Goal 3: Science

CPCS students will become proficient in Science.

Background

CPCS continues to support a rich experiential science curriculum provided by a science specialist in a variety of programmatic delivery models. In grades K-2 science instruction is provided to students in the science classroom setting for two hours weekly. In grades 3-8 science was taught by a science specialist who works with the math classroom teacher in three 60 minute blocks per week. In grades 7 and 8, science was taught by the middle school science teacher. The lower school science specialist and middle school science teachers coordinate an annual science fair for students in grades 3-8. This science fair was a huge success this year as it allowed students to demonstrate their capacity for original scientific inquiry. The school also hosted a Science and Tech night during which families come to learn about science and technology and to participate in fun and educational activities. These annual events, alongside our rigorous science instruction, have created a school culture in which students see themselves as scientists and technology enthusiasts.

Goal 3: Absolute Measure (G3.1)

Each year, 75% of CPCS students who are enrolled in at least their second year will achieve proficient scores on the 4th and 8th grade NYS Science exams.

Method

The school administered the New York State Testing Program science assessment to students in 4th and 8th grade in spring 2013. The school converted each student's raw score to a performance level and a grade-specific scaled score. The criterion for success on this measure requires students enrolled in at least their second year (defined as enrolled by BEDS day of the previous school year) to score at proficiency.

Results

Charter School Performance on 2012-13 State Science Exams By All Students and Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	98	51	100	43
8	73.1	26	73.1	26
All	89.6	77	89.9	69

CPCS cohort proficiency rate in grade 4 and 8 is just below 90% which significantly outpaces the 75% absolute measure goal.

Evaluation

The measure was met. This year we continued to see both the strength and growth of our lower school science program. At the middle school we lodged our first set of results just below grade level expectations. The middle school results suggested that we needed to retrofit our overall approach to ensure that we had the right staffing model and programmatic approach. We have added a 5th and 6th grade science teacher to our staffing plan. This adjustment gave us a teacher dedicated to ensuring that those students will receive deeper exposure to grade level content and it will also release the math teachers of those grades to concentrate solely on math instruction.

Additional Evidence

Science Performance by Grade Level and School Year

Grade	Percent of Students Enrolled in At Least Their Second Year at Proficiency					
	2010-11		2011-12		2012-13	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	89.8	49	90.2	51	100	43
8	-	-	-	-	73.1	26
All	89.8	49	90.2	51	89.9	69

CPCS proficiency rate in grade 4 has increased every year over the past three years of the charter period. The proficiency rate among 8th grade students fell just short of the 75% goal we have established for each grade level, however, the aggregated proficiency rate of the school is just below 90%.

Goal 3: Comparative Measure (G3.2)

Each year, the proficiency rates of CPCS students who are enrolled in at least their second year will exceed the proficiency rate of students in District 13 in NYC on the 4th and 8th grade NYS Science exams.

Method

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

Results

2012-13 State Science Exams Charter School and District Performance by Grade Level

Grade	Percent of Students at Proficiency			
	Charter School Students In At Least 2 nd Year		All District Students	
	Percent	Number Tested	Percent	Number Tested
4	100	43	N/A	N/A
8	73.1	26	N/A	N/A
All	89.9	69	N/A	N/A

Over eighty-nine percent CPCS students were proficient on the 4th and 8th grade science exams in 2013. We are unable to compare that level of proficiency to District 13 as district-level data are no longer released.

Evaluation

The school met the 75 percent expectation for its student's performance. The district will not release its results.

Summary of the Science Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, 75% of CPCS students who are enrolled in at least their second year will achieve proficient scores on the 4th and 8th grade NYS Science exams.	Achieved
Comparative	Each year, the proficiency rates of CPCS students who are enrolled in at least their second year will exceed the proficiency rate of students in District 13 in NYC on the 4th and 8th grade NYS Science exams.	Comparative Data Not Available

In aggregate CPCS met the 75% proficiency goal in 4th and 8th grades. We will continue to work to ensure that our proficiency level surpasses 90% in the next school year.

Action Plan

CPCS science specialists will continue to integrate science and math in grades 3-8 and strengthen our core science instruction in seventh and eighth grades. In addition to a lower school science specialist, the middle school has retained one teacher fifth and sixth grade and another for seventh and eighth grade science. We believe the addition of a second middle school teacher will allow for greater proficiency in providing deeper and broader engagement with content at each grade level. The lower school science specialists will continue to collaborate with the middle school science specialists to ensure a seamless transition from lower school to upper school science. As we continue to develop our project-based approach to learning opportunities, the lower school science specialist will work with all lower school teachers to incorporate science learning into their social studies units.

NCLB

Goal 4: NCLB
NCLB Accountability System

Goal 4: Absolute Measure (G4.1)
Under the state’s NCLB accountability system, the CPCS’s Accountability Status will be “Good Standing” each year.

Method

Since *all* students are expected to meet the state's learning standards, the federal No Child Left Behind legislation stipulates that various sub-populations and demographic categories of students among all tested students must meet state proficiency standards. New York, like all states, established a system for making these determinations for its public schools. Each year the state

issues School Report Cards which indicate each school’s status under the state’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.

Results

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

Evaluation

CPCS met this measure.

Additional Evidence

NCLB Status by Year

Year	Status
2010-11	Good Standing
2011-12	Good Standing
2012-13	Good Standing

Summary of the NCLB Goal

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

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

Art, Music, Physical Education, and Technology

Goal 5:
CPCS Students will participate in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education and Technology

Goal 5: Absolute Measure (G5.1)
Every CPCS student will participate in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education, and Technology classes as part of their weekly class schedule.

Results

Students in grades K-4 participated in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education and Technology classes at least once a week. In grades 5-8, specialty teachers taught their subject twice a week on a trimester basis. Specialty teachers are responsible for ensuring 100 percent participation in class.

Evaluation

CPCS met this measure.

Summary of the Art, Music, Physical Education, and Technology Goal

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	CPCS Students will Participate in Social Studies, Art, Music, Physical Education and Technology	Achieved

CPCS will continue to create additional opportunities to enhance our students' studies in these subjects next year. Particular emphasis will continue to be placed on improving technology integration in the classroom and also on providing opportunities for students to learn about potential professions in the arts.

APPENDIX B: ORGANIZATIONAL VIABILITY

Goal 6: Parent Satisfaction

Parents will Express a High Satisfaction Rating with the School

Goal 6: Absolute Measure (G6.1)

Each year, responses on the school survey will reflect that parents have high satisfaction with CPCS's program.

Method

CPCS used the DOE Parent Surveys to measure parent satisfaction. Surveys were distributed at the mid-winter parent teacher conferences. They also were sent home in the school's Tuesday folder. Parents were encouraged to provide their feedback via the school's auto dialer and during PTCC meetings. The results were tabulated by the NYC DOE.

Results

2012-13 Parent Satisfaction Survey Response Rate

Number of Responses	Response Rate
208	58%

2012-13 Parent Satisfaction on Key Survey Results

Category	Score out of 10
Academic Expectations	8.1
Communication	8.7
Engagement	8.4
Safety & Respect	8.6

Fifty-eight percent of our parents responded to this year's survey. Those participants rated CPCS at 8.45/10 in the key areas of parent satisfaction as articulated by the survey.

Evaluation

DOE Survey results indicate an above average level of parent satisfaction compared to schools citywide. Parent satisfaction with academic expectations, communication, engagement and safety & respect was above average. In addition, each category showed increases over the previous year and parent satisfaction was dramatically improved. The full DOE survey report is available:

http://schools.nyc.gov/OA/SchoolReports/2012-13/Survey_2013_K702.pdf

Goal 6: Absolute Measure (G6.2)

Each year, CPCS will have a daily student attendance rate of at least 90 percent.

Method

CPCS teachers track daily attendance in PowerSchool. The average daily attendance rate shown below is calculated by dividing the number of days in attendance for all students by the number of days enrolled for all students and multiplying that figure by 100.

Results

The average daily student attendance rate for CPCS for the entire 2012-13 school year was 94 percent.

Evaluation

CPCS met this goal.

Summary of the Parent Satisfaction Goals

Type	Measure	Outcome
Absolute	Each year, responses on the school survey will reflect that parents have high satisfaction with CPCS's program.	Achieved
Absolute	Each year, CPCS will have a daily student attendance rate of at least 90 percent.	Achieved

CPCS achieved absolute measures pertaining to parent satisfaction and student attendance. We will continue to work on trying to get more parent input into the survey. Our goal is to have at least 85 percent of families responding to the survey, and to maintain the highest possible levels of parent satisfaction. We endeavor to continue working with our PTCC to mobilize greater and more diverse parent responses and participation in school activities across both our campuses. We also remain focused on building a stronger K-8 parent program to help families continue to feel connected to their children's learning, to our programs and to the attainment of the school's mission.

Goal VII: CPCS will be Substantially Compliant with all Legal Requirements

Measure 1 (Absolute) Each year, CPCS will generally and substantially comply with all applicable laws, rules and regulations, including, but not limited to, the NY Charter Schools Act, the NY Freedom of Information Law (FOIL), the NY Open Meetings Law, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), and the provisions of its By-Laws and Charter.

Method

The State University of New York Charter School Institute (SUNY CSI) and the State Education Department (SED) conduct regular oversight visits at CPCS and audit the school's compliance with the above referenced statutes and other relevant documents such as the school's Charter and By-Laws. In addition, CPCS undertakes internal compliance audits to ensure that it is meeting all applicable provisions of the law, its Charter and its By-Laws.

Results

CPCS met this measure. For example, the school follows the procedures set forth in the above referenced statutes for informing families about their right to know information about their children's school files and certification status of their teachers. The school's Policies and

Procedures Manual, Staff Manual, and Operations Manual are continually revised to include more specific directions, for example, to staff about student and family rights pursuant to FOIL and FERPA. The Board of Trustees meetings are held pursuant to the Open Meetings Law and are submitted in a timely fashion to the school's authorizer.

Measure 2 (Absolute) Each year, CPCS will have in place and maintain effective systems, policies, procedures and other controls for ensuring that legal and charter requirements are met.

See **Method** discussion above.

Results

CPCS also met this measure. When necessary, the school consults with outside counsel to assist in legal matters and to interpret charter requirements. On an annual basis, the school revises its Operations Manual and updates its Policies and Procedures Manual and Staff Manual to clearly communicate school wide policies, protocols and controls to ensure legal and charter compliance. The Board monitors a "dashboard" of metrics for its monthly meetings relating to the school's operations. This dashboard covers an array of critical information such as enrollment information (including special education and ELL enrollment), test scores mock assessment data, and other indicators of student achievement and activities at the school. This tool allows the Board to closely monitor the school's overall progress, and to strategize early around any necessary interventions and additional supports or resources.

The Board also regularly updates other school policies such as the Financial Policies and Procedures to reflect suggested changes to policies made by various authorities.

Measure 3 (Absolute) Each year, CPCS will maintain a relationship with independent legal counsel who review relevant policies, documents, and incidents and make recommendations as needed and in proportion to the legal expertise on the Board of Trustees.

Method

CPCS consults an attorney with the Tannenbaum, Helpert, Syracuse & Hirschtritt firm for legal advice relating to its operations, including its policies and procedures, documents and particular incidents. This past year the Board also consulted with Jeffrey Kehl of Kehl, Katzive & Simon, LLP.

Results

The school has made revisions as necessary and continues to meet the measure.

Summary of Legal Requirements Goals

Goal VII Measure	Type	Description	Outcome
1	Absolute	Each year CPCS will generally and substantially comply with all applicable laws, rules and regulations, including, but not limited to, the New York Charter Schools Act, the New York Freedom of Information Law, the New York Open Meetings Law, the Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and Federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the provisions of its By-Laws and Charter.	Achieved
2	Absolute	Each year CPCS will have in place and maintain effective systems, policies, procedures and other controls for ensuring that legal and charter requirements are met.	Achieved
3	Absolute	Each year CPCS will maintain a relationship with independent legal counsel who review relevant policies, documents, and incidents and make recommendations as needed and in proportion to the legal expertise on the Board of Trustees.	Achieved

As mentioned above, the Board met these measures. The Board continues to focus on its development needs. One of the goals for the upcoming year is to focus on board training as it relates to deeper understanding of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS). An education committee is being commenced with the expectation that members will lead the Board in deepening understandings of CCSS and our students’ performance and growth relative to those standards.

Goal VIII: CPCS Will Make Responsible Financial Decisions and Demonstrate Sound Fiscal Practices and Management

Measure 1 (Absolute) Each year, CPCS will operate on a balanced budget, meaning actual revenues will equal or exceed actual expenses.

Method

The Board meets on a monthly basis to discuss the school’s financial standing at its meetings. In addition, the Chair of the Finance Committee consults on a regular basis with the Business Manager and Director.

Results

For the fiscal year ended 6/30/13, CPCS expects actual revenues to exceed actual expenses. Each year, CPCS will strive to achieve a balanced budget. This measure was met.

Measure 2 (Absolute) At the end of each fiscal year, unrestricted net assets will be equal to or exceed two percent of the school's operating budget for the upcoming year.

Results

For the academic year 2012-13, CPCS's unrestricted net assets will exceed two percent of the school's operating budget for the upcoming school year. This measure was met.

Measure 3 (Absolute) Each year, CPCS will take corrective action if needed in a timely manner to address any internal control or compliance deficiencies identified by its external auditor SED or CSI.

Method

CPCS retains Citrin Cooperman as our auditors. They review the school's finances during the annual audit in the late summer and make a report to the Board in the fall each year.

Results

This measure was met. CPCS continues to review and revise internal control procedures to be in compliance with its external auditor, SED and CSI.

Measure 4 (Absolute) Each year, the CPCS Board will provide effective financial oversight including making financial decisions that further the school's mission program and goals.

Method

See above under Measure 1. In addition, the Board monitors a "dashboard" of metrics for its monthly meetings relating to the school's operations. This tool allows the Board to closely monitor the school's progress and alignment with the school's mission, program and goals.

Results

This measure was met. CPCS's Board of Trustees continues to provide sound financial oversight to further the school's mission, programs and goals. The CPCS Board meets approximately every

month. At each meeting, the state of the school's financial position is presented to the full Board for review and discussion. Since its inception, CPCS has received unqualified opinions each year from an independent auditor.

Measure 5 (Absolute) Each year, CPCS will operate pursuant to a long range financial plan and create realistic budgets that are monitored and adjusted when appropriate.

Method

The Finance Committee conducts extensive budget meetings each spring. We make adjustments to the long range plan according to programmatic needs.

Results

This measure was met. CPCS has defined a long-range financial plan and adjusts this plan each year during its budget process. Adjustments are made with full Board review and approval during the year as needed.

Measure 6 Each year, CPCS will maintain appropriate internal controls and procedures and accurately document transactions in accordance with the Board of Trustees' direction and laws, regulations, grants and contracts.

Method

See above under Measure 1. The Board reviews the school's Financial Policies and Procedures on a regular basis. The business office gives presentations to staff to ensure compliance with these policies.

Results

This measure was met. CPCS continues to maintain appropriate internal controls and procedures and accurately documents transactions in accordance with the Board of Trustee's direction and laws, regulations, grants and contracts.

Measure 7 Each year, CPCS will comply with financial reporting requirements.

Method

See above under Measure 1.

Results

This measure was met. CPCS has been in full compliance with all financial reporting requirements to our Board of Trustees and regulatory bodies.

Measure 8 (Absolute) Each year, CPCS will maintain adequate financial resources to ensure stable operations and will successfully monitor and manage cash flow.

Method

See above under Measures 1 and 5.

Results

This measure was met. CPCS maintains adequate financial resources to ensure stable operations and successfully monitors and manages cash flow.

Summary of Fiscal Practices Goals

Goal VIII Measure	Type	Description	Outcome
1	Absolute	Each year, CPCS will operate on a balanced budget, meaning actual revenues will equal or exceed actual expenses.	Achieved
2	Absolute	At the end of each fiscal year, unrestricted net assets will be equal to or exceed two percent of the school's operating budget for the upcoming year.	Achieved
3	Absolute	Each year, CPCS will take corrective action, if needed, in a timely manner to address any internal control or compliance deficiencies identified by its external auditor, SED, or CSI.	Achieved
4	Absolute	Each year, the CPCS Board will provide effective financial oversight, including making financial decisions that further the school's mission, program and goals.	Achieved
5	Absolute	Each year, CPCS will operate pursuant to a long-range financial plan and create realistic budgets that are monitored and adjusted when appropriate.	Achieved
6	Absolute	Each year, CPCS will maintain appropriate internal controls and procedures and accurately document transactions in accordance with the Board of Trustees' direction and laws, regulations, grants and contracts.	Achieved
7	Absolute	Each year, CPCS will comply with financial reporting requirements.	Achieved
8	Absolute	Each year, CPCS will maintain adequate financial resources to ensure stable operations and will successfully monitor and manage cash flow.	Achieved

ED Section III. Financial Statements

The audit is being submitted separately.

SED Section IV. Disclosure of Financial Interest

The Trustee Disclosure forms were submitted on August 1, 2013.

Appendix B. Total Expenditures and Administrative Expenditures per Child

Total Expenditures $\$5,722,567/415.775=\$13,763$

Total Admin Expenditures $\$830,564/415.775=\$1,998$

The ratios may change subject to the final audit.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP
CHARTER SCHOOL
FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Independent Auditors' Report	1 - 2
Financial Statements	
Statements of financial position	3
Statements of activities and changes in net assets	4
Statements of functional expenses	5
Statements of cash flows	6
Notes to financial statements	7 - 12
Independent Auditors' Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters Based on an Audit of Financial Statements Performed in Accordance with <i>Government Auditing Standards</i>	13 - 14



CITRIN COOPERMAN

Attest & Assurance | Tax Compliance & Research | Specialty & Consulting

INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT

To the Board of Trustees
Community Partnership Charter School

Report on the Financial Statements

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of Community Partnership Charter School (the "School") (a nonprofit organization), which comprise the statements of financial position as of June 30, 2013 and 2012, and the related statements of activities and changes in net assets, functional expenses, and cash flows for the years then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statements

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of these financial statements in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America; this includes the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements that are free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditors' Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements. The procedures selected depend on the auditors' judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statements, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditors consider internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statements.

We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.

Opinion

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the School as of June 30, 2013 and 2012, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

Other Reporting Required by *Government Auditing Standards*

In accordance with *Government Auditing Standards*, we have also issued our report dated October 8, 2013, on our consideration of the School's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the School's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Citrin Cooperman & Company, LLP
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

New York, New York
October 8, 2013

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL POSITION
JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2012</u>
<u>ASSETS</u>		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 961,315	\$ 894,497
Grants receivable	170,625	122,963
Accounts and interest receivable	3,460	7,021
Investments	3,341,339	2,699,429
Due from NYCDOE	-	6,425
Due from Beginning with Children Foundation	53,029	7,506
Property and equipment, net of accumulated depreciation of \$337,517 in 2013 and \$284,207 in 2012	<u>106,274</u>	<u>140,988</u>
TOTAL ASSETS	<u>\$ 4,636,042</u>	<u>\$ 3,878,829</u>
<u>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</u>		
Liabilities:		
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	\$ 576,665	\$ 557,081
Due to NYCDOE	<u>1,691</u>	<u>-</u>
Total liabilities	<u>578,356</u>	<u>557,081</u>
Contingencies (Note 7)		
Net assets:		
Unrestricted:		
Board-designated for facility and personnel costs	1,200,000	1,200,000
Undesignated	<u>2,857,686</u>	<u>2,121,748</u>
Total net assets	<u>4,057,686</u>	<u>3,321,748</u>
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS	<u>\$ 4,636,042</u>	<u>\$ 3,878,829</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES AND CHANGES IN NET ASSETS
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2012</u>
Operating revenue:		
State and local per pupil operating revenue	\$ 6,308,860	\$ 5,617,788
Government grants	227,920	140,940
Other revenue	<u>1,539</u>	<u>4,099</u>
Total operating revenue	<u>6,538,319</u>	<u>5,762,827</u>
Operating expenses:		
Program services	5,381,682	5,222,214
Management and general	453,857	389,563
Development	<u>58,459</u>	<u>46,618</u>
Total operating expenses	<u>5,893,998</u>	<u>5,658,395</u>
Surplus on government-funded school operations	644,321	104,432
Contributions	72,061	88,880
Investment earnings	<u>19,556</u>	<u>32,132</u>
Change in net assets	735,938	225,444
Net assets:		
Beginning	<u>3,321,748</u>	<u>3,096,304</u>
Ending	<u>\$ 4,057,686</u>	<u>\$ 3,321,748</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
STATEMENTS OF FUNCTIONAL EXPENSES
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

	2013			2012				
	Program Services	Management and General	Development	Total	Program Services	Management and General	Development	Total
Personnel services	\$ 3,547,343	\$ 221,052	\$ -	\$ 3,768,395	\$ 3,406,352	\$ 186,270	\$ -	\$ 3,592,622
Employee benefits and payroll taxes	753,361	38,263	-	791,624	790,873	43,248	-	834,121
Occupancy	58,296	7,480	-	65,776	51,276	6,831	-	58,107
Consultants	57,248	-	-	57,248	84,125	-	-	84,125
Classroom instructional supplies	183,032	-	-	183,032	229,336	-	-	229,336
Textbook and library books	6,433	-	-	6,433	25,974	-	-	25,974
Curriculum and staff development	145,026	-	-	145,026	114,247	-	-	114,247
Outreach	3,705	-	-	3,705	3,612	-	-	3,612
Trips and admissions	28,134	-	-	28,134	64,628	-	-	64,628
Research and evaluation	30,289	-	-	30,289	18,164	-	-	18,164
After-school and summer school programs	83,027	-	-	83,027	21,000	-	-	21,000
Management fees	409,217	116,919	58,459	584,595	326,327	93,237	46,618	466,182
Accounting and legal fees	-	27,428	-	27,428	-	23,082	-	23,082
Office and technology supplies	-	24,443	-	24,443	-	19,459	-	19,459
Telephone	-	5,739	-	5,739	-	5,346	-	5,346
Postage and shipping	-	4,487	-	4,487	-	5,375	-	5,375
Miscellaneous expenses	27,094	4,213	-	31,307	34,624	4,796	-	39,420
Depreciation	49,477	3,833	-	53,310	51,676	1,919	-	53,595
TOTAL	\$ 5,381,682	\$ 453,857	\$ 58,459	\$ 5,893,998	\$ 5,222,214	\$ 389,563	\$ 46,618	\$ 5,658,395

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
STATEMENTS OF CASH FLOWS
FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2012</u>
Cash flows from operating activities:		
Change in net assets	\$ 735,938	\$ 225,444
Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to net cash provided by operating activities:		
Unrealized loss (gain) on investments	8,090	(6,660)
Depreciation	53,310	53,595
Changes in assets and liabilities:		
Grants receivable	(47,662)	(885)
Accounts and interest receivable	3,561	(1,614)
Due from NYCDOE	6,425	(6,425)
Due to/from Beginning with Children Foundation	(45,523)	(35,565)
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	19,584	136,253
Refundable advances	<u>1,691</u>	<u>(20,833)</u>
Net cash provided by operating activities	<u>735,414</u>	<u>343,310</u>
Cash flows from investing activities:		
Purchase of property and equipment	(18,596)	(112,700)
Purchase of investments	(2,000,000)	(1,575,000)
Proceeds from sale of investments	<u>1,350,000</u>	<u>1,153,172</u>
Net cash used in investing activities	<u>(668,596)</u>	<u>(534,528)</u>
Cash used in financing activities:		
Payment for equipment purchase included in accounts payable and accrued expenses	<u>-</u>	<u>(15,951)</u>
Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents	66,818	(207,169)
Cash and cash equivalents - beginning	<u>894,497</u>	<u>1,101,666</u>
CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS - ENDING	<u>\$ 961,315</u>	<u>\$ 894,497</u>
Supplemental disclosure of non-cash investing and financing activities:		
Equipment purchase included in accounts payable and accrued expenses	<u>\$ -</u>	<u>\$ 15,951</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

NOTE 1. ORGANIZATION AND NATURE OF OPERATIONS

Principal Business Activity

Community Partnership Charter School (the "School") is an education corporation that operates as a charter school in the borough of Brooklyn, New York. On April 4, 2000, the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York granted the School a provisional charter valid for a term of five years and renewable upon expiration. In January 2012, the School was approved for a third five-year renewal of its charter from the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, and on July 18, 2012, the School entered into a new charter agreement.

The School's mission is as follows: At the Community Partnership Charter School, families, educators and community members join to create a learning environment that fosters high academic achievement that exceeds the New York State Learning Standards. An enriched curriculum and dynamic partnerships between the School, families and community enable all students to become life-long learners and active citizens who value kindness and respect.

The New York City Department of Education (the "NYCDOE") provides free and reduced-price lunches and transportation directly to a majority of the School's students.

NOTE 2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of Financial Statements

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared on an accrual basis of accounting and are presented in accordance with accounting requirements for not-for-profit organizations. These requirements provide that all not-for-profit organizations provide a statement of financial position, a statement of activities, and a statement of cash flows, and that net assets be classified as unrestricted, temporarily restricted, or permanently restricted based on the existence or absence of donor stipulations regarding their use.

Recently Adopted Accounting Pronouncements

In May 2011, the Financial Accounting Standards Board ("FASB") issued Accounting Standards Update ("ASU") No. 2011-04, *Amendments to Achieve Common Fair Value Measurement and Disclosure Requirements in U.S. GAAP and IFRSs*. ASU 2011-04 amends FASB Accounting Standards Codification ("ASC") 820, *Fair Value Measurement*, providing a consistent definition and measurement of fair value as well as similar disclosure requirements between accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America ("GAAP") and International Financial Reporting Standards. ASU 2011-04 changes certain fair value measurement principles, clarifies the application of existing fair value measurement, and expands the FASB ASC 820 disclosure requirements, particularly for Level 3 fair value measurements. ASU 2011-04 was effective for the year beginning July 1, 2012. The adoption of ASU 2011-04 did not have a material effect on the School's financial statements, but did require certain additional disclosures.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

NOTE 2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONTINUED)

Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the date of the financial statements, and the reported amounts of revenue and expenses during the reporting period. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

Cash and Cash Equivalents

The School maintains cash in bank deposit accounts which, at times, may exceed federally insured limits. The School has not experienced any losses in these accounts. The School considers all highly liquid instruments purchased with a maturity of three months or less to be cash equivalents.

Contributions

The financial statements of the School reflect contributions received from the public and other organizations. Contributions, including unconditional promises to give, are recognized in the statements of activities and changes in net assets as revenue in the period in which they are received or unconditionally promised.

The School reports gifts of cash and other assets as restricted support if they are received with donor stipulations that limit their use. When a donor restriction expires, that is, when a stipulated time restriction ends or a purpose restriction is accomplished, temporarily restricted net assets are reclassified to unrestricted net assets and reported in the statements of activities and changes in net assets as "Net assets released from restriction." Amounts received with donor stipulations that limit their use to certain purposes are reported as unrestricted support if the stipulated purpose restriction is accomplished in the same year.

Grants and Refundable Advances

Revenue from the state and local governments resulting from the School's charter status, which is based on the number of students enrolled, is recorded when services are performed in accordance with the charter agreement. Revenue from federal, state and local government grants and contracts is recognized when qualifying expenditures are incurred. Amounts received in excess of expenditures incurred are recognized as refundable advances.

Contributed Services

Contributed services are reported as contributions at their fair value if such services create or enhance nonfinancial assets, would have been purchased if not provided by donation, require special skills, and are provided by individuals possessing such skills.

A number of volunteers have made a contribution of their time to the School to develop academic and other programs and to serve on the board of trustees. The value of this contributed time is not reflected in the financial statements inasmuch as those services would not typically be purchased had they not been provided by donation.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

NOTE 2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONTINUED)

Investments

Investments are reported at fair value. Fair value is the price that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants at the measurement date. See Note 8 for a discussion of fair value measurements.

Purchases and sales of securities are recorded on a trade-date basis. Interest income is recorded on the accrual basis. Net appreciation (depreciation) includes the School's gains and losses on investments bought and sold as well as held during the year.

One financial institution held 100% of the School's investments at June 30, 2013 and 2012. These investments are primarily comprised of certificates of deposit and are FDIC insured.

Property and Equipment

The School capitalizes all purchases of property and equipment in excess of \$1,000 with a useful life of greater than one year. Property and equipment are carried at cost. Depreciation is computed using the straight-line method over the estimated useful lives of the respective assets.

Net Assets

Unrestricted net assets are not restricted by donors or donor-imposed restrictions have expired. Board-designated net assets were established by the board of trustees to provide a fiscally prudent reserve for unforeseen facility, personnel and other issues. Temporarily restricted net assets are restricted by donors for a specific purpose or for a specified time period beyond the current fiscal year.

Functional Allocation of Expenses

The costs of providing the various programs and other activities have been summarized on a functional basis in the accompanying statements of functional expenses. Certain costs have been allocated among program and supporting services.

Income Taxes

The School is a not-for-profit organization and is exempt from federal income taxes under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code (the "Code") and from state income taxes. As a not-for-profit entity, the School is subject to unrelated business income tax ("UBIT"), if applicable.

The School recognizes and measures its unrecognized tax benefits in accordance with FASB Accounting Standards Codification ("ASC") 740, *Income Taxes*. Under that guidance, the School assesses the likelihood, based on their technical merit, that tax positions will be sustained upon examination based on the facts, circumstances, and information available at the end of each period. The measurement of unrecognized tax benefits is adjusted when new information is available or when an event occurs that requires a change.

COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012

NOTE 2. SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES (CONTINUED)

Income Taxes (Continued)

Management has evaluated the School's tax positions and has concluded that the School has taken no uncertain tax positions that require adjustment to the financial statements. Generally, the School is no longer subject to income tax examinations by U.S. federal, state or local taxing authorities for years before 2009.

Fair Value Measurements

FASB ASC 820 establishes a framework for measuring fair value. That framework provides a fair value hierarchy that prioritizes the inputs to valuation techniques used to measure fair value. The hierarchy gives the highest priority to unadjusted quoted prices in active markets for identical assets or liabilities (Level 1 measurements) and the lowest priority to unobservable inputs (Level 3 measurements). Categorization within the valuation hierarchy is based upon the lowest level of input that is significant to the fair value measurement. Valuation techniques used need to maximize the use of observable inputs and minimize the use of unobservable inputs. Under this standard, fair value is defined as the exit price, or the amount that would be received to sell an asset or paid to transfer a liability in an orderly transaction between market participants as of the measurement date.

The three levels of the fair value hierarchy under FASB ASC 820 are described as follows:

Level 1 inputs to the valuation methodology are unadjusted quoted prices for identical assets or liabilities in active markets that the School has the ability to access.

Level 2 inputs to the valuation methodology include: quoted prices for similar assets or liabilities in active markets; quoted prices for identical assets or liabilities in inactive markets; inputs other than quoted prices that are observable for the asset or liability; and, inputs that are derived principally from or corroborated by observable market data by correlation or other means. If the asset or liability has a specified (contractual) term, the Level 2 input must be observable for substantially the full term of the asset or liability.

Level 3 inputs to the valuation methodology are unobservable and significant to the fair value measurement.

The School assesses the levels of the investments at each measurement date, and transfers between levels are recognized on the actual date of the event or change in the circumstances that caused the transfer in accordance with its accounting policy regarding the recognition of transfers between levels of the fair value hierarchy. There were no transfers among Levels 1, 2 and 3 during fiscal years 2013 and 2012.

Subsequent Events

In accordance with FASB ASC 855, *Subsequent Events*, the School has evaluated subsequent events through October 8, 2013, the date on which these financial statements were available to be issued. There were no material subsequent events that required recognition or additional disclosure in these financial statements.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

NOTE 3. RELATED-PARTY TRANSACTIONS

Beginning with Children Foundation (the "Foundation") is a not-for-profit organization dedicated to improving the educational opportunities of urban children through the creation of autonomous, high-performing public schools. The Foundation is a cofounder of the School.

As an educational manager to charter schools during the fiscal years ended June 30, 2013 and 2012, the Foundation entered into a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") agreement with the School. Pursuant to the terms of the MOU agreement, the School agreed to pay service fees to the Foundation in the amounts of \$584,595 and \$466,182 for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2013 and 2012, respectively. The Foundation supported the School in the areas of leadership and strategy, curriculum and assessment, research and evaluation, business services, compliance, development, technology, communications, outreach, and alumni program management. Amounts due from the Foundation at June 30, 2013 and 2012, were \$53,029 (inclusive of contributions received on behalf of the School) and \$7,506, respectively.

NOTE 4. PROPERTY AND EQUIPMENT

Property and equipment consisted of the following at June 30, 2013 and 2012:

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>Estimated Useful Life</u>
Furniture and fixtures	\$ 147,224	\$ 141,074	5 - 7 years
Computer equipment	277,374	264,928	3 years
Leasehold improvements	<u>19,193</u>	<u>19,193</u>	5 years
	443,791	425,195	
Less: accumulated depreciation	<u>(337,517)</u>	<u>(284,207)</u>	
Property and equipment, net	<u>\$ 106,274</u>	<u>\$ 140,988</u>	

Depreciation expense was \$53,310 and \$53,595 for the years ended June 30, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

NOTE 5. SCHOOL FACILITIES

The School occupies space in public school buildings owned by the NYCDOE located at 241 Emerson Place in Clinton Hill, Brooklyn, and 114 Kosciuszko Street, Brooklyn, which have been made available to the School at no charge.

NOTE 6. EMPLOYEE BENEFIT PLAN

The School maintains a defined contribution plan under Section 401(k) of the Internal Revenue Code covering all eligible employees. Under the plan, the School provides matching contributions. In addition, the School may elect, on a discretionary basis, to contribute a percentage of all qualified employees' compensation to the profit-sharing component of the plan. The amount charged to operations for contributions to these funds was approximately \$72,000 and \$76,000 for the years ended June 30, 2013 and 2012, respectively.

**COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
JUNE 30, 2013 AND 2012**

NOTE 7. CONTINGENCIES

Certain grants and contracts may be subject to audit by the funding sources. Such audits might result in disallowances of costs submitted for reimbursement. Management is of the opinion that such cost disallowances, if any, will not have a material effect on the accompanying financial statements. Accordingly, no amounts have been provided in the accompanying financial statements for such potential claims.

NOTE 8. FAIR VALUE MEASUREMENTS

Assets and liabilities measured at fair value are based on one or more of three valuation techniques identified in the tables below. The valuation techniques are as follows:

- (a) *Market approach.* Prices and other relevant information generated by market transactions involving identical or comparable assets or liabilities;
- (b) *Cost approach.* Amount that would be required to replace the service capacity of an asset (replacement cost); and
- (c) *Income approach.* Techniques to convert future amounts to a single present amount based on market expectations (including present value techniques, option-pricing and excess earnings models).

The following tables summarize the School's assets measured at fair value on a recurring basis, categorized by GAAP's valuation hierarchy as of June 30, 2013 and 2012:

Description	Level 1 Quoted Prices in Active Markets for Identical Assets	Level 2: Significant Other Observable Inputs	Level 3: Significant Unobservable Inputs	Total	Valuation Technique
June 30, 2013:					
Money market fund (included in cash and cash equivalents)	\$ 26,891	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,891	(a)
Certificates of deposit (included in investments)	-	3,341,339	-	3,341,339	(b)
Total	\$ 26,891	\$ 3,341,339	\$ -	\$ 3,368,230	
June 30, 2012:					
Money market fund (included in cash and cash equivalents)	\$ 53,840	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 53,840	(a)
Certificates of deposit (included in investments)	-	2,699,429	-	2,699,429	(b)
Total	\$ 53,840	\$ 2,699,429	\$ -	\$ 2,753,269	

The following are descriptions of the valuation methodologies used for assets measured at fair value. There have been no changes in the methodologies used at June 30, 2013 and 2012:

The money market fund is valued at cost plus accrued interest, which approximates fair value.

The certificates of deposits are valued at cost plus accrued interest and unrealized gains (losses), which approximates fair value.



CITRIN COOPERMAN

Attest & Assurance | Tax Compliance & Research | Specialty & Consulting

**INDEPENDENT AUDITORS' REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER
FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED
ON AN AUDIT OF FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE
WITH *GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS***

To the Board of Trustees
Community Partnership Charter School

We have audited, in accordance with the auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the financial statements of Community Partnership Charter School (the "School") (a nonprofit organization), which comprise the statement of financial position as of June 30, 2013, and the related statements of activities, functional expenses and cash flows for the year then ended, and the related notes to the financial statements, and have issued our report thereon dated October 8, 2013.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statements, we considered the School's internal control over financial reporting (internal control) to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinion on the financial statements, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the School's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the School's internal control.

A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct, misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statements will not be prevented, or detected and corrected, on a timely basis. A *significant deficiency* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control that is less severe than a material weakness, yet important enough to merit attention by those charged with governance.

Our consideration of internal control was for the limited purpose described in the first paragraph of this section and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies. Given these limitations, during our audit we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses. However, material weaknesses may exist that have not been identified.

Compliance and Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the School's financial statements are free from material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit, and accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed no instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under *Government Auditing Standards*.

Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the School's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with *Government Auditing Standards* in considering the School's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

New York, New York
October 8, 2013


CITRIN COOPERMAN & COMPANY, LLP
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Transmittal Form
Annual Financial Statement Audit Report
for SUNY Authorized Charter Schools

School Name:	Community Partnership Charter School
Date (Report is due Nov. 1):	November 1, 2013
School Fiscal Contact Name:	Brian Stemmer
School Fiscal Contact Email:	bstemmer@bwcf.org
School Fiscal Contact Phone:	212.318.9120
School Audit Firm Name:	Citrin Cooperman
School Audit Contact Name:	Adam Reiss
School Audit Contact Email:	[REDACTED]
School Audit Contact Phone:	[REDACTED]
Audit Period:	2012-13
Prior Year:	2011-12

The following items are required to be included:

- .. The independent auditor's report on financial statements and notes.
- .. Excel template file containing the Financial Position, Statement of Activities, Cash Flow and Functional Expenses worksheets.
- .. Reports on internal controls over financial reporting and on compliance.

The additional items listed below should be included if applicable. Please explain the reason(s) if the items are not included. Examples might include: a written management letter was not issued; the school did not expend federal funds in excess of the Single Audit Threshold of \$500,000; the management letter response will be submitted by the following date (should be no later than 30 days from the submission of the report); etc.

Item	If not included, state the reason(s) below (if not applicable fill in N/A):
Management Letter	
Management Letter Response	
Form 990	
Federal Single Audit (A-133) ¹	
Corrective Action Plan	

Please also send an ELECTRONIC copy of: 1.) This transmittal form; 2.) Audited Financial Report; and if applicable 3.) Management Letter and Response; 4.) Federal Single Audit (A-133) ONLY to the following offices via email. A copy of the Excel file containing the four schedules Does NOT need to be included.

NYS Education Department Public School Choice Programs 89 Washington Avenue Room 462 EBA Albany, New York 12234 charterschools@mail.nysed.gov	NYS Education Department Office of Audit Services 89 Washington Avenue Room 524 EBA Room 524 EBA Albany, New York 12234 fsanda133@mail.nysed.gov
---	---

¹ A copy of the Federal Single Audit must be filed with the Federal Audit Clearinghouse. Please refer to OMB Cir

**Community Partnership Charter School
Statement of Financial Position
as of June 30**

<u>ASSETS</u>	<u>2013</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>FIC</u>
<u>CURRENT ASSETS</u>			
Cash and cash equivalents	961315	894497	
Grants and contracts receivable	170625	122963	
Accounts receivables	3460	7021	
Prepaid Expenses	0	0	
Contributions and other receivables	53029	13931	
TOTAL CURRENT ASSETS	1,188,429	1,038,412	
PROPERTY, BUILDING AND EQUIPMENT, net	106274	140988	
OTHER ASSETS	3341339	2699429	
TOTAL ASSETS	4,636,042	3,878,829	
<u>LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS</u>			
<u>CURRENT LIABILITIES</u>			
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	75089	38538	
Accrued payroll and benefits	501576	518543	
Dreferred Revenue	0	0	
Current maturities of long-term debt	0	0	
Short Term Debt - Bonds, Notes Payable	0	0	
Other	1691	0	
TOTAL CURRENT LIABILITIES	578,356	557,081	
LONG-TERM DEBT and NOTES PAYABLE, net current	0	0	
TOTAL LIABILITIES	578,356	557,081	
<u>NET ASSETS</u>			
Unrestricted	4057686	3321748	
Temporarily restricted	0	0	
TOTAL NET ASSETS	4,057,686	3,321,748	
TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS	4,636,042	3,878,829	

CSI:
State, Federal or other

CSI:
NON GRANT
- Due from School Districts
- Due from Governments

CSI:
Operating and Capital
Reserves, Deferred Costs,
Investments, Due from
Affiliate/CMO, Fixed
Assets

CSI:
Obligations under,
Capital Leases,
Advanced Billing, Due to
Affiliate/CMO,

CSI:
Land, Building, Loan(s)
related

**Community Partnership Charter School
Statement of Activities
as of June 30**

	2013			2012	FIC ny nu
	Unrestricted	Temporarily Restricted	Total	Total	
REVENUE, GAINS AND OTHER SUPPORT					
Public School District					
Resident Student Enrollment	5622497	\$-	\$5,622,497	5019193	
Students with disabilities	627665	-	627,665	561079	
Grants and Contracts					
State and local	0	-	-	0	
Federal - Title and IDEA	270525	-	270,525	178456	
Federal - Other	16093	-	16,093	0	
Other	0	-	-	-	
Food Service/Child Nutrition Program	0	-	-	-	
TOTAL REVENUE, GAINS AND OTHER SUPPORT	6,536,780	-	6,536,780	5,758,728	
EXPENSES					
Program Services					
Regular Education	5381682	\$-	\$5,381,682	5222214	
Special Education	0	-	-	0	
Other Programs	0	-	-	0	
Total Program Services	5,381,682	-	5,381,682	5,222,214	
Management and general	453857	-	453,857	389563	
Fundraising	58459	-	<u>58,459</u>	46618	
TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES	5,893,998	-	5,893,998	5,658,395	
SURPLUS / (DEFICIT) FROM SCHOOL OPERATIONS	642,782	-	642,782	100,333	
SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE					
Contributions					
Foundations	72061	\$-	\$72,061	88880	
Individuals	0	-	-	0	
Corporations	0	-	-	0	
Fundraising	0	-	-	0	
Interest income	19556	-	19,556	32132	
Miscellaneous income	1539	-	1,539	4099	
Net assets released from restriction	0	-	-	0	
TOTAL SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE	93,156	-	93,156	125,111	
CHANGE IN NET ASSETS	735,938	-	735,938	225,444	
NET ASSETS BEGINNING OF YEAR	3321748	-	3,321,748	3096304	
PRIOR YEAR/PERIOD ADJUSTMENTS	0	-	-	0	
NET ASSETS END OF YEAR	\$4,057,686	\$-	\$4,057,686	\$3,321,748	

**Community Partnership Charter School
Statement of Cash Flows**

as of June 30

	<u>2013</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>FIC</u>
			*Please briefly explain any nu
CASH FLOWS - OPERATING ACTIVITIES			
Increase (decrease) in net assets	735938	225444	
Revenues from School Districts	0	0	
Accounts Receivable	3561	-1614	
Due from School Districts	6425	-6425	
Depreciation	53310	53595	
Grants Receivable	-47662	-885	
Due from NYS	0	0	
Grant revenues	0	0	
Prepaid Expenses	0	0	
Accounts Payable	36551	136253	
Accrued Expenses	-16967	0	
Accrued Liabilities	0	0	
Contributions and fund-raising activities	0	0	
Miscellaneous sources	0	0	
Deferred Revenue	1691	-20833	
Interest payments	0	0	
Unrealized gains (losses) on investments	8090	-6660	
Other	-45523	-35565	
NET CASH PROVIDED FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES	\$735,414	\$343,310	
CASH FLOWS - INVESTING ACTIVITIES	\$	\$	
Purchase of equipment	-18596	-112700	
Other	-650000	-421828	
NET CASH PROVIDED FROM INVESTING ACTIVITIES	\$(668,596)	\$(534,528)	
CASH FLOWS - FINANCING ACTIVITIES	\$	\$	
Principal payments on long-term debt	0	0	
Other	0	-15951	
NET CASH PROVIDED FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES	\$-	\$(15,951)	
NET (DECREASE) INCREASE IN CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS	\$66,818	\$(207,169)	
Cash at beginning of year	894497	1101666	
CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENTS AT END OF YEAR	\$961,315	\$894,497	

**Community Partnership Charter School
Statement of Functional Expenses
as of June 30**

		2013					
		Program Services			Supporting Service		
	No. of Positions	Regular Education	Special Education	Other Education	Total	Fund-raising	Management and General
		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Personnel Services Costs							
Administrative Staff Personnel	7	253886	-	-	253,886	0	221052
Instructional Personnel	48	3135083	-	-	3,135,083	0	0
Non-Instructional Personnel	8	158374	-	-	158,374	0	0
Total Salaries and Staff		3,547,343	-	-	3,547,343	-	221,052
Fringe Benefits & Payroll Taxes		753361	-	-	753,361	0	38263
Retirement		0	-	-	-	0	0
Management Company Fees		409217	-	-	409,217	58459	116919
Legal Service		0	-	-	-	0	3045
Accounting / Audit Services		0	-	-	-	0	24383
Other Purchased / Professional / Consult		57248	-	-	57,248	0	0
Building and Land Rent / Lease		58296	-	-	58,296	0	7480
Repairs & Maintenance		0	-	-	-	0	0
Insurance		0	-	-	-	0	0
Utilities		0	-	-	-	0	0
Supplies / Materials		189465	-	-	189,465	0	0
Equipment / Furnishings		0	-	-	-	0	0
Staff Development		145026	-	-	145,026	0	0
Marketing / Recruitment		0	-	-	-	0	0
Technology		0	-	-	-	0	24443
Food Service		0	-	-	-	0	0
Student Services		145155	-	-	145,155	0	0
Office Expense		0	-	-	-	0	4487
Depreciation		49477	-	-	49,477	0	3833
OTHER		27094	-	-	27,094	0	9952
Total Expenses		381,682	\$-	\$-	\$5,381,682	\$58,459	\$453,857

		2012	
S			
Total	Total		
\$	\$	\$	
221,052	474,938	537122	
-	3,135,083	2240784	
-	158,374	814716	
221,052	3,768,395	3,592,622	
38,263	791,624	834121	
-	-	0	
175,378	584,595	466182	
3,045	3,045	3332	
24,383	24,383	19750	
-	57,248	84125	
7,480	65,776	58107	
-	-	0	
-	-	0	
-	-	0	
-	189,465	255310	
-	-	0	
-	145,026	114247	
-	-	0	
24,443	24,443	19459	
-	-	0	
-	145,155	107404	
4,487	4,487	5375	
3,833	53,310	53595	
<u>9,952</u>	<u>37,046</u>	44766	
\$512,316	\$5,893,998	\$5,658,395	

**Community Partnership Charter School
Projected Operating & Capital Budget
Academic Year 2013-2014**

	Approved Budget 2012-2013	Proposed Budget-LS 2013-2014	Proposed Budget- MS 2013-2014	Proposed Both Sites 2013-2014
Enrollment	427	248	192	440
Revenues - Private:				
Funds utilized from Net Assets		-	-	
Hayden Foundation		-	-	
Other Private		-	-	
Total Private Revenues		-	-	
Revenues - Public:				
NYS Per Student Allocation	5,776,029	3,354,696	2,597,184	5,951,880
Erate		-	-	
Federal IASA (e.g. Title 1) funding	130,000	107,085	82,916	190,000
Special Education Funding	590,519	370,882	288,686	659,568
Federal Title II-VI Funding	10,000	8,454	6,546	15,000
Total Public Revenues	6,506,548	3,841,117	2,975,332	6,816,448
Revenues - Other:				
Interest Income	15,000	5,636	4,364	10,000
Total Other Revenues	15,000	5,636	4,364	10,000
Grand Total Revenue & Other Income	6,521,548	3,846,753	2,979,696	6,826,449

**Community Partnership Charter School
Projected Operating & Capital Budget
Academic Year 2013-2014**

	Approved Budget 2012-2013	Proposed Budget-LS 2013-2014	Proposed Budget- MS 2013-2014	Proposed Both Sites 2013-2014
Enrollment	427	248	192	440
Operating Expenses:				
Total Salaries & Wages	4,058,665	2,370,265	1,969,594	4,339,859
Personnel Related Costs				
Employee Benefits	568,214	331,837	275,743	607,580
Retirement Plans	121,760	65,182	54,164	119,346
Payroll Taxes	365,280	213,324	177,263	390,587
Total Personnel Related	1,055,254	610,343	507,170	1,117,513
Grand Total Personnel	5,113,919	2,980,608	2,476,764	5,457,372
Occupancy				
Building Permits	12,000	2,818	2,182	5,000
Insurance - Prop & Liab	42,000	26,489	20,511	47,000
Cleaning Supplies	3,000	564	436	1,000
Utilities	5,000	2,818	2,182	5,000
Maintenance & Repairs	22,501	5,636	4,364	10,000
Equipment Rental	20,000	11,272	8,728	20,000
Total Occupancy	104,501	49,597	38,403	88,000

**Community Partnership Charter School
Projected Operating & Capital Budget
Academic Year 2013-2014**

	Approved Budget 2012-2013	Proposed Budget-LS 2013-2014	Proposed Budget- MS 2013-2014	Proposed Both Sites 2013-2014
Enrollment	427	248	192	440
Educational Programs				
Classroom Instructional Materials & Supplies	45,000	25,362	19,638	45,000
Art Supplies	7,501	4,227	3,273	7,500
Music Supplies	10,000	5,636	4,364	10,000
Math Supplies	10,000	11,272	8,728	20,000
ELA Supplies	20,000	11,272	8,728	20,000
Physical Education Supplies	5,000	2,818	2,182	5,000
Social Studies Supplies	7,501	4,227	3,273	7,500
Science Supplies	8,000	4,509	3,491	8,000
Foreign Language Supplies	7,000	-	-	-
After School Program	60,000	35,000	35,000	70,000
Summer School Program	21,000	-	-	-
Library Books	20,000	11,272	8,728	20,000
Curriculum Consultants	95,000	-	-	-
Staff Development	85,000	47,906	37,094	85,000
Community Academic Enrichment	40,000	22,544	17,456	40,000
Technology Supplies Education	80,000	56,360	43,640	100,000
Testing Materials	20,000	14,090	10,910	25,000
Family Outreach	5,000	2,818	2,182	5,000
Trips & Admissions	55,000	34,000	75,000	109,000
Total Educational Programs	601,002	293,313	283,687	577,000
Consultants				
School Development & Support	95,000	33,816	-	33,816
Literacy		-	26,184	26,184
ELL Consultants		10,000	10,000	20,000
Speech Consultants	7,501	4,227	3,273	7,500
Total Consultants	1,199,503	48,043	39,457	87,500
Special Needs Program				
Speech Consultants	7,501	-	-	-
Special Needs Supplies	4,000	2,254	1,746	4,000
Total Special Needs Programs	11,501	2,254	1,746	4,000

**Community Partnership Charter School
Projected Operating & Capital Budget
Academic Year 2013-2014**

	Approved Budget 2012-2013	Proposed Budget-LS 2013-2014	Proposed Budget- MS 2013-2014	Proposed Both Sites 2013-2014
Enrollment	427	248	192	440
<hr/>				
Other G&A Costs				
BwCF Service Fee-10% of full fte & title \$	591,603	354,626	274,589	629,215
Audit & Accounting	22,000	14,090	10,910	25,000
Legal	5,000	2,818	2,182	5,000
ERATE Consultant	-	-	-	-
Health & Safety	1,000	564	436	1,000
Employment Search & Advertising	10,000	5,636	4,364	10,000
Telephone/Communications	10,000	4,227	3,273	7,500
Printing & Publications	5,000	2,818	2,182	5,000
Office Supplies	18,000	10,145	7,855	18,000
Technology Support Consultants	50,000	14,090	10,910	25,000
Technology Supplies Admin	8,000	4,509	3,491	8,000
Postage & Shipping	4,500	2,536	1,964	4,500
Payroll Service Fees	7,501	4,509	3,491	8,000
Travel	1,200	676	524	1,200
Dues & Subscriptions	10,000	6,763	5,237	12,000
Bank Fees	250	282	218	500
Graduation Supplies	1,500	500	1,000	1,500
Student Meals	15,000	9,018	6,982	16,000
Meetings, Teacher Appreciation	2,501	5,636	4,364	10,000
Total Other G&A Costs	763,055	443,443	343,972	787,415
Contingency	-	-	-	-
Total Operating Expenditures	6,593,978	3,817,258	3,184,029	7,001,287
Net Operating Income (Deficit) Prior to Capital Expenditures	(72,430)	29,495	(204,333)	(174,838)
Capital Expenditures:				
Classroom Furniture & Equipment	14,000	5,636	4,364	10,000
Computer Technology & Equipment	12,500	-	-	-
Total Capital Expenditures	26,500	5,636	4,364	10,000
Total Operating & Capital Expenditures	6,620,478	3,822,894	3,188,393	7,011,287
Net Operating Income (Deficit) after Capital Expenditures	(98,930)	23,859	(208,697)	(184,838)

**Community Partnership Charter School
 Projected Operating & Capital Budget
 Academic Year 2013-2014**

	Approved Budget 2012-2013	Proposed Budget-LS 2013-2014	Proposed Budget- MS 2013-2014	Proposed Both Sites 2013-2014
Enrollment	427	248	192	440
PER PUPIL ANALYSIS				
Per Pupil Revenue		13,527	13,527	13,527
Per Pupil Expenditure		15,415	16,606	15,935
% of FTE's		56.36%	43.64%	100.00%
Students by grade				
k	49	52	52	52
1	49	49	49	49
2	49	49	49	49
3	49	49	49	49
4	49	49	49	49
5	49	54	54	54
6	49	49	49	49
7	49	49	49	49
8	35	40	40	40
Total	427	440	440	440

Appendix E: Disclosure of Financial Interest Form

Created Thursday, July 25, 2013

Page 1

331300860810 COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP C

An Appendix E: Disclosure of Financial Interest Form must be completed for each active Trustee who served on the charter school's Board of Trustees during the 2012-13 school year. Trustees are at times difficult to track down in the summer months. Trustees may complete and submit at their leisure (but before the deadline) their individual form at: <http://fluidsurveys.com/surveys/vickie-smith/appendix-e-disclosure-of-financial-interest-form/>.

Trustees who are technologically advanced may complete the survey using their smartphones or other mobile devices by downloading the this bar code link to the survey <http://fluidsurveys.com/account/surveys/210748/publish/qrcode/>. (Make sure you have the bar code application reader on your phone).

If a Trustee is unable to complete the form by the deadline (i.e, out of the country), the school is responsible for submitting the information required on the form for that individual trustee.

Just send the links via email today to your Trustees requesting that they each complete their form as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Yes, each member of the school's Board of Trustees has received a link to the Disclosure of Financial Interest Form.

Yes

Thank you.

Appendix F: BOT Membership Table

Created Thursday, July 25, 2013

Updated Wednesday, July 31, 2013

Page 1

331300860810 COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP C

1. Current Board Member Information

	Full Name of Individual Trustees	Position on Board (Officer or Rep).	Voting Member	Area of Expertise &/or Additional Role	Terms Served & Length (include date of election and expiration)	Committee affiliations
1	Martin Ragde	Chair/President	Yes	Audit and Finance (Chair), Director / School Review Committees (Chair)	2007	
2	David Stutt	Treasurer	Yes	Treasurer, Audit and Finance, Community Outreach (Chair), Nominating Committee (Chair)	2007	
3	Amy Kolz	Member		Nominating Committee, Community Outreach	05/2013 05/2016	
4	Kiisha Morrow	Secretary		Secretary, Community Outreach, School Review	03/2013 03/2016	
5	Joanna White-Oldham	Member		Director / School Review Committee, Community Outreach	3/2012	
6	Clare Cusack	Member		Audit & Finance Committee, Director / School Review Committee	5/2010	
7	Melanie Bryon	Member Ex-Officio		Non-Voting member, Director of CPCS LS		
8	Keisha Rattray	Member Ex-Officio		Non-Voting member, Director of CPCS MS		
9						
10						
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						

2. Total Number of Members Joining Board during the 2012-13 school year

2

3. Total Number of Members Departing the Board during the 2012-13 school year

1

4. According to the School's by-laws, what is the maximum number of trustees that may comprise the governing board?

7

5. How many times did the Board meet during the 2012-13 school year?

10

6. How many times will the Board meet during the 2013-14 school year?

10

Thank you.

Appendix H: Enrollment and Retention Efforts

Describe the efforts the charter school has utilized in 2012-2013 and a plan for efforts to be taken in 2013-2014 to attract and retain a greater enrollment of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for free and reduced priced lunch.

Target Populations

In compliance with the July 16, 2012 New York State Education Department issued memo detailing sanctions for charter schools that do not mirror district percentages in the following categories for enrollment and retention targets we intend to utilize the prescribed formulas for targeted enrollment as follows:

- 1). Students with disabilities
- 2). English language learner
- 3). Students who are eligible for the free and reduced priced lunch program

The preference for the categories listed above will be given in the form of a duplicate (Sped) or triplicate (ELL/FRPL). For example, a student who lives in district 13 or 14 who is listed as ELL or FRPL will be entered in the lottery 3x's increasing their probability of being accepted. Additionally, the waiting list for grades 1-6 will be randomized with the same preferences.

Priority for admission was given to residents of the district (and, after the initial enrollment program, siblings of current students), students who are English language learners, students with disabilities and students who are eligible to participate in the free or reduced-price lunch program.

Following the lottery and the completion of the school enrollment process, the school's Director of Operations conducted analyses of student demographics, including whether a student has a disability, is an English Language Learner or qualifies for free or reduced lunch. A percentage of the total school population has been determined and we are working to ensure enrollment that allows BwCCS is meeting its targets for enrollment as discussed above.

Recruitment

Historically, CPCS has relied on relationships with local preschools, the neighboring Lafayette Gardens and Pratt housing developments and parent referrals for our core group of applicants. This year we had nineteen siblings apply to our school through the lottery and our families continue to spread the word about the type institution we are and what families can expect when they join our community. Parent leaders joined the lower school director at several preschools this year and shares experiences that resonated with prospective families. Other members of the school community attended community events, district meetings and shared enrollment information with interested parents. Still others visited neighborhood churches, and local businesses to distribute flyers and posters. Those posters invited families to participate in our information sessions and tours. CPCS held informational sessions during the day and evenings as well as on Saturdays.

For the 2013-2014-school year, our recruitment mirrored the past year's efforts.

Required Form: Appendix E - Disclosure of Financial Interest Form

Created Thursday, July 25, 2013

<https://fluidsurveys.com/surveys/vickie-smith/appendix-e-disclosure-of-financial-interest-form/f5672ba3675a11fb7cd2fcb2686df0>

Page 1

Please open the link to this form using **Google Chrome** as your browser. Doing so will allow you to input your signature on page 2 of the form. Thank you.

1. Trustee Name:

Amy Kolz

2. Charter School Name:

Community Partnership Charter School

3. Charter Authorizer:

SUNY

4. *Your Home Address:

4. *Your Home Address: | Street Address

4. *Your Home Address: | City/State

4. *Your Home Address: | Zip

5. *Your Business Address

5. *Your Business Address | Street Address

5. *Your Business Address | City/State

5. *Your Business Address | Zip

6. *Daytime Phone Number:

7. *E-mail Address:

8. Select all positions you held on Board:

(check all that apply)

(No response)

9. Are you a trustee and also an employee of the school?

No

10. Are you a trustee and an employee or agent of the management company or institutional partner of the charter school?

No

13. Have you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house had an interest in or engaged in a transaction with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six-month period prior to such service?

No

14. Are you a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with school that is doing business with the charter school and in which such entity, during your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or relationship?

No

Signature of Trustee

Two handwritten signatures in black ink. The first signature on the left is a cursive script that appears to start with a large 'A' and ends with a loop. The second signature on the right is also in cursive, starting with a large 'K' and ending with a long horizontal stroke.

Required Form: Appendix E - Disclosure of Financial Interest Form

Created Thursday, July 25, 2013

Updated Friday, July 26, 2013

<https://fluidsurveys.com/surveys/vickie-smith/appendix-e-disclosure-of-financial-interest-form/1e42b8db876128ef5e47c03934d214>

Page 1

Please open the link to this form using **Google Chrome** as your browser. Doing so will allow you to input your signature on page 2 of the form. Thank you.

1. Trustee Name:

Kiisha Morrow

2. Charter School Name:

Community Partnership Charter School

3. Charter Authorizer:

SUNY

4. *Your Home Address:

4. *Your Home Address: | Street Address

4. *Your Home Address: | City/State

4. *Your Home Address: | Zip

5. *Your Business Address

5. *Your Business Address | Street Address

5. *Your Business Address | City/State

5. *Your Business Address | Zip

6. *Daytime Phone Number:

7. *E-mail Address:

8. Select all positions you held on Board:

(check all that apply)

- Secretary

9. Are you a trustee and also an employee of the school?

No

10. Are you a trustee and an employee or agent of the management company or institutional partner of the charter school?

No

13. Have you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house had an interest in or engaged in a transaction with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six-month period prior to such service?

No

14. Are you a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with school that is doing business with the charter school and in which such entity, during your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or relationship?

No

Signature of Trustee

Required Form: Appendix E - Disclosure of Financial Interest Form

Created Friday, July 26, 2013

<https://fluidsurveys.com/surveys/vickie-smith/appendix-e-disclosure-of-financial-interest-form/acc78a6b78b05ad9a6db6ee76d61aa>

Page 1

Please open the link to this form using **Google Chrome** as your browser. Doing so will allow you to input your signature on page 2 of the form. Thank you.

1. Trustee Name:

Martin Ragde

2. Charter School Name:

Community Partnership Charter School

3. Charter Authorizer:

SUNY

4. *Your Home Address:

4. *Your Home Address: | Street Address

4. *Your Home Address: | City/State

4. *Your Home Address: | Zip

5. *Your Business Address

5. *Your Business Address | Street Address

5. *Your Business Address | City/State

5. *Your Business Address | Zip

6. *Daytime Phone Number:

7. *E-mail Address:

8. Select all positions you held on Board:

(check all that apply)

- Chair/President

9. Are you a trustee and also an employee of the school?

No

10. Are you a trustee and an employee or agent of the management company or institutional partner of the charter school?

No

Page 2

13. Have you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house had an interest in or engaged in a transaction with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six-month period prior to such service?

No

14. Are you a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with school that is doing business with the charter school and in which such entity, during your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or relationship?

No

Signature of Trustee

Required Form: Appendix E - Disclosure of Financial Interest Form

Created Monday, July 29, 2013

Updated Tuesday, March 25, 2014

<https://fluidsurveys.com/surveys/vickie-smith/appendix-e-disclosure-of-financial-interest-form/eac7ba11c81f136ef4f025a029617f6>

Page 1

Please open the link to this form using **Google Chrome** as your browser. Doing so will allow you to input your signature on page 2 of the form. Thank you.

1. Trustee Name:

Joanna White-Oldham

2. Charter School Name:

Community Partnership Charter School

3. Charter Authorizer:

SUNY

4. *Your Home Address:

4. *Your Home Address: | Street Address

4. *Your Home Address: | City/State

4. *Your Home Address: | Zip

5. *Your Business Address

5. *Your Business Address | Street Address

5. *Your Business Address | City/State

5. *Your Business Address | Zip

6. *Daytime Phone Number:

7. *E-mail Address:

8. Select all positions you held on Board:

(check all that apply)

- Parent Representative

9. Are you a trustee and also an employee of the school?

No

10. Are you a trustee and an employee or agent of the management company or institutional partner of the charter school?

No


13. Have you or any of your immediate family members or any persons who live with you in your house had an interest in or engaged in a transaction with the charter school during the time you have served on the board, and in the six-month period prior to such service?

No

14. Are you a member, director, officer or employee of an organization formally partnered with school that is doing business with the charter school and in which such entity, during your tenure as a trustee, you and/or your immediate family member or person living in your house had a financial interest or relationship?

No

Signature of Trustee

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "John Smith", written in a cursive style.