

**FINAL APPLICATION REVIEW 2010-2011**

<b>Proposed School Name:</b>	<b>Proposed School Location:</b>
MATCH Community Day Charter Public School	Boston (Roxbury)
<b>Network of Schools with MATCH Charter Public School</b>	
<b>Grades Served at Full Capacity:</b>	700
<b>Number of Students Served at Full Capacity:</b>	preK (K1)-12
<b>Proposed Opening Year:</b>	FY2012

**Public Statement:**

MATCH Community Day Charter Public School is a proposed preK-12 replication of the existing MATCH Charter Public School. Each grade would have roughly 50 students, for a total of 700, in Boston.

The mission of the school will remain: to prepare all students to succeed in college and beyond. The student population will remain mostly low-income, minority families. However, MATCH Community Day is proposing to focus on the subset of low-income students who are classified as English Language Learners. Historically in Boston, these children have principally been from families speaking Spanish, Haitian Creole, Cape Verdean Creole, Chinese, and Vietnamese.

**Mission Statement:**

The mission of MATCH Community Day Charter Public School is to prepare Boston children to succeed in college and beyond, in particular those would be the first in their families to earn a college degree. We intend this school to serve large numbers of English language learners.

**Proposed Growth Plan for First Five Years of Operation:**

School Year	Grade Levels	Total Student Enrollment
First Year	K1, 2	100
Second Year	K1, K2, 2, 3	200
Third Year	K1 - 4	300
Fourth Year	K1 - 5	350
Fifth Year	K1 - 6	400

**Mission, Vision, and Description of the Community(ies) to Be Served**

**Primary Strengths**

- The mission was clear and succinct regarding the purpose of the proposed school. (Section I.A.)
- The applicant group provides a detailed and consistent description of the modifications to the proposed school from the existing school throughout the application. (Section I.A.)
- The vision was compelling, demonstrated meaningful values, and expanded on the mission statement with specific strategies.

**Primary Weaknesses**

- Reviewers were critical of the generalizations within the mission statement and the lack of emphasis on the quality of instruction used to ‘serve large numbers of English language learners.’ (Section I.A.)
- The application provides limited evidence of the demand for the proposed programming other than the present demand for seats at Boston’s ‘no excuses’ college preparatory 6-12 charter public

Reviewers considered the partnership with the Community Day Charter Public School (CDCPS) a considerable strength in order to meet the needs of elementary school students and English language learners (ELLs). (Section I.B.)

- The application provides descriptions of the unique services that demonstrate the value of the proposed school, such as the extended school day and tutoring programming for every student. (Section I.C.)
- The application provides a clear description of the achievement gap experienced by Boston’s low income students and students with Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The application proposes that ‘high standards and strong data-driven teaching’ will help all learners to make academic gains. The application intends to also provide targeted tutoring and reach students early in their academic careers with the K-12 model. (Section I.C.)

schools. (Section I.C.)

### **Educational Philosophy, Curriculum and Instruction**

#### **Primary Strengths**

- The application describes the founding group’s beliefs and values which are aligned with the proposed school’s mission. The belief in high expectations was reflected throughout the application. (Section II.A.)
- The application cites research that supports the proposed literacy development approach as a method to improve student academic performance. (Section II.A.)
- The application provided a comprehensive overview of the curriculum for the proposed school that incorporated both CDCPS and MATCH information. (Section II.B.)
- The application and applicant group indicated that teachers will receive four weeks of training during the summer in collaboration with CDCPS and MATCH.

#### **Primary Weaknesses**

- The proposed school intends to utilize CDCPS’s curriculum and pedagogy for grades K1-5 and MATCH’s curriculum and pedagogy for grades 6-12. It is unclear how the differences in philosophy between these two schools will be aligned. During the interview, the applicant group acknowledged that they have to address this transition during the middle grades. (Section II.B., II.C., II.D., and II.E.)
- The application provides limited information about the process to develop, improve and refine curriculum. The application states that the process is data-driven and provides examples of activities used to evaluate curriculum but it is unclear how the curriculum is then improved. (Section II.B.)
- While the application provides a

- The application contained a clear description of the multiple measures used to evaluate teachers and the role of the principal in gathering information on the faculty's effectiveness. (Section II.B.)

structured lesson plan as an example of effective instructional technique, the example did not address the needs of diverse learners nor the targeted population of LEP students. (Section II.B.)

- The application provided limited information about how teachers will inform the strategy for offering professional development. (Section II.B.)

### **Assessment System, Performance, Promotion, and Graduation Standards**

#### **Primary Strengths**

- The proposed school intends to fully adopt CDCPS' performance, promotion and graduation standards for the lower grades in addition to their robust assessment and data management systems. (Section II.C.)
- The application provides performance standards within clear rubrics for K1-8 that are easy to understand and provide detailed information about student performance towards standards. (Section II.C.)
- The proposed school utilizes Personal Educational Goals (PEGs) for the lower grades to communicate student performance in an authentic and meaningful way for students and families. (Section II.C.)
- The graduation requirements for 8 and 12 grade were clearly described within the application. The graduation standard for the high school demonstrated high standards for student performance. (Section II.C.)
- The application described the use of internally designed benchmark tests based on released MCAS test items, multiple standardized tests, and internally developed formative assessments. (Section II.D.)

#### **Primary Weaknesses**

- Reviewers were concerned that the proficiency standard for K1-8 within the promotion policy was not based on high expectations. The application did not have a promotion policy described for the high school grades though it was clear from the graduation policy that students are required to pass all classes with a 70%. Reviewers were concerned by a perceived disconnect between the CDCPS and MATCH components of the proposed school. (Section II.C.)
- The application did not provide a clear description of the link of assessments to curriculum and how assessment data facilitates decision-making about adjustments to the educational program or professional development. (Section II.D.)

## **School Characteristics**

### **Primary Strengths**

- The proposed school intends to replicate two key aspects of the existing MATCH school's program: a high dosage of individualized daily tutoring and relentless and ongoing outreach to parents. The proposed school intends to implement two hours of daily tutoring at every grade level to be broken into two or three time blocks. The application also described a clear strategy to gauge parental satisfaction through frequent communication with tutors, teachers and the principal in addition to annual surveys. Parental feedback is communicated to all stakeholders through the annual report and dissatisfaction is discussed and addressed. (Section II.E.)

### **Primary Weaknesses**

- The application and the applicant group provided limited information about the programming modifications between the lower and upper grades. It was unclear from the application how the programs would be implemented and how the school day will operate for students and teachers. (Section II.E.)
- While the applicant group provided additional information during the interview, the application did not describe a behavior philosophy and provided limited information about a cohesive plan that is appropriate to the range of ages that the proposed school intends to serve. (Section II.E.)

## **Special Student Populations and Student Services**

### **Primary Strengths**

- The application describes the implementation of the Response to Intervention (RTI) model to provide all students access to the general education curriculum. (Section II.F.)
- The application provides accurate information regarding the identification and assessment of ELLs, family notification, language development instruction, and sheltered content instruction within English language learner programming. The application also provides examples of the methods that will be used by teachers to provide ELLs access to the general education curriculum. (Section II.F.)
- The applicant group intends to recruit classroom teachers that are English as a Second Language (ESL) certified and to provide Sheltered English Immersion (SEI) category training to teachers and tutors. (Section II.F.)
- The proposed partnership between the proposed school and CDCPS is a

### **Primary Weaknesses**

- The application provides a limited description of the processes and procedures to identify, assess, and provide instruction to students in need of special education services. The application indicates that teachers and tutors will receive training in special education programming and also provided examples of in-class accommodations. (Section II.F.)

considerable strength in order to fulfill the school’s mission to meet the needs of English language learners (ELLs). (Section II.B and II.F.)

- It is evident based on past student performance that the applicant group, MATCH Charter Public School, has the capacity to successfully work with students in need of special education services. (Section II.F.)

### **Enrollment and Recruitment**

#### **Primary Strengths**

- The proposed school has a clear strategy for growth that balances increasing numbers with viability. The application provides a succinct rationale for the applicant group’s choices. (Section III.A.)
- The recruitment plan provides a clear strategy to target the LEP student population in Boston, including marketing in non-English language media, applications in multiple languages and collaborations with immigrant population service providers. (Section III.A.)
- The application provided a clear plan for a public lottery that is in accordance with charter school statute and regulations. (Section III.A.)

#### **Primary Weaknesses**

- No primary weaknesses.

### **Capacity and School Governance**

#### **Primary Strengths**

- The MATCH board of trustees is a talented and motivated group of individuals with a clear and mindful approach to replication. Board members encompass professional expertise in business, education, community development, technology, and government. (Section III.B.)
- The MATCH board has implemented a number of organizational changes over the past two years in anticipation of replicating their school model. (Section III.B.)

#### **Primary Weaknesses**

- When asked in the interview to clarify the services that are being purchased as part of the agreement with CDCPS, the applicant group stated that they will be receiving curriculum, assessments, and technical assistance. As stated in Chapter 71, Section 89(k): “Charter schools shall not charge any public school for the use or replication of any part of their curriculum subject to the prescriptions of any contract between the charter school and any third party providers.” (Section III. C.)

- The MATCH board listened to the critiques of their original prospectus proposal and responded with an innovative collaboration with a charter school that has demonstrated success with LEP students in Lawrence. (Section III.B.)
- The application clearly outlines the role of the board of trustees, the executive director and administrators at the school. In the interview, the applicant group clarified questions about the central office staff. (Section III.B.)
- The application provides a clear policy development process and strategy for board development and evaluation. (Section III.B.)

**Capacity for Network of Schools**

**Primary Strengths**

- The proposed school can leverage the expertise of CDCPS and its management company Community Day Care Center of Lawrence(CDCMO) to train faculty and support the curriculum, instruction and assessment components necessary to realize the programming of this model as it relates to English language learners and elementary school age students. (Section III.C.)
- MATCH has undertaken the recent expansion from grades 9-12 to grades 6-12 and the myriad of responsibilities related to both a programming and operational expansion. (Section III.D.)

**Primary Weaknesses**

- The application contained a limited draft of the agreement between MATCH Charter School and Community Day Charter Public School. This draft agreement outlines the addition of two CDCPS representatives to the MATCH board of trustees, the services that the proposed school will receive from CDCPS and the related fees associated with these services, and the ability of CDCPS to recruit teachers from the MATCH Teacher residency. The agreement did not outline any further information about how the relationship will be evaluated or monitored. If chartered, the contract would need further refinement and then review and approval by the Department. (Section III.C.)

**Management**

**Primary Strengths**

- The application provided a clear management chart of the proposed network of schools and network-level administrative staff that clarified the

**Primary Weaknesses**

- The application provided a limited discussion of the provision of professional development by MATCH Teacher Residency and outside providers. The

<p>reporting structure. (Section II.D.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application described the intentional plan that built organizational capacity through additional staff at the administrator level to manage operational systems, such as human resources, finances and infrastructure prior to submitting their proposal. (Section III.D.)</li> <li>• The application detailed the plans to recruit teachers from the MATCH Teacher residency or from existing MATCH faculty. (Section III.D.)</li> </ul>	<p>application does not provide consistent information on the scheduling of professional development opportunities during the school year. (Section III.D.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The application describes multiple opportunities for the different staff of the existing MATCH schools and the proposed school to meet but it is unclear how these activities will be managed and implemented to build consistency and best practices across schools. (Section III.D.)</li> </ul>
--	--

**Facilities, Transportation, and Finances**

<p><b><u>Primary Strengths</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• During the interview, the applicant group indicated that they have signed an option for a facility in Roxbury on Shirley Street in anticipation of a charter. (Section III.E.)</li> <li>• The application described a clear plan to provide district bus transportation for grades K1-7, and provide MBTA passes to students in grades 8-12. (Section III.E.)</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Primary Weaknesses</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No primary weaknesses.</li> </ul>
--	--