

A1. District or Charter School Name (Maximum 50 Characters) School District of Philadelphia*

A2. School Name (Maximum 50 Characters) Cleveland Elementary Mastery Charter School 7/1/12

A3. Grade span (Maximum 25 Characters) K-8

Federal SIG requirements provide a funding range of \$50,000 to \$2,000,000 per building, per year to support school reform models.

SCHOOL CLOSURE MODEL MAXIMUM

Schools opting to implement the school closure model must budget and spend all funds during Year 1 of the grant. Funds may NOT be spent to provide instructional services to transferred students.

Examples of allowable costs that MAY be supported by SIG funds are 1) parent and community outreach (including press releases, newsletters and newspaper announcements), 2) transition services for parents and students, 3) orientation activities, and 4) costs for revisions to transportation routes, classroom assignments, etc., that exceed the amount of money normally spent on such activities due to the closure of the school.

TRANSFORMATION, TURNAROUND AND RESTART MODEL MAXIMUMS

A4. Schools choosing the transformation, turnaround and restart models will provide the following data for review to determine the appropriateness of the funding request.

	Building Enrollment (October 2011)	Low Income Percentage (Free & Reduced Lunch) Format: #.##	Building ESL Population	AYP Status (2011-12 School Year)
School Level Data	637	93.4	5	School Improvement II

A5. Funds requested Year 1: 1500000

A6. Funds requested Year 2: 1500000

A7. Funds Requested Year 3: 1400000

A8. Total Amount of Funds Requested: 4400000

SIG eligible schools are identified based on student achievement, academic growth, graduation rate, AYP status and grade levels served. The methods used to identify eligible schools are intended to select schools most in need of reform. While this data analysis is sufficient for determining SIG eligibility, it does not provide sufficient information to make instructional and management decisions at the school level.

Your school story includes information from other data sources (academic, behavioral, other non-academic, etc.); changes in administration, governance structure and leadership; curriculum mapping, revision and development activities; implementation of new core instructional programs; staffing changes, recruiting efforts, incentives, supports and mentoring for new and/or struggling teachers; and professional development plans and initiatives.

B1. Provide specific, explanatory information regarding the 3-5 year history of the school to include the elements above as well as any school reform planning efforts to include data analysis, data review and root cause analysis, parent and community involvement in school reform efforts and any other relevant information to describe the school history and current school environment. (Maximum 25000 Characters)

Cleveland Elementary school has been a low-performing, unsafe elementary school for as long as the parents and community members can remember – many of whom attended the school when they were children. The Tioga section of Philadelphia is predominantly African American and low income, with little industry in the community. Unemployment is twice the national level. Abandoned row homes, vacant lots, and adults with substance abuse issues are a part of the community norm. The last five years of school self-analysis paint a picture of a school constantly trying to pull itself up, yet the data shows a school unable to succeed in this effort. The school has had many of the basic tools and strategies needed to improve achievement in place, but kept missing the mark in a number of ways – either by lack of fidelity of implementation to program or use of materials, lack of staff buy in to District-selected strategies for student improvement, low staff morale, inability to access and use real time data on student needs, or lack of flexibility in academic and co-curricular decisions intended to impact students. Parents felt disenfranchised and left out of their children's learning and were frustrated at the lack of communication with the school. In some years, such as 2010, the school actually made AYP, only to sink back down into School Improvement and missing their targets in 2011. Even in the “up” years when the school improved, the school has consistently been in the bottom 15% of all schools in the School District of Philadelphia as measured by student achievement and has suffered from a history of school violence – with specific Cleveland Elementary violence chronicled in last year's Pulitzer Prize winning story “Assault on Learning”. Parents at Cleveland sought to be a part of the District's Renaissance Schools process to turn around failing schools this year after many years of frustration over not having a quality school option for their children. Their 19-1 School Advisory Council vote on April 16, 2012 in favor of choosing to Restart the school under Mastery Charter Schools is their effort to change Cleveland quickly and effectively. The Mastery leadership team in partnership with the parent-led Student Advisory Council are the authors of this application using all available data on the school over the past five years, and perhaps more importantly, the voices of parents whose dissatisfaction with their children's education has led to this

coming change. Our intent is to work together to implement the Mastery elementary model going forward, while building off a few pockets of success the school has had in some areas of the program. In section C of this application we will go into great detail analyzing student data. However, since a large part of the story of Cleveland -- and why they are going to become a Mastery Charter School under Restart effective 7/1/12 -- lies in their persistently low academic performance, a brief summary of the school performance data is also included in this section. Based on PSSA data, there are numerous concerns at Grover Cleveland Elementary School (Cleveland) that are highlighted in the data including:

- PSSA trends at the school have hovered in the same range with low proficiency levels in every grade and subgroup over time. While the school did manage to hit its growth targets and make AYP in 2010, the school fell back into School Improvement II in 2011 by missing the targets in Reading for the whole school, as well as for African American and Low Income subgroups. All other targets hit in 2011 were through Safe Harbor or Safe Harbor with Confidence interval and the School achieved a “9” on the District’s “School Performance Index” ranking all District schools on a 1 (top 10%) to 10 (bottom 10%) scale.
- The school’s PSSA results over the past five years have left the school in the bottom 15% of all District schools based on performance, regardless of any progress made over time.
- Only 42.3% of students were proficient/advanced in math on the 2011 PSSA. In addition, 34.2% of students are below basic in math per the 2011 PSSA.
- Only 34.1% of students were proficient/advanced in reading on the 2011 PSSA
- 36.7% of students were below basic in reading on the 2011 PSSA
- 41.9% of males were below basic in reading on the 2011 PSSA
- 56.6% of students with IEPs were below basic in reading on the 2011 PSSA
- Students in grades 3-6 were more likely to score below basic than proficient/advanced on the 2011 PSSA

It should be noted that between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 Cleveland did show some growth in the percentage of students proficient/advanced in math and reading on the PSSA school wide. In math, the school showed a gain of 9.1 percentage points and in reading a gain of 1.9 percentage points. Even with those gains the school is still significantly below the state average and not on track to close the gap in reading or math in the next 10 years.

Past and current academic practice at Cleveland, 2009-2012

1. Alignment of curriculum, instruction and materials to content and performance standards: Cleveland became an “Empowerment School” in Philadelphia in 2009. Under that District-led school improvement initiative, the teachers, administrators and instructional support staff of Cleveland Elementary School were provided with the following materials by the District’s central office to make certain curriculum, instruction and their teaching materials were aligned to the content and performance standards: The alignment to the curriculum, instructional practices and resource materials are in line with the guidelines of the School District of Philadelphia. At Cleveland all teachers are provided with the adopted core curriculum from the SDP. Regular and Special Education teachers use the School District of Philadelphia’s Content Standards to ensure that grade level content and Performance Standards are addressed for all students. Data along with the standards are the focus of grade level group meetings. The school met AYP progress goals in 2010, but failed to meet the progress targets in 2011 and fell back into School Improvement II. PSSA data over the past five years tells a story of Cleveland’s ongoing need to provide intensive support to all students in the school, especially students who have IEP goals, as no single group of students is performing anywhere near the state average. During 2010-11 and 2011-12 Cleveland focused on implementing Corrective Reading and Corrective Math programs and to utilize the Inclusive Practices Classroom model to support the special education students while in the same class with peers, which gives additional

support from both the regular and special education teachers. All ELL students have full access to the Core Curriculum with modified instruction with an emphasis on academic language and instructional strategies. The school's Annual Improvement plan noted common planning time among teachers and collaboration with creating lesson plans as ways to support content and performance standards, as well as having the Principal monitor lesson plans and make classroom visits. However, after review by the Restart team, it appears that lesson plans were not consistently provided or reviewed, that the leadership team did not have time to do more than one and sometimes two classroom visits to each teacher, and that common planning time was not consistently used in an effective manner to focus on student achievement. While the plan looks good on paper, it was not implemented with fidelity and does not appear to be having the desired impact on student outcomes.

2. Availability of standards-based instructional materials appropriate to all student groups: Cleveland School has provided teachers adopted Core Curriculum materials from the SDP to be used by all students. Core Curriculum Supplemental materials have also been used in the school. The Core Curriculum has served as the roadmap for all teachers to follow with a strong focus on vocabulary development and weekly constructed responses in both reading and math. Read 180, Fast ForWord, Study Island and First in Math have provided support to students to boost their academic interest and skill level. Annual book inventories conducted by the school appear to have been very helpful in allowing the school team to know if there is a need to purchase any replacements materials from the school budget each year and to prioritize spending on instructional materials. Teacher lesson plans, when available, show evidence of use of adopted core curriculum. Proficient and Advanced students are invited to attend a Saturday Scholars program using researched based materials such as PSSA Coach, Buckle Down, Break Away Math, Jumpstart and Measuring Up. Participation in the program has been minimal, with no incentives for participation for these students.

3. Alignment of staff development to standards, assessed student performance and professional needs: The school had a professional development plan in 2010 and 2011 that spoke to a lack of focus on what goals the faculty should be driving toward each year. Based on written plans, it appears the team had great intentions to do deep data analysis, ongoing review, and root cause analysis each year to address student needs, but there is no evidence that this cycle was ever actually followed and implemented. While regular staff development sessions were scheduled according to the District's professional development calendar and the Principal wrote in the plan of an intent to use faculty surveys to determine PD topics, there was little record of content delivered during PD sessions, no survey data on faculty satisfaction with PD, and no linkage between PD content and student achievement in the ensuing weeks. It seems the leadership team and faculty had great intentions for developing a data-driven PD calendar, but it either got sidelined due to lack of focus or often the PD sessions were canceled in favor of District-developed PD sessions required to be delivered at the school level – often, it appears, after being given to the principal at the last minute and with little thought on connection to individual school needs. The “one size fits all” PD approach at Cleveland as a District Empowerment School appears to have had a negative impact on the school's ability to get any substantive PD program going in the last several years – with lack of buy in from faculty and staff and no connection to real-time student needs. Several teachers at Cleveland did take advantage of the ongoing professional development that is offered by the SDP and the Academic Division on an optional basis. With the assistance and expertise of the Grade Group Leaders, teachers have been enhancing their skills in reading across the curriculum with a focus on guided reading with an emphasis on differentiated instruction.

4. Service provided by

the regular program to enable underperforming students to meet standards: There is evidence that the Cleveland Instructional Team met in August 2011 to review data and identify underperforming students. All underperforming students, including those with IEP goals are supported in the regular classroom through the Inclusive Practices Classroom model. Students currently receive the following supports at Cleveland: Targeted small group instruction identified by the teachers; Academic support by Paraprofessional Educators; Student Teachers; Corrective Reading and Math. The programs have been modified to meet the needs of all of the students who are not performing at their optimal levels. The Special Education Teachers push in with the students who need more support. Co-teaching is also being tested this year at Cleveland in some classrooms to improve success for students – we are awaiting performance data to note if this model had any impact in the pilot rooms. The culture of the school also has had a lot to do with student achievement. Things like attendance and school violence have been persistent problems and the school really focused on these in 2010-11 and continues to do so this year with mixed results. For climate and safety, the school was identified as one of the District's most violent elementary schools in 2009-10 and this led to the development of a Positive Behavior Support model being rolled out in 2010-11. While the school data shows dramatic lowering in school violence data for last year – particularly in assaults (down from 18 and 22 in 2009 and 2010 to only 3 in 2011), parents at the school complained to the Restart team that they believe while some improvements have been made, the big decrease is due to underreporting by the school. The parent-led School Advisory Committee claimed rampant bullying and fighting in the school and lack of administrative response to parental complaints about these issues. Indeed, a walkthrough of the building on a recent school day left observers with the image of students and adults yelling at each other in stairwells, students walking the halls during class, and general disorder in common spaces and some classrooms. When selecting a school Restart provider, the parents' top two declared needs at Cleveland in 2012 were changing school climate and academic achievement. School attendance was also a push at the school last year – finally bringing the school in line with the District average of 91% daily attendance for K-8 schools. They used a part time liaison to focus on truancy, which seemed to help. Getting students to focus on extracurriculars was also a stated focus in the school's improvement plan this year, however, no data is available from the school regarding participation in EC programming and/or the link between participation after school and academic progress during school. Finally, constant change with the adults in the building has been a threat to student achievement over time. Three leadership changes in five years and a 40% teacher turnover rate over three years – with many of the positions being filled by first-year teachers – has led to some chaos in the classroom for students and families. Parents complain that the “great teachers” often leave after a few years and that they have not been able to build a working relationship with the new principal.

6. Use of state and local assessment results to modify instruction and improve student achievement: At Cleveland they used formative and summative assessments to drive instruction, including PSSA, District Benchmarks, DIBELS, report cards, Acuity data, DRA, and WRAP. Instructional practices over the past two years were adjusted and modified using data from state and local assessments. Data walls were to be posted in each classroom, yet a tour of the classrooms reveals little evidence that this was a school-wide initiative in practice. Special Education teachers use Benchmark and the Predictive Assessments to write IEPs. In addition, the Key Math, Woodcock, DRA and DIBELS data assist teachers in crafting IEPs. A review of actual practice of the school shows varying level of focus by the administration and use by teachers of

a data-driven approach. The faculty appear to want to do the right thing for their students, but they are not being led in a way that helps them harness the power of data in meaningful ways.

7. Family, school, district and community resources available to assist underperforming students: The school has noted several resources in their Action plans over the last few years intended to positively impact family and community effect on underperforming students, such as the CSAP process, Extended Day, Positive Behavior Support Program (PBS), Gratz Reading Program, Peer Mediation Program, support staff in the classroom, mentors in the building, the FAST program, Men of Honor, Nicetown-Tioga Association, Tioga United, Calvary Chapel, and From the Heart Ministries, and our faith based partners. Upon Mastery's review of available data and meeting with parents and community organizations, there is no coherence to the plan for engaging community partners and parents in student achievement and this is an area in need of much improvement. In fact, the parent-led student advisory council currently reports feeling the administration and many faculty are non-responsive to their requests to be engaged in the life of the school over the past year. The school does have a formal partnership with Education Works to provide an after school program option and a critical mass of families do have their students enrolled in that program. This presents itself as an opportunity for future partnership to really impact underperforming students via extended day.

8. School, district and community barriers to improvements in student achievement: There are many barriers to learning at Cleveland – and part of the problem over the last several years has been adults accepting these barriers rather than overcoming them. Barriers noted by faculty and staff as challenges to learning at Cleveland include:

- Low funding levels restricting extracurricular programming
- Negative peer pressure leading to poor behavior
- Skill deficits of children entering kindergarten and limited content exposure for students transferring in in upper grades
- Limited language acquisition prior to enrollment
- Student “Social Capital” challenges including family income, social skills, and ability to develop relationships
- Many parents in transitional living arrangements (e.g. foster care, shelters, homelessness, group homes, living with grandparent or other non-parent relative)

9. Limitations of the current program to enable underperforming students to meet standards: The school team noted that their current plan had not been implemented with “fidelity and rigor” in their own self-assessment. They also cited three major factors in their inability to make progress: (a) Teaching staff lacking the time or focus on assessing and providing feedback to students concerning work samples on a daily basis; (b) Students’ emotional, mental health and medical challenges; and (c) limited onsite resources to connect students and families to the services they need outside school (e.g. housing, medical or mental health care, counseling, income support, etc.). The Mastery team’s analysis of the history of the school over the last five years would include a total lack of focus in the academic program to drive consistent student gains over time.

C1. SIG funds must be used to support the identified needs of the school beginning in the 2012-13 school year. Proper identification of student and teacher needs is a result of the implementation of a comprehensive, school-wide needs assessment. Provide a detailed explanation of the process used to identify needs. Information MUST be provided in the following areas, at a minimum: data, analysis and identification and prioritization of needs. (Maximum 25000 Characters)

Mastery Charter Schools was selected by the Cleveland Elementary School Advisory Council in a 19-1 vote on April 16, 2012 to turnaround the school starting in July 2012 under the Restart model for School Improvement. The School District of Philadelphia did a thorough needs assessment of Cleveland during 2010-11 prior to including it in the Request for Proposals for charter operators under the Renaissance (Restart) program. Cleveland is a Tier I SIG eligible school currently in School Improvement II. The Mastery Charter team taking over the school for 2012-13 has participated with the School District and the parent-led School Advisory Council in this needs assessment and has created the School Improvement Plan submitted under this grant application for 2011-12. While the District has not been able to provide all data requested to the Mastery team, we believe we have sufficient data to make strong programmatic decisions for next year. Cleveland will be Mastery's sixth Restart school under SIG in Philadelphia and we are getting results. In fact, our first three Restarts under SIG that opened in fall 2010 each received a letter of commendation from the Pennsylvania Department of Education for their outstanding first-year results and promising practices. The SIG application for Cleveland is built on what we know is working in our other five restarts, data and performance trends unique to Cleveland, and input from the parents and community members who have very actively engaged with the Mastery team on creating a plan to turnaround this failing school. Based on most recent School Report Card data provided to Mastery by the School District, we know that Cleveland is in the bottom 15 percent of all District schools this year in terms of student academic performance and related factors. The School District of Philadelphia's School Performance Index (SPI) is used to determine how District schools are performing compared to one another beyond simply using AYP status. Each District school received a score of 1-10 (10 being lowest) in each of two categories: (1) overall rank compared to all schools District-wide (10 decile bands) and (2) overall rank compared to the 10 most similar schools by grade configuration and student demographics (poverty, minority student subgroups, Special Education, and ELL students). The SPI is weighted by school in three areas: •Student Progress (50%) – Individual student PSSA growth year over year •Student Achievement (40%) – Achievement Gap, PSSA Proficiency and Below Basic Levels for subgroups (low income, African American or Latino, Special Education, English Language Learners) •Student Engagement/Parent Satisfaction (10%) – Student Attendance, parent satisfaction results (survey) Cleveland Elementary earned a rank of 9/10 in this District-wide SPI comparison that included 239 total comparison schools and 10 schools demographically similar to Cleveland. The SPI score and almost decade of inability to make significant academic progress is what placed Cleveland in the "Renaissance Eligible" category for school turnarounds. Later in this application, the Renaissance School competition and selection process are described in sections 1-3 under "Restart Model Questions" of this application. While the Data section below includes a thorough needs assessment based on our assessment of the 10-11 action plan implementation as well as current and past school performance data, and extensive parent input, PDE should be aware that the District's creation of the School Performance Index also serves as a longitudinal proxy for overall school failure compared to the other 239 schools District-wide. A school could not be selected for a turnaround unless both the quantitative data and the qualitative review of the school indicated a decisive failure at all levels of the school. The Restart model is in response to the history of persistent failure at Cleveland.

1.1 – Academic Data This review is a comparison of data from the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years. There are numerous concerns at Grover Cleveland Elementary School (Cleveland) that are highlighted in the data including:

- Only 42.3% of

students were proficient/advanced in math on the 2011 PSSA o 34.2% of students were below basic in math on the 2011 PSSA • Only 34.1% of students were proficient/advanced in reading on the 2011 PSSA o 36.7% of students were below basic in reading on the 2011 PSSA It should be noted that between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 Cleveland did show growth in the percentage of students proficient/advanced in math and reading on the PSSA. Even with these gains the school is still significantly below the state average and not on track to close the gap in reading in the next 10 years. Academic data broken down by: a. Subject – Reading/Math We analyzed Cleveland’s PSSA performance data in Reading and Math for 2011 (see below) as compared to 2010 results (disaggregated data will be explained in later sections of the data review). While the school did improve its raw scores in 2011, in each subject, school-wide performance has been hovering in the bottom 15% of all Philadelphia public schools. This is especially the case with IEP students and male students. Mastery Charter school, the Restart operator for this school has a track record of turning around failing schools in Philadelphia. In the turnaround schools they currently operate open more than three years, the school PSSA averages in Reading and Math have gone up 42 points or more in in each subject and grade level. These schools have shown they can meet or exceed the statewide averages for these subjects in tested grades within four years of taking over the school. In addition, at Mastery’s first three SIG Restarts in Philadelphia opened in fall 2010, all three achieved double digit gains in Reading and Math school wide in year one under Restart. Mastery took on three more SIG-eligible schools as Restarts in fall 2011 and predictive data reveals they are on a similar path to dramatic gains for children. Cleveland will be Mastery’s 9th turnaround school and 6th Restart model under School Improvement in Philadelphia. We believe Mastery will achieve similar results with Cleveland in both Reading and Math. Whole School Data (Percentages 2011 compared to 2010) MATH 2011 PA State -- 77.1 Adv/Prof; 10.6 Below Basic 2011 Cleveland -- 42.3 Adv/Prof; 34.2 Below Basic 2010 Cleveland – 33.2 Adv/Prof; 39.3 Below Basic READING 2011 PA State -- 73.5 Adv/Prof; 12.3 Below Basic 2011 Cleveland – 34.1 Adv/Prof; 36.7 Below Basic 2010 Cleveland – 32.2 Adv/Prof; 42.4 Below Basic For our analysis of grade level and subgroup data, we have included relevant PSSA data points for each grade and disaggregated groups at Cleveland, however, we do not restate the date for each group due to text limits in this section. b. Data by Grade level – 3 – 8 - -Percent Proficient/Advanced and Below Basic Cleveland is a K-8 school, so only grades 3-8 are tested using the PSSA each year. Overall the 2011 PSSA results for Cleveland include some grades showing gains, other grades showing insignificant increases, and some grades having even lower results than in 2010. Below are some of the areas of alarm that are evident in the grade level data. Grade 3: In 2011, Cleveland saw a 3.7 percentage point increase in the number of students proficient in reading, but a 1.7 percentage point increase in the number of 3rd graders below basic in reading – with 52.3% of 3rd graders reading at a below basic level, Mastery will need to dedicate significant resources and attention to improving literacy skills with these students. The 3rd grade scores dropped in math by 2.9 percentage points. Grade 4: On the 2011 PSSA math exam, 35.2% of students were below basic (an increase of 9.6 percentage points from 2010). Cleveland’s 2011 4th grade reading scores showed little gain from the prior year. Grade 5: Some of the most impressive gains in the school last year were in Grade 5. The school dramatically decreased the percentage of below basic students in reading (down 13 points) and math (down 5 points) and had similar double-digit gains in advanced and proficient readers (up 11.8 points). While still far below the state average in actual performance, our review of school documents and discussions with administration point to better fidelity to the instructional

model by the fifth grade team and a strong set of grade-group leaders. Grade 6: As we move into middle grades, the 6th grade reading scores are cause for alarm. In 2011 the 6th grade reading scores had half as many students scoring advanced or proficient with only 17.5% of students either proficient or advanced. Sixth grade math achievement did see positive gains of 6 points in advanced/proficient, however, still far below their targets. Grades 7 and 8: We see strong math gains in both 7th and 8th grade at Cleveland. Our review finds the math team in the middle grades appears to be a talented group from review of academic data, lesson plans, student work, and feedback from parents. The school almost doubled math proficiency in 7th grade (up 20 points) and tripled 8th grade math proficiency to 44 percent. The 7th grade reading scores were also particularly strong (up 21.7 points). COHORT ANALYSIS: We wanted to look at cohorts to understand progress for the same children year over year. In general, Cleveland's cohorts showed small improvement on the 2011 PSSA as they moved from one grade to the next (e.g. 2010 3rd graders compared to the same students as 4th graders in 2011) and it would suggest that their school improvement plan had a small, marginal impact on student achievement. Of note was that students moving from grade 4 to 5 last year actually lost ground – fewer students proficient and more below basic. Mastery will look deeper at the current 6th grade student achievement in 2012 to determine if any special interventions are needed next year to prevent further learning loss. c. Subgroup There are five PSSA-eligible subgroups at Cleveland: male students, female students, African American students, low Income students, and students with IEPs. However, since 94.2% of all students are African American and 93.4% of students are reported as low-income, subgroup data for these two groups mirrors the overall averages and trends in each subject, grade and school-wide. The performance of IEP students, however, is worth notice. Overall, only 13.2% of IEP students were proficient in reading and 27.8% proficient in math. While these scores are an improvement over 2010 results —dramatically so in IEP math -- they are still significantly below the school's overall performance average, significantly lagging the state average for students with IEPs, and represent only 1 in 10 IEP students being proficient readers . It is also worth noting that male students at Cleveland underperformed relative to female students in both reading and math. In every grade 3-6, male students were more likely to score below basic than proficient or advanced in reading. This is a striking concern and highlights a need for Mastery to target all struggling readers, but especially male readers next year. d. Standards and Anchors As Mastery was only designated as the Restart provider a week prior to the SIG application deadline, the School District was unable to fulfill our request for school and grade level data for 2010 and 2011 PSSA performance disaggregated by standard or anchor. Once we have this data, we will identify specific standards and anchors on which Cleveland was especially weak as we have done in our other six Restarts in Philadelphia to tailor the academic plan further. e. Classroom Level Data The school district was unable to provide classroom level data to Mastery charter. Under the new Restart model, Mastery's entire data system is built upon linking classroom teacher or subject teacher to individual student performance, so we will be able to provide this data going forward if awarded a School Improvement Grant. 1.2 -- Student data on other factors Student Violence, Suspension, and Attendance In 2010, Cleveland saw a significant number of disruptive, violent and inappropriate student acts. This included 30 assaults, 19 arrests and 117 out of school suspensions. All of these numbers are extremely high for a K-8 school. In 2011, the number of incidents decreased, but the school still had 75 suspensions, 3 weapons incidents and 2 arrests. While attendance increased from 90% to 91% last year (at the District average for K-8 schools), the school had a truancy rate of

51% during the 2011 school year. Clearly, students will need to be in the building consistently in order to impact learning and the Mastery plan will address active attendance. Summer and After School Intervention The school currently offers limited out of school time options. In summer 2011, the school operated a limited academic summer school program which was attended by no more than 5 percent of the school population on any instructional day. After school programming is currently provided by an outside contractor, Education Works. We have met with the provider and have requested their data reports on students in the program.

1.3 -- Professional Development Data Throughout Cleveland's Action Plan for 2011-2012, there is no reference to any consistent expectations on what classroom instruction should look like and there doesn't appear to be a fully developed support plan for teachers but instead PD for this year included a list of 13 very general topics to cover. Based on data from teachers and a review of the PD logs, the school has not successfully implemented a coherent approach to professional development. As a part of Mastery Charter, Cleveland staff will go through a deliberate and sequential professional development cycle that starts with a significant amount of professional development during the summer, followed-up by weekly Professional Development on Wednesdays and targeted individual coaching and support. We are nationally recognized for our teacher training and coaching model and are currently supported by the Gates Foundation to train other districts and charters on how to implement the model.

1.4 -- Parent Data The School District of Philadelphia's survey of Cleveland's Parents highlights several concerns that parents currently have about Cleveland (1) Only 40% of parents agree that their child's school is safe, (2) 35% of parents believe that the school's environment is not supportive to their children, (3) Over 80% of parents believe that this often or very often conflict at the school based on race, culture, religion, sexual orientation, gender or disability, and (4) Over 60% of parents believe that school staff are often or very often disrespectful to students. Mastery worked for more than three months during the Restart provider selection process to meet with more than 250 parents and community members, identify the concerns of parents and give them confidence that we can address them in the school immediately. Mastery's model is based on building a positive school environment that includes positive student- student, student-staff, and parent-staff relationships and a specific focus on building a school culture program.

1.5 -- Leadership Data: Cleveland has had three different principals over the last five years and has a teacher retention rate of 60% over the last three years. Teacher survey data on the school is unavailable as there was an extremely low response rate by teachers on the School District of Philadelphia's Teacher Survey.

SECTION 1.2: DATA ANALYSIS

1) Review Team The Data Review for School Improvement was conducted by two separate parties over the course of the 2011-12 year: a) School District of Philadelphia Team – a team including the principal, school staff, and Academic Division Director reviewed the school's data to create the most recent school action plan. The District's Office of Accountability determined eligibility for Renaissance and at that time the District Charter Office and a parent-led Student Advisory Council joined the District planning team. b) Mastery Charter School—applied to take over Cleveland Elementary as part of the Renaissance process. Prior to being selected by the School Advisory Council in April 2012, Mastery presented its plan for transforming Cleveland to parents and community members. Over the past three months, the Mastery team met with parents to discuss parent engagement needs, analyzed school –level student data (by grade, content area, and subgroup), created a framework for the academic plan for 2012-13, and placed three of our leadership team members for next year (upper and lower school principals and Director of Operations) full time on school opening for

Cleveland. All three leaders were in leadership roles in existing Mastery schools this year training to prepare for founding leadership roles in a future Restart school. This summer, the full team of teachers, administrators, and parents for the new Mastery Charter School Cleveland Elementary will be working together on the school opening plan and conducting home visits to students to be ready to serve every child on day one.

2) Data Connections After reviewing the Cleveland Elementary data, Mastery Charter believes that there is a need for significant improvement in nearly every aspect of the school:

- Student Achievement – By far the most alarming element of Cleveland at present is its consistent failure to eliminate the achievement gap for the low-income, students of color enrolled at the school. The school is consistently at least 35-40 percentage points below the state average in Reading and in Math over each of the last five years, with more than a third of the students scoring below basic in each subject. At Mastery we believe that reading is the key to addressing academic deficiencies, and our Restart plan focuses on interventions designed to improve reading and writing skills. We will also implement our rigorous benchmark assessment program that assesses student progress in reading, writing, and math in grades K through 8. Mastery has not yet received 2011 PSSA data at the classroom, instructional standard, or anchor level, however, this and the 2012 data will be provided to us by the District in early August 2012. At that time, our instructional team will review each student's data and enter it into our Mastery Value Added System to create a baseline achievement level for each student. They will also then create academic plans for every student for the start of the school year. For the school, we have developed a projected achievement curve which maps out the expected student growth from pre-turnaround baseline to meeting or exceeding state averages in Reading and Math in four years. Mastery will also conduct our own set of baseline assessments:
 - o For all students in grades K-2 and students in grades 3-5 scoring Basic/Below Basic the prior year, we will conduct the Fountas and Pinnell reading level assessment at the beginning of each academic year to gauge annual literacy growth.
 - o In grades 3-8, all students will take the 4Sight assessment, as well as the Terranova mathematics and literacy level exams as pre and post test measures of content mastery. The results of these assessments, along with prior PSSA data, will be entered into our Value Added System data system. This system allows us to individually assess the growth of each student on their content benchmark exams every six weeks – allowing us to determine if their progress is accelerating or decelerating given the statistical trajectory of their previous academic assessments. Mastery will also review the IEP for every current special education student and review the CSAP files for any incoming student who had an academic or social intervention plan last year at Cleveland to prepare for implementation of these plans. Consistent with the School Improvement Grant guidelines that suggest a granular approach to school improvement, Mastery will implement a comprehensive school model that will address nearly every aspect of the schools' operation. Indeed, our view is that the instructional, intervention, and professional development systems at the current Cleveland Elementary are broken and need to be replaced.
- Teacher Development and Retention – Our review of Cleveland Elementary data indicates a complete lack of connection between teacher professional development, observation, and performance. In contrast, the Mastery system is tightly aligned where student outcomes are tied to our Instructional Standards (teaching best practices) as well as our professional development and observations. Our teachers are also paid and promoted based on their ability to improve student achievement through our nationally recognized performance based pay system. The new Mastery Cleveland Elementary will have weekly professional development sessions designed around one of two

things: a) looking at student data and determining strategies to improve outcomes in a target area (e.g. using PSSA predictive data to improve summarization skills for students if that was a common weakness in Reading), or b) helping teachers develop their skills in one or more of our Instructional Standards (to improve their instruction and thus drive student achievement). Our goal is that at least 85% of all teachers at Cleveland in 2012-13 will directly improve student achievement at the classroom level and improve their teaching ability as documented by 8+ observations throughout the year. We also have set an 85% teacher retention goal at Cleveland for 2012-13 so we can begin to build a consistent core faculty.

- Parent Engagement – After reviewing Cleveland’s current data and spending extensive time with the parents on the School Advisory Committee, we have concluded that parent engagement must be a focus for the new Mastery Cleveland. We aim to have 85% or more of ALL parents participate in their child’s school life – be it attending a teacher conference, participating at a school event, or consistently communicating by email/phone or our parent web portal with teachers. To accomplish our goal, we will have a dedicated school culture team that will focus on engaging parents, and Mastery teachers will communicate regularly with families of struggling students. Mastery has already begun discussions with parents to rebuild the school’s Parent Association and has several strong parent leaders engaged in this process.
- School Culture – the attendance data for Cleveland is at the District average for K-8 schools, but far below the standard for Mastery elementary schools. Suspension and violence data at the school are high and the Mastery model will address turning Cleveland into a non-violent, chaos-free environment. Mastery’s goal is to increase Average Daily Attendance to 95% and reduce the level of serious incidents to 1 per 100 students or fewer. Creating a positive school culture is an immediate focus of a Mastery turnaround, and that will be the case at Cleveland starting in August 2012.

SECTION 1.3: PRIORITIZATION OF NEEDS Mastery Charter’s analysis of school data from prior years leads to five (5) priorities for the whole school turnaround under the Restart model. The School Advisory Council spent more than 60 hours reviewing student data and selecting the lead operator for the Cleveland Elementary Restart. During Mastery’s effort to become the school provider for Cleveland and internal team was identified to review Cleveland’s data and identify the priority needs for 2010-2013. Since selection last week, this team now includes assigned school leadership for 2012-13, parents, and Mastery Network Support Team leaders.

2012-2015 Priorities for Cleveland Elementary. Five priority areas are identified here with more detail on specific goals for each need in section C2 of the application.

1. Whole School Focus on Literacy
2. Increased Instructional Time
3. Focus on Teacher Development
4. Parent Engagement
5. Improve School Culture and Student Expectations

C2. The PA Department of Education has developed a process for implementing an effective needs assessment called Getting Results Continuous Improvement Plan. If this process was used and the school has an approved plan for the 2011-12 school year on file at PDE, the only information required in this section is a list of the prioritized needs identified for the school.

Add new data by entering the fields, then clicking the ADD button at the end of the row on the right.

Priority Goal #	Need	Annual Goal
2	Whole School Focus on Literacy	1) Hire, train and deploy additional literacy personnel in grades K-2; (2) Implement writing curriculum K-8; (3) Literacy triage interventions for below basic students in

		grades 3-8; (4) Focus on literacy across content areas in math, science, social studies, and art; and (5) Average 1.5 years of growth for K-2 students on Fountas and Pinnell assessment.
3	Increased Instructional Time	(1) Implement at least 30 minutes of enhanced instructional time M-F; and (2) Open Saturday school on at least 10 Saturdays; (3) Implement and track results of Mastery summer program starting in summer 2013
4	Focus on Teacher Development and Engagement	(1) Introduce teachers to Mastery Instructional Standards (teaching practice); (2) Provide 1:1 coaching to new teachers; and (3) Focus on teacher use of Mastery's Value Added System (MVAS) and eSchools student information system to drive student outcomes (*all data systems include PSSA performance/growth data); Hire dedicated teacher coach and Apprentice School Leaders; 90% of teachers participate in 8+ observation/feedback sessions each year
6	Improve school culture and student expectations	(1) New books and materials in place in August 2012 to implement new curriculum; (2) Initial technology investments for student access to technology and online interventions; (3) Focus on implementation of SEL program to build students' social/emotional needs to improve attendance, and to reduce suspensions and violent incidents; and (4) Enhance School Culture staff to set initial tone in the building upon Restart; (5) contract with mental/behavioral health provider and hire social worker to focus on students' social/emotional needs and backlog of CSAP cases.
4	Improve Parent Engagement	(1) Reinvent Parent Association and conduct regular meetings; (2) Engage parents in developing the "community school" concept; (3) Increase parent participation in parent/teacher conferences; (4) Conduct school-wide parent satisfaction survey with at least 60% response rate.
1	Increase student achievement in reading and math at all grade levels	(1) Schoolwide reading adv/proficient to 44% year one; math a/p to 52%. (2) Schoolwide reading and math BB each reduced to 28% year one; (3) Open school in August 2012 with new, grade appropriate instructional materials in all core subjects with faculty trained in daily use.

When providing prioritized needs, each need should be numbered (1, 2, 3) so that prioritized needs can be easily linked to goals, activities and evaluations throughout the entire application.

C3. Given the current achievement data for the school and the identified needs, provide a summary of the annual PSSA goals established.

(Optional) (Maximum 5000 Characters)

Cleveland Elementary is being restarted under SIG guidelines as a Mastery Charter School

campus due to years of poor performance as outlined in Sections B and C of this application. Based on stagnant or slowly improving PSSA scores over many years where Cleveland students are performing in the bottom tier of all Philadelphia public schools, the PSSA targets listed in section C4 for the three years of the SIG application follow Mastery's "Achievement Curve" model to help each Restart school close the achievement gap with the state within four years. While there is no room to list the grade level targets in this application, the Mastery achievement curve includes school-level goals for increasing reading and math levels in advanced and proficient as well as decreasing below basic IN EVERY GRADE to help meet the school wide and subgroup targets. These targets use the Cleveland baseline scores from 2010-11 with a focus on making enough gains annually to close the achievement gap with the state. The IEP subgroup will be of particular concern as that has been the hardest to serve group at Cleveland in the past and we must focus on increasing achievement for this critical group of learners.

C4. Complete the chart giving PSSA percentages for the 2010-11 school year.

	Current PSSA Math Data - % Below Basic Format: ###	Current PSSA Math Data - % Basic Format: ###	Current PSSA Math Data - % Proficient Format: ###	Current PSSA Math Data - % Advanced Format: ###	Current PSSA Reading Data - % Below Basic Format: ###	Current PSSA Reading Data - % Basic Format: ###	Current PSSA Reading Data - % Proficient Format: ###	Current PSSA Reading Data - % Advanced Format: ###
All Students	35	23	29	13	37	29	26	8
White non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black/African American non-Hispanic	35	23	29	13	37	30	24	9
Latino/Hispanic	27	27	33	13	27	20	53	0
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Indian/Native American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-racial/ethnic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IEP-Special Education	56	16	23	5	55	30	13	2
English Language Learners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economically Disadvantaged	35	23	29	13	37	29	26	8

Hispanic									
Black/African American non-Hispanic	23	17	45	15	23	21	46	10	
Latino/Hispanic	22	18	45	15	20	16	60	4	
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
American Indian/Native American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Multi-Racial/ethnic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
IEP - Special Education	35	27	31	7	35	35	26	4	
English Language Learners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Economically Disadvantaged	23	17	45	15	23	21	46	10	

C7. Complete the chart giving PSSA percentage goals for Year 3 of this grant (2014-15).

	Year 3 PSSA Math Goal - % Below Basic Format: ###	Year 3 PSSA Math Goal - % Basic Format: ###	Year 3 PSSA Math Goal - % Proficient Format: ###	Year 3 PSSA Math Goal - % Advanced Format: ###	Year 3 PSSA Reading Goal - % Below Basic Format: ###	Year 3 PSSA Reading Goal - % Basic Format: ###	Year 3 PSSA Reading Goal - % Proficient Format: ###	Year 3 PSSA Reading Goal - % Advanced Format: ###
All Students	19	13	52	16	20	14	55	11
White non-Hispanic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black/African American non-Hispanic	19	13	52	16	20	14	55	11
Latino/Hispanic	20	12	52	16	16	14	64	6
Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
American Indian/Native American	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Multi-racial/ethnic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IEP-Special Education	25	3	37	8	25	40	30	5

English Language Learners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Economically Disadvantaged	19	13	52	16	20	14	55	11

Tier I and Tier II schools must choose to implement one of four required interventions in the 2012-13 school year. The LEA must adequately support the intervention selected by the school. (LEAs that have 9 or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the transformation model in more than 50% of those schools.) Tier III schools that choose to implement one of the four reform models must complete the section for that model.

D1. Reform model to be implemented in this school:

- Transformation
- Turnaround
- Restart
- Closure

D2. Provide a brief summary of the process used to select one of the four reform models and explain why the model chosen is the best option for meeting the needs of the school.

(Maximum 15000 Characters)

Cleveland Elementary was selected to become a Renaissance Charter School by the School District of Philadelphia based on a comprehensive review of eligible, low-performing schools District-wide in 2011. Information on Cleveland's status as a low-performing school is detailed in sections B and C of this application. Mastery Charter Schools, the provider selected by a School Advisory Committee (SAC) made up of parents and community members, competed to win Cleveland with four other charter operators over a two month selection process. The process involved more than six open houses to Mastery schools, weekend question and answer sessions with parents, written responses to SAC member questions, a tour of the facility and review of current Cleveland data as well as a lengthy written proposal by Mastery to the SAC. Cleveland parents opted for Mastery in a 19-1 vote and came before the School Reform Commission to advocate that they wanted a 100% Restart under Mastery, as they believed that the full Mastery model proposed under Restart was the best option for meeting the needs of the school as Mastery had a proven track record of turning around failing schools in a short period of time and Mastery's strengths aligned with the areas of weakness at Cleveland. Mastery turned around three failing Philadelphia public schools (Thomas, Shoemaker, and Pickett) between 2005 and 2007, each with breakthrough results as Mastery is cited as the national example for the SIG Restart model by the U.S. Department of Education. In 2010, Mastery turned around three additional failing schools (Mann, Harrity, and Smedley) under SIG Restart all with double digit gains in the first year. Another three failing schools were Restarted under Mastery in fall 2011 and are currently in their first year. Mastery's first three turnaround schools have gone from among the lowest performing schools in the district to among the

highest. At all three schools, violent incidents have dropped 80% while student turnover decreased by nearly half. All Renaissance Restarts have remained neighborhood catchment schools and achievement has skyrocketed under the Mastery model.

THE MASTERY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DESIGN AS RESTART MODEL FOR CLEVELAND

There are seven key design elements common to the Mastery model – all elements combine research-based practices and have been proven to work in Mastery turnarounds of failing schools:

1. High Expectations School Culture
2. Aligned Curriculum & Assessments
3. Outstanding Teachers
4. Data-Driven Management & Instruction
5. Literacy Focus
6. Comprehensive Student Support
7. Parent Engagement

1. High Expectations School Culture (*Priority Need #6: Improve School Culture and Student Expectations) *Achievement-Focused School Culture: A positive, orderly, achievement oriented school culture is paramount to a successful school turnaround. Mastery intentionally fosters a “success through work hard” culture. We create an achievement-focused school culture by sweating the small stuff while fostering meaningful, personalized relationships between students and adults in the following ways:

- *A Dedicated School Culture Team & Relationship-Driven Safety: A dedicated team, including a Director of School Culture, Deans of Students, and Social Workers, is responsible establishing quality, personal relationships between students and adults.
- *Restorative Practice & Non-Violence: Mastery disciplinary systems focus on relationships and raises attention to the harm done to victims, offenders, and the overall community.
- *College Focus: Beginning in kindergarten, Mastery constantly delivers the message: “you are going to college.”
- *School-Wide Behavior Systems: All teachers adopt school-wide classroom behavior systems that provide immediate feedback to students for positive and negative behavior.
- *School Values & Code of Conduct: Mastery’s mission statement and values serves as the foundation of our school culture and disciplinary system based on personal responsibility for self and others.
- *School Culture Rituals and Programs: These include uniforms, community meetings, classroom circles, and award systems.
- *Mastery Grading & Promotion: At the middle-grade levels (5-8), Mastery uses a “Mastery” and “Incomplete” system. Students “Master” a course by attaining a grade of 76% or above. Anything less is considered “Incomplete” and must be revisited.

2. Aligned Curriculum & Assessments (Priority Need #1: Increase student achievement) *Sequenced Course Structure: Our academic program is intentionally designed by starting with the end point – the knowledge, academic and personal skills that students must learn by graduation in order to be prepared for higher education and the global economy. We then back map these skills by grade level and subject down to kindergarten. Each grade level is defined by the measurable learning outcomes that students will learn and achieve. Grade level standards are then sub-divided into six week report periods with each period covering a specific set of skill standards. We have adopted this intentional, focused, standards-based approach because it clarifies for teachers and students the skills and content that need to be taught and mastered in order for students’ succeed.

3. Outstanding Teachers (*Priority Need #4 – Focus on Teacher Development) *Fantastic Staff : Research indicates that teacher quality is the best predictor of student academic performance. Mastery attracts high quality teachers because we offer a competitive salary, positive collegial environment, performance-based promotion, and comprehensive professional development and support.

*Common Instructional Model: To ensure quality teaching in every classroom, Mastery has developed and adopted common Instructional Standards. The standards are largely based on the work of Madeline Hunter, an icon of the pedagogical field. The lesson flow follows Madeline Hunter’s model of Direct Instruction, Guided Practice, Independent Practice. At the heart of the Instructional

Model are a few foundational concepts: (1) Urgency; (2) Focus; (3) Objective-Assessment Alignment; and (4) Rigor. *Intensive Classroom Support & Performance-Based Pay: Mastery has created a comprehensive teacher coaching and professional development program. The foundation of the program is our alignment of instructional standards, individualized coaching, professional development, 360 degree feedback, and performance-based pay. Onsite teacher coaches, Master Teachers, Apprentice school leaders, and central office staff provide ongoing support to teachers in their classrooms. Sufficient time is allocated for teacher planning and professional development. 4. Data Driven Instruction & Management (All six Priority Needs are impacted by our data systems and use) *Interim Assessment System: Mastery has created a customized benchmark assessment program that assesses the skills and knowledge that must be learned in a given report period for each subject. The benchmark data is used to identify students in need of support, highlight curricular gaps, and help focus instruction. A full professional development day is dedicated after each assessment cycle so teachers can review their classes' data and develop plans for re-teaching and reassessment for the next report card cycle. *Assessment Driven Instructional Cycle: Mastery teaching revolves around a common instructional cycle. The cycle is comprised of four components: a) Planning, b) Teaching, c) Assessment, d) Analysis. This assessment data then drives unit and lesson plans and informs individualized student support and differentiation for the upcoming report period. *Data-Driven Management: Student performance data drives every aspect of Mastery. Our student information system collects students' attendance, disciplinary records, grades, benchmark assessment, and predictive/summative test results. At the conclusion of each six -week report period, school leaders review the data to identify successes as well as students in need. Measurable goals and intervention plans are developed for the coming 6-week report period and the cycle begins again. 5. Literacy Focus (**Priority Need #2: Whole School Focus on Literacy) Mastery believes the foundation of student achievement is reading. The National Research Council has found that "Academic success, as defined by high school graduation, can be predicted with reasonable accuracy by knowing someone's reading skill at the end of 3rd grade." Perhaps the biggest challenge in turning around a failing school is to address students' reading deficits. At the K-2 level, Mastery will dedicate three 50 minute periods daily to reading instruction in addition to a dedicated read aloud block and writing class. Every two K-2 classrooms will also have a shared literacy teacher and utilize self-directed computer-based instruction so the classroom can be subdivided into small reading groups of 8-10 students. Students will be homogenously grouped so that teachers can target the specific learning needs of students. After initial student placement testing, students will work in fluid groups that are constantly reassessed to ensure proper placement. From grade 3-5, students continue with Reading Mastery and extend into literature study, language and word study, and a writing class. In grades 6-8 the curricula is novel based. Students with significant reading deficits will receive an additional targeted intervention block. 6. Comprehensive Student Support (**Priority Need #6: Improve School Culture and Student Expectations) * Scaffolded Course Structure: Multiple Entry Points, Single Exit: In a school turnaround, we recognize that students will be performing at dramatically varying skill levels – from functionally illiterate to above grade level. To effectively meet students at their incoming skill levels, we offer multiple course options in grades 7 and 8. Students with lower reading skills receive coursework that is specifically designed to accelerate reading skills. To ensure students catch up quickly, these accelerated entry-level "ramp-up" courses are typically limited to 20 students or less per class. This structure ensures that all students get the support they require and receive the high school

preparatory coursework they need. *Support For Struggling Students: Our six week benchmarks allow us to identify struggling students before they fall too far behind. Struggling students receive differentiated instruction, additional tutoring, or pull-out support. Students struggling with non-academic issues are also quickly identified and the school culture creates action plans to support these students. At the elementary level, support includes: (1) Reading support based on instructional level; (2) Corrective Reading for students with significant reading deficits; (3) Pull out literacy coaching in Grades K-2 with one full time literacy teacher dedicated to each pair of classrooms to focus on literacy support for students; (4) SAP: Students of persistent concern may be referred to the Student Assistance Program (SAP)—to formally examine the root causes of low performance and implement plans to address areas of concern. (5) Summer School: Students who do not Master core subjects and need additional support will attend summer school and SIG funds will also support the design and implementation of a summer program for basic and proficient students to advance their skills.

*More Time (priority goal # 3): Mastery at Cleveland will operate a longer school day and year than traditional public schools through our extended learning time initiative. The typical school day will be 7.5 hours with an additional thirty minutes to an hour every day of targeted learning intervention based on each student's need. Students not achieving Mastery in a course, or who score at the Basic or Below Basic level in the prior year's PSSA will receive additional support during this time. Our school year starts in late August and runs until the end of June. Homework is another way to create additional learning time. We will build the habit of "homework time" by assigning kindergarteners 30 minutes of homework each night, increasing to 60 minutes per night in third grade, 80 minutes per night by fifth, and two hours by seventh.

7. Parent Engagement (*Priority Need #5: Improve Parent Engagement) To be successful, parents/guardians must partner with the school to support their child's academic success.

*Parent Communication is enhanced through (a) Take-Home Binders: Elementary students will take home daily binders that will include the child's homework as well as the students' work from the day. b) On-line Monitoring. Mastery uses a student information system (Pinnacle) that allows parents to log-in at any time to check their child's grades and homework assignments in real time. c) Progress Reports: Progress reports (report cards) will be distributed to students and parents each report period every 6 weeks. d) Conferences: Parents will be able to meet with their child's teachers and discuss their child's progress during several parent/teacher conferences scheduled during the school year. *Parent Training: We will also work to provide professional development to parents in supporting their child's learning including, parent training on academic routines and training on our reading and math curriculum at their child's grade level so parents can help students with homework or are empowered to contact teachers when their child has a problem. *Parents In School Governance: Mastery has already begun discussing how to help the Cleveland Parent Association reorganize with members of the School Advisory Council. The Parent Association will meet regularly with the principal to provide feedback and to organize school supports and parent outreach, and representatives will serve on the Mastery Network Parent Advisory Council to ensure parental voice in the governance of the school. In addition, the SAC that selected Mastery has accountability targets for the charter to meet and will meet with the principal four times per year to review progress toward goals.

RESTART MODEL

Yes, this school will be using the Restart reform model. Fill in each question in this section.

In this section of the SIG application, the required actions are listed for the Restart reform model. For each requirement, the following must be provided: Goal, Action(s) to be taken, Anticipated date for implementation and completion, Method of Evaluation, Estimated 3-year cost, and the Priority goal these actions will address.

G1. The LEA implements a review process for choosing the Charter Management Organization (CMO) or Educational Management Organization (EMO).

(Optional)

Add new data by entering the fields, then clicking the ADD button at the end of the row on the right.

Goal	Action(s) To Be Taken	Anticipated Dates for Implementation and Completion	Method of Evaluation	Estimated Costs (3 Years)* Format: #.##	Priority Goal These Actions Will Address
SDP identifies Renaissance Schools	Advertises RFP	February 2012	Review of qualified respondents	0	1,2,3,4,5

G2. The LEA identifies the EMO/CMO selected or the pool of potential providers.

(Optional)

Add new data by entering the fields, then clicking the ADD button at the end of the row on the right.

Goal	Action(s) To Be Taken	Anticipated Dates of Implementation and Completion	Method of Evaluation	Estimated Costs (3 Years)* Format: #.##	Priority Goal These Actions Will Address
SDP matches CMO with school	Presentations, visits, vote by school	April 1, 2012	Selection approved by the School Reform Commission (SRC)	0	1,2,3,4,5

G3. The school to be "restarted" has retained its original grade configuration or has a plan for those students to be moved.

(Optional)

Add new data by entering the fields, then clicking the ADD button at the end of the row on the right.

Goal	Action(s) To Be Taken	Anticipated Dates of Implementation and Completion	Method of Evaluation	Estimated Costs (3 Years)* Format: #.##	Priority Goal These Actions Will Address
------	-----------------------	--	----------------------	--	--

					Will Address
Retain the original grade configuration	Mastery Cleveland will open as a K-8 neighborhood school with the existing catchment areas	August 2012 - July 2015	The charter agreement between the School District of Philadelphia and Mastery Charter Schools stipulates Mastery maintain the original enrollment catchment areas and grade configuration.		

G4. The LEA/school has an implementation plan to assure a smooth "restart" for the 2011-12 school year.

(Optional)

Add new data by entering the fields, then clicking the ADD button at the end of the row on the right.

Goal	Action(s) To Be Taken	Anticipated Dates of Implementation and Completion	Method of Evaluation	Estimated Costs (3 Years)* Format: #.##	Priority Goal These Actions Will Address
Goals for the Restart under Mastery are listed in both our PSSA goals for each year and our prioritized needs for the school in this application	See our action plan narrative in this application for the itemized actions and focus activities that will occur prior to fall 2012	Please see section L18 for the timeline	Method for evaluating depends on the goal and are listed throughout the application next to each target. Some examples of metrics for evaluating success include, but are not limited to, student academic achievement as measured by the PSSA, school violence reduction, attendance increases, enrollment	4259376	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

			<p>increases, teacher satisfaction, teachers receiving coaching and participating in observations, etc. We have an elaborate data system that can track all student and teacher level data points to report on outcomes.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

***Costs can include pre-implementation activities to prepare for the implementation of the reform model at the beginning of the 2013-13 school year. Some examples of possible pre-implementation activities are:**

Community meetings to review school performance and discuss the reform model to be implemented; communications between the school and parents regarding the school status, school choice options, social services, etc.; the rigorous review of external providers (experts, CMOs, EMOs) to properly select those with whom to contract; remediation and enrichment to students to be involved in the implementation of a reform model;

Identification and purchase of instructional materials to be used in the 2012-13 school year; instructional planning sessions to review data and develop curriculum for use in the 2012-13 school year; training necessary to implement new or revised instructional programs and strategies in the 2012-13 school year; and development and piloting of data systems to be used in connection with the reform program to be implemented in the 2012-13 school year.

This school is a Tier I or Tier II participating Title I school that does not meet the 40% poverty eligibility threshold and is applying for a waiver to implement a schoolwide program.

(Optional)

No

This school is a Tier I or Tier II participating Title I school and is applying for a waiver to "start over" in the school improvement timeline. A school that elects to "start over" in the school improvement timeline will forfeit their Title I school improvement grant.

(Optional)

For each required action outlined in the Description of Reform Plan section of the application, 3-year cost estimates were required. Provide a breakdown of each of these estimated costs below. Breakdowns must be by category, by year and by unit and a description must be provided. A description of the plan for sustainability is also required

for each budgeted item.

J1. Estimated 3-year Cost: Amount entered in this section of the application should equal the total amount estimated in the Description of Reform Plan section.

Add new data by entering the fields, then clicking the ADD button at the end of the row on the right.

Category	Year	Number to be Purchased	Unit Cost Format: ###	Total Cost Calculated: ###	Description of Budgeted Item	Sustainability Plan
Contracted Services	Year 1	1	100000	100000	Contract with RHD to provide mental/behavioral health counseling to students	Shift to 70% time in year 4 and sustained by operating budget as school will have 180 more students by year 4 and all start up expenses will be paid.
Contracted Services	Year 2	1	100000	100000	Contract w/ RHD -- see year 1 description	See Year 1 for sust. plan
Contracted Services	Year 3	1	100000	100000	Contract w/ RHD -- see year 1 description	See Year 1 for sust plan.
Staff	Year 1	1	65000	65000	Salary for 1 FTE Dean to work with disruptive youth in lower school	Reduce to part time on school budget in year 4 and eliminate position in year 5 based on climate change at school
Staff	Year 2	1	66950	66950	Extra dean in lower school -- see year 1 for description	See year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 3	1	68959	68959	Extra dean in lower school -- see year 1 for detail	See year 1 for sust plan
Community and Parent Outreach	Year 1	1	30000	30000	1 FTE Attendance liaison to work on truancy	Reduce to PT in year 3, shift PT to operating in years 4-5 based on increased enrollment

Community and Parent Outreach	Year 2	1	30900	30900	1 FTE Attendance liaison -- see year 1 description	see year 1 for sust plan
Community and Parent Outreach	Year 3	1	15914	15914	Shift to PT attendance liaison	see year 1 for sust plan
Community and Parent Outreach	Year 1	1	52000	52000	FT Parent and Community Outreach coordinator	Shift to PT in year 3 and sustain PT role on operating at full building capacity in years 4 and beyond
Community and Parent Outreach	Year 2	1	53650	53650	FTE Parent and Community Outreach Coordinator	See year 1 for sust plan
Community and Parent Outreach	Year 3	1	27584	27584	Part Time Parent/Community Outreach staff	see year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 1	1	60000	60000	1 FTE to write and deliver pilot social emotional learning curriculum in middle grades	Shift to 50% cost share at school in year 3 and operating picks up 100% in year 4 based on increased enrollment
Staff	Year 2	1	61800	61800	Social Emotional Learning faculty	see year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 3	1	31827	31827	50% share of FT SEL teacher	see year 1 for sust plan
Assessment Materials	Year 2	1	30000	30000	Cleveland will participate in Common Core roll out in curriculum in years 2-3. This will pay for benchmarks aligned to common core.	One time cost in years 2-3 of SIG.
Assessment Materials	Year 3	1	20000	20000	See year 2 description of benchmarks aligned to common core	One-time cost

Assessment Materials	Year 2	1	50000	50000	Pay contracted staff to modify Cleveland K-8 curriculum to align w/ common core and design honors curriculum	one time cost in years 2-3 of SIG
Assessment Materials	Year 3	1	20000	20000	Common Core curriculum materials alignment K-8 -- see year 2 for description	Project ends in year 3
Materials & Supplies	Year 1	650	500	325000	New books and instructional materials for all 650 students in year one of Restart	One time start up cost; 20% replacement cost of materials built into school budget going forward
Materials & Supplies	Year 2	100	500	50000	Adding 100 students in year 2 - - pay for new instructional materials for all	One time cost.
Materials & Supplies	Year 3	80	500	40000	Adding 80 students in year 3, one time cost of buying new books and instructional materials	one time cost. replacement costs of 20% built into school budget
Staff	Year 1	1	80000	80000	1 FTE new teacher coach to work with all first year teachers in 1:1 instructional coaching	Reduce to .5 FTE on operating budget in year 4 and sustained by per pupil funding from increased enrollment
Staff	Year 2	1	82400	82400	1 FTE Teacher Coach	see year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 3	1	84872	84872	1 FTE Teacher Coach	See sust plan in year 1
Staff	Year 1	1	80000	80000	1 fully released apprentice school leader to train to	Training 1 ASL each year at/for

						support Cleveland next year or provide instructional support this year	Cleveland will help shore up the talent pipeline at the school. In year 4 the Mastery network will pick up the costs of any future talent pipeline needs at the school.
Staff	Year 2	1	82400	82400		1 FTE Apprentice School Leader -- see year 1 description	See year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 3	1	84872	84872		1 FTE Apprentice School Leader	See year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 1	30	1200	36000		Provide EC stipends to 30 faculty to provide 30 hours each of EC instructional programs after school	Shift to 70% Sig in year 2 and 50% in year 3; school can sustain at 50% effort in year 4 and beyond based on operating budget
Staff	Year 2	30	840	25200		70% of cost of 30 faculty running after school EC instruction -- school covers 30%	see year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 3	30	600	18000		50% cost of 30 faculty running instructional EC after school	see year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 1	27	3000	81000		Supplemental summer program for 350 students summer 2013	Reduce to 275 students year 3 on SIG and shift to operating with 200 students in year 4 based on increased proficiency (e.g. less need) and increased enrollment

						funding
Staff	Year 3	22	3000	66000	Supplemental Summer program 275 students -- see year 1 for description	See year 1 for sust plan
Materials & Supplies	Year 1	650	472	306800	New student technology (laptops, desktops, IWBs and projectors and ELMOs) less than \$1500 per item	One time cost of start up for 650 students in year one; +100 in year 2, +80 in year 3; Refresh rate of 30% built into operating budget
Materials & Supplies	Year 2	100	472	47200	New student tech (see year 1 description) for 100 additional students in year 2	See year 1 for sust plan
Materials & Supplies	Year 2	80	472	37760	Student technology for 80 new students in year 3	See year 1 for sust plan
Computer Equipment	Year 1	8	6196.25	49570	equip over \$1500: 1 \$2k laptop cart; 1 router \$12k; 5 switches \$31k; 1 server \$4k	All one time expenses for setting up enhanced student technology to run online interventions and blended learning models
Computer Equipment	Year 2	7	4419.43	30936.01	3 laptop carts at \$2k each; 4 switches for increased capacity at \$6237 each	One time expense of increasing tech capacity to offer blended learning for all students; plus capacity for 100 new students in year 2
Computer Equipment	Year 3	3	2000	6000	3 laptop carts to fit out new classrooms for 80 new	one time cost to fit out tech in year 3; all

					students in year 3 based on blended learning model	replacement costs built into operating budget in out years at 30% refresh rate
Staff	Year 1	6	60000	360000	6 FT Literacy Support Teachers to push in K-2 Classrooms for individualized/small group support in K-2 lit	Shift to 5 K-2 literacy support teachers in year 3 and 4 FTE on permanent budget in year 4 by increasing class size and school enrollment and stabilizing literacy needs in grades 1-2
Staff	Year 2	6	61800	370800	6 FT literacy support teachers in K-2 (see year 1 description)	See year 1 for sust plan
Staff	Year 3	5	63654	318270	5 FT literacy support teachers in K-2	see year 1 for sust plan
Software	Year 1	1	15000	15000	Software licences for literacy interventions	Site licenses reduce in cost over time, with full cost supported on school budget in years 4 and beyond
Software	Year 2	1	10000	10000	See year 1 for description (includes Achieve 3000) -- 65% cost of year 1	See year 1 for description
Computer Equipment	Year 3	1	7500	7500	site licenses for instructional software -- see year 1 for descripton; cost in year 3 is 50% of year 1	See year 1 for sust plan.
Staff	Year	10	17415	174150	Fringe at 27% rate	See salary line

	1					for 10 FTEs under instructional and student supports (Dean, SEL Teacher, Instructional Coach, ASL, and 6 K-2 lit support)	for each position for sustainability plans
Staff	Year 1	10	17937.5	179375		Fringes on 10 supplemental staff -- see year 1 for description	See year 1 staffing lines for each role for sustainability plan
Staff	Year 3	10	15897.59	158975.9		Fringes on 8.5 supplemental staff -- see year 1 for description	see year 1 for each position for sust plan -- some positions have begun to phase out or go part time by year 3
Community and Parent Outreach	Year 1	2	11070	22140		Fringes on Attendance liaison and Parent and Community Outreach positions	See each staffing line in year one for sust plan for each role
Staff	Year 2	2	11414.5	22829		Fringes on 2 FT community position (outreach and attendance)	see year 1 for each position for sust plan
Staff	Year 3	2	5872.17	11744.34		Fringes on 2 Part Time positions in year 2 for community engagement and attendance	See year 1 for each position for sust plan -- both positions have shifted to part time by year 3.

Explain any "Other" budget category used above.

(Optional) (Maximum 3000 Characters)