The State Education Department
The University of the State of New York

Office of Innovative School Models
Charter Schools Office
462 EBA
Albany, New York 12234
518-474-1762

Charter School Annual Report
2009 - 2010

Charter School Information and Cover Page

Name of Charter School____Genesee Community Charter School_____

Primary Address_____657 East Ave_____

_____Rochester, NY 14607_____

Telephone _____585-271-4552 ext. 460_____Fax_____585-271-5904_____

BEDS #_____261600860826_____

District/CSD of Location_____Rochester City School District_____

Charter Entity_____NYS Board of Regents_____

Date School First Opened for Instruction_____August, 2001_____

School Leader_____Lisa A. Wing_____
(print name)

E-mail Address of School Leader____[redacted]**_____**

President, Board of Trustees_____Lyle E. Beach_____
(print name)

E-mail Address and Phone Number of Board President_[redacted]

[redacted]

Student Assessment Data
New York State Assessment Results
Grades 3 – 8 ELA and Math
2009-10 Annual Report

Grades 3 – 8 State ELA Assessments Results

Year of Test	Grade 3				Grade 4				Grade 5				Grade 6				Grade 7				Grade 8			
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**
2009-10 – All Students	3	9	53	34	9	30	61	0	0	26	63	11	4	11	82	4								
General Education Students	3	3	55	38	7	29	64	0	0	21	67	13	5	5	86	5								
Special Education Students	0	67	33	0	20	40	40	0	0	67	33	0	0	33	67	0								
2008-09 – All Students	0	9	75	16	0	7	83	10	0	7	80	13	0	17	79	4								
General Education Students	0	7	76	17	0	7	85	7	0	4	83	13	0	5	90	5								
Special Education Students	0	33	67	0	0	0	67	33	0	0	100	0	0	25	75	0								
2007-08 – All Students	0	3	61	35	6	6	84	3	0	11	86	4	0	3	87	10								
General Education Students	0	0	32	68	4	8	65	23	0	14	71	14	0	7	63	30								
Special Education Students	0	0	67	33	0	20	80	0	17	50	33	0	0	0	100	0								
2006-07 – All Students	13	9.7	68	9.7	3.2	16	71	9.7	0	6.5	84	9.7	8	16	64	12								
General Education Students	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a								
Special Education Students	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a								

New York State Assessment Results

Grades 3 – 8 State Math Assessments Results

Year of Test	Grade 3				Grade 4				Grade 5				Grade 6				Grade 7				Grade 8			
	L1	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**	**L1**	**L2**	**L3**	**L4**
2009-10 – All Students	0	31	34	34	3	27	58	12	0	30	67	4	4	43	39	14								
General Education Students	0	31	31	38	4	21	61	14	0	25	71	4	5	36	41	18								
Special Education Students	0	33	67	0	0	60	40	0	0	67	33	0	0	67	33	0								
2008-09 – All Students	0	3	63	34	0	3	67	30	0	7	63	30	0	4	63	33								
General Education Students	0	3	62	34	0	4	67	30	0	8	54	38	0	0	60	40								
Special Education Students	0	0	67	33	0	0	67	33	0	0	100	0	0	25	75	0								
2007-08 – All Students	0	0	35	65	3	10	68	19	4	22	63	11	0	7	66	28								
General Education Students	0	0	32	68	4	8	65	23	0	14	71	14	0	7	63	30								
Special Education Students	0	0	67	33	0	20	80	0	17	50	33	0	0	0	100	0								
2006-07 – All Students	13	9.7	68	9.7	3.2	16	71	9.7	0	6.5	84	9.7	8	16	64	12								
General Education Students	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a								
Special Education Students	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a								

Other Student Assessment Data
2009-10

Name of Test: **Measures of Academic Progress** **Subtest:** **Reading**

Grade	Date of Test	#Enrolled in Grade on DOT	#Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	#Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score-RIT Range	Qualitative Level	Percent Achieving
3	June 2010	32	0	0	0	32	163-189	Below Grade Level Norms	9.7
							190-199	At Grade Level Norms	19.4
							200-235	Above Grade Level Norms	71
4	June 2010	33	0	0	0	33	175-199	Below Grade Level Norms	15
							200-206	At Grade Level Norms	21
							207-235	Above Grade Level Norms	64
5	June 2010	27	1	0	0	26	198-206	Below Grade Level Norms	7.7
							207-212	At Grade Level Norms	19.2
							213-243	Above Grade Level Norms	73
6	June 2010	28	0	0	0	28	182-209	Below Grade Level Norms	18.5
							210-213	At Grade Level Norms	18.5
							214-236	Above Grade Level Norms	63

Name of Test: **Measures of Academic Progress** **Subtest:** **Mathematics**

Grade	Date of Test	#Enrolled in Grade on DOT	#Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	#Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score-RIT Range	Qualitative Level	Percent Achieving
3	June 2010	32	2	0	0	30	180-190	Below Grade Level Norms	16.7
							191-199	At Grade Level Norms	13.3
							200-234	Above Grade Level Norms	70
4	June 2010	33	0	0	0	33	185-203	Below Grade Level Norms	18.2
							204-211	At Grade Level Norms	42.4
							212-225	Above Grade Level Norms	39.4
5	June 2010	27	0	0	0	27	191-212	Below Grade Level Norms	25.9
							213-220	At Grade Level Norms	14.8
							221-249	Above Grade Level Norms	59.3
6	June 2010	28	3	0	0	25	175-216	Below Grade Level Norms	56
							217-222	At Grade Level Norms	20
							223-251	Above Grade Level Norms	28

Name of Test: **Measures of Academic Progress** **Subtest:** **Language Usage**

Grade	Date of Test	#Enrolled in Grade on DOT	#Absent on Grade on DOT	# Exempted in Grade by IEP	#Exempted in Grade by ELL Status	# Students Assessed in Grade	Score-RIT Range	Qualitative Level	Percent Achieving
3	June 2010	32	0	0	0	32	172-192	Below Grade Level Norms	9.7
							193-202	At Grade Level Norms	19.4
							203-232	Above Grade Level Norms	71
4	June 2010	33	0	0	0	33	177-201	Below Grade Level Norms	21.2
							202-208	At Grade Level Norms	18.2
							209-231	Above Grade Level Norms	60.6
5	June 2010	27	0	0	0	27	200-208	Below Grade Level Norms	18.5
							209-212	At Grade Level Norms	22.2
							213-236	Above Grade Level Norms	59.3
6	June 2010	28	0	0	0	28	181-211	Below Grade Level Norms	35.7
							212-215	At Grade Level Norms	21.4
							216-236	Above Grade Level Norms	42.9

Developmental Reading Assessment Scores as of June 2010
Percent Achieving at DRA Level

K	**1**	**2**	**3***	**4**	**6**	**8**	**10**	**14**	**16 and above**	**Total**
#	3	6	6	2	3	5	1	2	2	30
%	10	20	20	6.6	10	16.6	3.3	6.6	6.6	

First	**8**	**12**	**16**	**18***	**20**	**24**	**30**	**34 and above**	**Total**
#	1	3	3	5	2	2	2	12	30
%	3.3	10	10	16.6	6.6	6.6	6.6	40	

Second	**3**	**12**	**14**	**20**	**24**	**28***	**30**	**34**	**38**	**40**	**50**	**Total**
#	1	2	1	3	1	1	3	5	8	4	2	31
%	3.2	6.4	3.2	9.6	3.2	3.2	9.6	16	25.8	12.9	6.4	

Third	**28**	**30**	**38***	**40**	**50 & above**	**Total**
#	2	1	2	14	12	32
%	6.25	3	6.25	43.7	37.5	

*Indicates performance at grade level

Developmental Reading Assessment Scores as of June 2010
Percent Achieving at DRA Level

Fourth	**28**	**30**	**40***	**50***	**60 or above**	**Total**
#	2	2	9	16	4	33
%	6	6	27	48	12	

Fifth	**50***	**60***	**70**	**80 or above**	**Total**
#	2	5	4	16	27
%	7.4	18	14.8	59	

Sixth	**34**	**50**	**60***	**70***	**80 or above**	**Total**
#	1	2	7	8	10	28
%	3.5	7	25	28.5	35.7	

*Indicates performance at grade level

Progress Toward Goal Attainment

Progress Toward Goal Attainment
2009-10

Goal/Objective: Desired Level of Attainment	Actual Result: Observed Level of Attainment	Measure Used to Indicate Attainment of the Goal/Objective	Was the Goal/ Objective Met? (Y/N)	Explanation if Not Met/Efforts to be Undertaken
Satisfactory review by Expeditionary Learning	Average score of 3.62/4	EL Implementation Review	Yes	
95% students promoted to the next grade level	99.5% students promoted to next grade level	Promotion Rates	Yes	
Active parent involvement in the school program and events	High	Volunteer log, attendance at Family events	Yes	
90% parents satisfied	99% parents satisfied	Re-enrollment data, parent satisfaction survey, new applications	Yes	
Conduct ongoing, comprehensive, and informative assessment	High	Use of NYS exams, DRA tests, MAPS tests	Yes	
Provide exemplary professional development for staff	High	Professional development schedule, EL Implementation Review, PD attendance records	Yes	
Maintain a respectful, safe, orderly learning environment	High	Behavior log, suspension rates, parent satisfaction survey, EL implementation Review	Yes	

Please see the following narrative for more detailed explanation of progress toward goals.

Genesee Community Charter School
Progress Toward Goals
2009-2010

Goal 1

Satisfactory annual review by Expeditionary Learning

The Genesee Community Charter School incorporated the Expeditionary Learning model as part of our original charter proposal, and we have maintained a strong relationship with the organization throughout our first nine years. Our school has become a demonstration site for EL, hosting over 200 visitors annually. "Teachers and principals from across the country continue to visit, for site seminar and throughout the year to see what Expeditionary Learning can look like in the hands of inspired school leaders and outstanding, dedicated teachers" (Expeditionary Learning Implementation Review, June 2010, p. 2).

Our implementation of the model continues to be strong, earning us a school score average of 3.68 out of 4 on our Implementation Review. We continued to perform particularly well in the areas of Learning Expeditions, Lesson Design, School Culture and Character, Leadership, and School Structures, and showed considerable growth in Assessment Practices. A theme in the review narrative was EL's observation that GCCS staff is hungry for continual improvement. "Even in areas where GCCS is considered national leaders, the school leader and faculty is constantly asking, 'How can we do it better?'" (Expeditionary Learning Implementation Review, June 2010, p. 3).

Learning Expeditions. Our commitment to high-quality, rich learning expeditions has continued into our ninth year of using the EL model. Many of this year's expeditions have been implemented in previous years. A topic of ongoing staff conversation revolves around the wisdom of repeating expedition plans vs. developing new plans with different learning targets, classroom activities, fieldwork, and final products. We believe that it is important to continually improve the learning experiences we provide for students, and for that reason it is appealing to re-tool a previous plan and try it again. But it is also important to keep ourselves on the cutting edge, continually searching for new ideas, and experiencing the stimulation that comes from taking new risks and not always knowing how things will turn out. As with most things, the answer probably lies in achieving a balance between the two. It has been a year of trying to strike that balance.

Fieldwork is one of the most constructive aspects of our program at GCCS. This year's students used the RMSC extensively as they studied the solar system, prehistoric life, early people, native peoples, and early Rochester. Classes traveled the length of the Genesee River as they examined its geology and investigated the early settlements along its banks. They walked the paths of Benjamin Franklin, Paul Revere, and other revolutionaries in Philadelphia, Valley Forge, and Boston as they learned about the formation of their country. They visited world-class museums with strong health-related exhibits in Columbus, Pittsburgh, Denver, and Houston. They "settled" in Webster Park and built bridges, fences, mill wheels; made jam, crafted lanterns, dug potatoes, and shucked corn; and attended frontier school taught by a strict taskmistress.

Each field experience is carefully designed to address specific learning targets, immerse students in particular experiences, or help students deepen their passions and understandings. Armed with clipboards, note-taking sheets, sketchpads, and pencils, students travel to near and distant places to further their learning. They explore, observe, interview experts, conduct experiments, and sketch and photograph. The information they gather is used in the classroom to help students answer the expedition's guiding questions and to contribute to the class's final product. But a less obvious outcome is the disposition we nurture in students to become resourceful, curious, observant, lifelong learners who feel a strong connection to and respect for their community.

The sixth grade curriculum, which each year focuses on a "hot topic" in Rochester, was a huge success. Kate Bennett charged the class with preparing recommendations for a new health-related exhibit for the museum. The class spent the fall learning about epidemics through time, the ways in which those diseases affected people of different social classes, and the ways in which governments dealt with the epidemics. In the winter, the class studied body systems and ways to keep the body healthy. In the spring, after traveling to four museums, students created a proposal for an exhibit, wrote a document explaining each component, and constructed mock-ups of the displays and activities. The class will present its recommendations to Ms. Bennett and the museum staff next week.

As part of the sixth grade's curriculum, the class hosted our second 5K Race for Kids. The event was held at Genesee Valley Park with about 125 racers. The entire sixth grade trained for the event throughout the year and participated in the race. Its success has encouraged us to make this an annual event.

A highlight of the year was our 2005-2006 alumni's keynote address at the Expeditionary Learning National Conference in Kansas City, Missouri. Five representatives from that class spoke to an audience of nearly 800 educators, describing their sixth grade research and presentation to the Mayor about the merits of re-watering the Erie Canal in downtown Rochester. Touted as "the best keynote address in the history of Expeditionary Learning," these students inspired teachers and school leaders from around the country to tackle ambitious, locally compelling problems with their students.

Reading. Our generally strong literacy program has been refined this year to better address the needs of struggling students. Building upon the work of the second grade teachers last year, each class implemented targeted intervention for students who struggle but do not receive special education services. In addition, our special education coordinator is providing intervention services for sixteen students from grades two through five.

We have seen tremendous growth in many of these students. For example, a second grader who entered the year with a DRA score of "3" is concluding the year on grade level at a "24." A third grader began second grade with a DRA score of "4" and is ending third grade on grade level with a score of "38."

The kindergarten and first grade teachers used the Wilson Fundations program with more than half their students to increase phonemic awareness and build decoding skills. Almost all children in these classes are on grade level at this point in the year.

Several children who continue to struggle in spite of intensive interventions have been referred for special education evaluation. Parents made eighteen referrals this year to the Committee on Special Education. Thirteen (72%) of the referrals resulted in special education classification and additional services for children. Five referrals (28%) resulted in no classification or additional services.

Writing. Our writing program continues to be strong, and writing infuses every other subject area. A new initiative this year was the adoption and implementation of our new spelling program. The Sitton Spelling Program was used at least three times per week in all classes. Teachers of younger students have already seen positive results. Our upper-grade teachers are pleased with the program, and are looking forward to receiving students who have had a year or more of solid spelling instruction behind them.

Math. We continued to use the new version of the *Investigations* program. Our major effort in Math this year was to create a K-6 map of the skills required by the New York State Standards and aligned with the *Investigations* and *Connected Math* (sixth grade) programs. We are concerned about ensuring that we fill any gaps in our math programs. We also want to identify areas of the math program that are not required by New York State Standards, and therefore can be addressed more quickly or skipped if necessary. We are also concerned about the heavy load of math content for which our upper grade teachers are responsible. We are considering ways in which some concepts, vocabulary, and skills can be introduced in earlier grades so that children have a stronger background when they encounter this content in upper grades. This work will be finished in August.

Arts. The integration of the arts into expeditions was very strong this year. The arts teachers met with classroom teachers while planning expeditions and then again for a mid-expedition check-in. Teachers attended every other arts class with their students so that they could participate in projects and facilitate connections between the arts and expeditions. One highlight of arts integrations was the masterful acrylic paintings on canvas of the Genesee River and its geology. A musical highlight was an opera about prehistoric life. In P.E., a highlight was dance of the formation of the river, which incorporated the concepts of continental drift, glaciation, the water cycle, and erosion.

As part of the Arts Grant, we filmed a documentary about best practices in arts integration. The purpose of the documentary is to define and provide examples of integration of the arts that extends beyond the thematic or topical; that provides students with ways to deepen and express content-area learning at a more conceptual level. The documentary features interviews of classroom and arts teachers, footage of planning meetings and classroom instruction, and examples of student work in music, visual arts, and dance. The documentary will be completed by November.

Social Curriculum. Teachers invest significant energy into creating a positive, productive learning environment for children – an environment in which children can express themselves, solve conflicts, share ideas, and work together. Morning meetings, class meetings, problem-solving conferences, parent conferences, and other rituals and procedures help teach our children appropriate and friendly behavior.

We have had fewer instances of relational aggression this year, although we do still see it crop up beginning in late third grade and peaking in fifth grade. Teachers are very quick to name this behavior and teach positive alternatives. They involve parents and invoke consequences when patterns become apparent. While it seems inevitable that we will always encounter such behavior, we are much better equipped to manage it and keep it to a minimum.

Some of our fifth and sixth grade students have been the victims of cyber-bullying this year. These instances happen on social networking sites that students use at home, but occasionally the ramifications are felt in the classroom. The school has taken a stance that it will not become involved in sorting out and solving cyber-bullying, but when we are made aware of instances, we immediately alert parents to the problem and encourage them to monitor their children's computer usage.

Our school hosted a class from St. John Fisher College for ten weeks. Their course on classroom management was being taught at a City school, and the professor was dissatisfied with the models that her students were seeing. She moved the class to GCCS, and the pre-service teachers observed in classrooms and led morning meetings. The professor and her students were very pleased with the fine models our teachers provided.

Goal 2

Ninety-five percent of students are promoted to the next grade level

We promoted 99.5% of our students to the next grade level.

Goal 3

Active parent involvement in the school program and events

We have continued to make concerted efforts to communicate regularly with parents. Each class prepared a weekly newsletter to keep parents informed about classroom goals and activities. *Currents* was published bimonthly.

The Family Association has two new chairs who, along with our Program Committee Chair and the Family Association Secretary, have done a terrific job organizing Family Association events and improving communication with parents.

Parents took an active role in shaping the Background Checks policy. They participated in the Family Talent Show, attended a Pot Luck Social, hosted a staff appreciation luncheon, enjoyed a winter skating party and a spring dance party, and attended Family Game Night and a Native American storyteller presentation. Parents also volunteered three Saturday mornings to clean the school.

The Family Association has instituted an outreach initiative for new families. New families are assigned to a veteran parent, who makes an initial phone call to welcome them to the school and answer questions. New families have expressed how nice it was to have someone reach out and make them feel like part of our school community.

The Family Association has also begun publishing its own newsletter. The newsletter is published every other month, alternating with *Currents*. The Family Association has also published a school directory, which will be useful for families wishing to carpool, send birthday invitations, or arrange play dates.

Once again we held chaperone orientation sessions this year. These orientations help prepare parents for the demands of fieldwork. Chaperone selection was smooth sailing this year (compared with previous years); the current chaperone policy is working well and providing us with safe, attentive, and skilled support on field studies.

Goal 4

Ninety percent of parents satisfied

One reflection of parent satisfaction is the vast majority of students who will return in 2010-2011. 95.2% of our students entering grades 1-5 returned for 2010-2011. Of those not returning, 50% (five children) moved to a suburb and will attend their suburban elementary school, and 50% (five children) moved to more traditional district or charter schools.

Another indication is the number of applicants for enrollment for 2010-2011. We had 121 applications for 20 open kindergarten spaces for Fall. We had approximately 100 applications for Grades 1-5.

We conducted a parent satisfaction survey in May, 2010. Surveys were mailed to homes along with a self-addressed stamped envelope. We received 57 responses, which is about a 34% response rate.

On average, 99% of the responding parents were somewhat satisfied, satisfied, or very satisfied. 96% of the responding parents were satisfied or very satisfied. The areas of greatest satisfaction seemed to be the quality of expeditions and student exhibition nights, the language arts program, the quality of teaching, the arts program, books and materials, the school facility, and discipline.

The area of least satisfaction, as it is every year, is with the math curriculum. *Investigations* is different enough from a traditional approach that parents often have difficulty comprehending

how their children are learning math. We worked on the math program as a school focus area, and several comments did reflect increased, although skeptical, satisfaction in that area. We have ramped up our communication with parents about mathematics, and we have included both increased challenge and increased attention to basic facts and algorithms as we make our way through the new edition of *Investigations*.

Goal 5

Conduct ongoing, comprehensive, and informative assessment

Teachers continue to use individual, small group, and large group assessments to gauge children's progress. Developmental reading assessments, running reading records, math unit tests, and performance tasks give teachers additional insight into children's progress. In addition, we are using more pre-assessment in math to determine appropriate grouping and instruction levels for children.

The New York State ELA and Mathematics exams were administered to our students in Grades 3-6, the NYS Science exam was administered to fourth graders, and the NYS Social Studies exam was administered to fifth graders. Results are included in the tables attached to this report.

We implemented a new form of standardized testing for Grades 2-6 this year. The Measures of Academic Progress (MAPS) test is a computer-based assessment in Reading, Mathematics, and Language Usage. The program selects the difficulty of items it presents to students based on the accuracy of students' previous answers. The resulting score lies along a continuum from Kindergarten to 12th Grade, and allows teachers to monitor students' progress from year to year. Results can be disaggregated into strands from the New York State Standards so that teachers can identify areas of strength and need in classes and individuals.

Goal 6

Provide exemplary professional development for staff

At GCCS, we have a two-pronged approach to professional development. The first is our own professional growth, and the second is our dissemination of effective practices to educators from other schools around the country.

We devote most of our professional development effort to addressing the focus areas selected by our staff based on an analysis of student performance, feedback from Expeditionary Learning, input from the State Education Department, and parent satisfaction surveys. This year we chose four focus areas: spelling, mathematics, using assessment data, and Response to Intervention.

Spelling. Our task with spelling was to become familiar with the Sitton Spelling Program and to implement it with some fidelity this year. We received introductory training in August and follow-up training in February. As we are still getting to know the program and its component parts, we may need to pursue additional professional development next year.

Math. In Math, as described above, we created a map of the *Investigations* program aligned with the New York State Standards. We need additional time to sort out how we might streamline the math program in order to provide the appropriate level of support and challenge for all of our students.

Use of Assessment Data. A major focus this year was to improve our use of assessment data in order to track student progress and inform instruction. We implemented the MAPS assessment (described below) in the fall, winter, and spring. We analyzed student data to identify strands and skills that require more focus, and to identify students who need targeted intervention in specific areas. We administered older versions of the New York State Math and ELA exams to students early in the year and analyzed data for the same purposes. The Observation Survey was given to kindergarten and first graders, the Developmental Reading Assessment was administered to all students, and some diagnostic tests, such as the WIST (from the Wilson Reading Program), were given to struggling students. The staff became more adept at analyzing assessment results and in using those results to shape classroom instruction and interventions. This is an area that requires quite an investment of time, and we anticipate spending more professional development time next year learning to efficiently and effectively use assessment data.

Response to Intervention. Response to Intervention (RTI) was our fourth focus area. RTI integrates assessment and intervention within a multi-level system to maximize student achievement and to reduce behavior problems. With RTI, teachers identify students at risk of failure, monitor student progress, provide targeted interventions, and adjust the intensity and nature of interventions depending on a student's progress. We developed our own definition of each tier of intervention and identified the modifications or specialized instruction we would provide for each. We clarified how we would determine the tier into which children would be placed and the assessments we would use to measure student progress. We are continuing to work on a consistent school-wide documentation system for RTI.

We have once again evolved a staple of our professional development – examining one another's teaching. This year, we videotaped one another's lessons and engaged in a protocol to look at "teacher moves." We defined these as the little moment-by-moment decisions that can enhance or detract from teaching, and can promote or hinder student learning. These include questioning techniques, phrasing of directions or student prompts, use of materials or props, pacing, word choice, injection of suspense or mystery in a lesson, and movement of the teacher through the classroom. Teachers reported that they became more conscious of their moves and more aware of the way small elements of teaching can affect student engagement and learning.

The second aspect of professional development at GCCS is the dissemination of effective practices to other schools. We have many strengths – our strong culture of community; engaging, substantive learning expeditions; integration of the arts into academic disciplines; the use of community resources – which are our responsibility to share with others. In turn, our staff benefits greatly from facilitating the learning of other educators. Teachers from other schools provide us with an authentic professional audience, which keeps our faculty engaged in continuous examination of our work and our students' performance.

Our seventh Site Seminar yielded an attendance of 125 participants. While attendance was terrific and participants' experiences were positive, the GCCS staff was not satisfied with the format of the event. The seminar was structured with one day at World of Inquiry School and one day at GCCS with an optional third day for workshops. The optional day was very lightly attended, and did not accomplish its purpose to provide learning extensions of our guests. In addition, about half the guests left early on the second day, making it difficult to provide an effective debrief session and bring the event to a positive closure. We expressed our concerns to Expeditionary Learning, and they agreed to consider a change in structure. We have recently learned that our Site Seminar will be extended to three days – two days for school observations and one day for workshops. We are looking forward to revisiting the structure for the Site Seminar in order to provide the best experience for visitors and for GCCS staff.

Five of our teachers attended the Expeditionary Learning National Conference, presenting master classes on topics such as integrating movement into science and looking at teacher work. We attended some very informative master classes as well, which will help us shape some new practices for next year.

This was the final year of the federal Arts Dissemination Grant. We kept the same structure for working with the Springfield schools that we had last year. EL reports that there have been many positive outcomes in the Springfield schools, with a definite increase in teachers' use of the arts in classrooms.

Goal 7

Maintain a respectful, safe, orderly learning environment

We have had few serious discipline issues this year. The vast majority of classroom management and discipline issues are handled by teachers. Parents are contacted and special behavior plans are put in place for children with continual behavior challenges. We have had just three suspensions this year, two for one students and one for another student. We developed a Behavior Intervention Plan for one student, and saw slight improvement in the amount of schoolwork he produced.

Charter School Student Attrition Rates
2009-10

	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07
Number of students leaving for lack of transportation	0	0	0	0
Number of students leaving for geographic reasons (e.g., out of state/district relocation)	12	11	10	14
Number of students leaving for more restrictive special education setting	0	1	1	2
Number of students leaving due to parental choice (e.g., school transfer closer to residence, local elementary school, parent convenience)	12	1	3	1
Number leaving for other reasons (undetermined)	0	0	0	0
Total number of students leaving	24	13	14	17
Highest Number Enrolled *(July 1 – June 30)*	215	213	212	211
Total Percent Attrition	11.2	6.1	6.6	8.1

95.2% of our students who completed grades K-4 at GCCS in June returned for the 2010-2011 school year. Of those not returning, 50% (five children) moved to the suburbs and are attending their suburban elementary schools and 50% (five children) transferred to more traditional district or charter schools.

57% of our fifth grade students returned for sixth grade in 2010-2011. This is an extremely low percentage for us, and is due to a number of factors. The Rochester City School District opened a new International Baccalaureate program for grades 6-12, and parents were told that if their children did not enter as sixth graders, they would not have an opportunity to enter the IB program in future years. While greatly distraught about this forced choice, six parents chose to have their children transfer to the IB program so that their middle and high school placement was assured. Four children went to their suburban middle schools, which also begin at sixth grade. One child moved out of state.

Charter School Teacher Attrition Rates
2009-10

	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07
Number of Classroom Teachers	14	14	14	14
Number of Special Area Teachers	5	5	4	4
Total Number of Teachers	19	19	18	18
Total Number of Teachers Leaving	1	0	1	3
Total Percent Attrition	**5**	**0**	**5**	**17**

	2009-10	2008-09	2007-08	2006-07
Number of teachers leaving for geographic reasons (out of state/relocation)	0	0	0	0
Number of teachers leaving to take a position in a school district	0	0	0	0
Number of teachers leaving to take a position in another charter school	0	0	0	0
Number of teachers not retained	0	0	0	1
Number of teachers leaving for other reasons (or undetermined)	1	0	1	2