



OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Office of the Superintendent
1025 Second Avenue, Room 301
Oakland, CA 94606
Phone (510) 879-8200
Fax (510) 879-8800

TO: Board of Education
FROM: Anthony Smith, Ed.D., Superintendent
David Montes de Oca, Coordinator; Office of Charter Schools
DATE: January 27, 2010
RE: Community School for Creative Education
Charter Petition Request

Legislative File

File ID No.: 09-3136
Introduction Date: 10/28/2009
Enactment No.: 10-0171
Enactment Date: 1-27-10
By: *AS*

ACTION REQUESTED

Deny the charter petition to establish the Community School for Creative Education. Pursuant to *Education Code §47605*, the petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all of the 16 elements required by the Charter Schools Act; and due to the nature of the discrepancies and inconsistencies set forth within the petition as detailed in this report, the petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.

SUMMARY

Staff recommends that the OUSD Board of Education **deny** the charter petition for Community School for Creative Education under the California Charter Schools Act. Staff recommends denial based on factual findings, specific to this particular petition, detailed in this report.

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

- 1) The lead petitioner, Ida Oberman, submitted the Community School for Creative Education petition on October 28, 2009 at a regularly scheduled Board of Education meeting.
- 2) Staff held an introductory meeting with the lead petitioner and petitioning group, Ida Oberman, et. al., on November 12, 2009 to explain the petition review process and obtain petitioning group contact information.
- 3) A public hearing was held on November 18, 2009. Representatives from the lead petitioning group presented.
- 4) Staff conducted two Petitioner Interviews on December 11, 2009 and December 14, 2009.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Education Code §47605:

Charter law outlines the criteria governing the approval or denial of charter school petitions. The following excerpt is taken from the Charter Schools Act, Education Code §47605. This excerpt delineates charter approval and denial criteria:

A school district governing board shall grant a charter for the operation of a school under this part if it is satisfied that granting the charter is consistent with sound educational practice. The governing board of the school district shall not deny a petition for the establishment of a charter school unless it makes written factual findings, specific to the particular petition, setting forth specific facts to support one or more of the following findings:

- (1) The charter school presents an unsound educational program for the pupils to be enrolled in the charter school.*
- (2) The petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.*
- (3) The petition does not contain the number of signatures required.*
- (4) The petition does not contain an affirmation of each of the conditions described in Education Code §47605(d).*
- (5) The petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of the 16 required charter elements.*

DISCUSSION

The Community School for Creative Education submitted a charter petition to the Oakland Unified School District on November 19, 2008 to operate a K-8 charter school to begin in fall, 2009. The petition was denied by the State Administrator on February 11, 2009. A second charter submission to the Oakland Unified School District by the petitioning group took place on October 28, 2009, proposing to operate a K-8 charter school to begin in fall, 2010.

Staff conducted a review and evaluation of the CSCE charter petition based exclusively on the merits and contents of the second petition submission. Substantial staff time and deliberation has been afforded to ensure compliant, thoughtful, objective evaluation of this specific petition.

Staff convened a petition review team comprised of leadership within the District, which subsequently conducted an evaluation of the petition pursuant to the Charter Schools Act and with the application of the Oakland Unified School District Petition Evaluation Rubric. Staff convened a review team* of reasonable individuals with combined public school expertise appropriate for this particular petition to evaluate the contents of the charter petition based on the OUSD Charter Petition Evaluation Rubric which is available to the public. The individual members of this team dedicated over 50 combined hours of time reviewing and evaluating this charter petition. The petition review team identified both strengths and deficiencies within the proposed educational program and its implementation as set forth in the petition.

Petition Review Team included:

- Coordinator of Early Childhood Development Programs
- Manager of School Improvement Coaching
- Family and Community Department Representative

- Director of School Portfolio Management
- Program Manager of Visual and Performing Arts
- Two (2) Principals of elementary schools successfully serving predominantly low income, second language students
- Charter School Program Analyst
- Charter School Financial Accountant

** Team members include experience working in and/or developing charter schools, and a member who is a former Waldorf trained teacher of a Waldorf inspired public charter school in Northern CA.*

Office of Charter Schools staff has additionally dedicated over 75 hours of time reviewing the charter petition in its entirety; including conducting research regarding various aspects of the proposed instructional program, and engaging the petitioning group in an interview process to better understand aspects of the proposed educational program as well as developing this staff report and recommendation. Staff has further identified both strengths and deficiencies in the proposed educational program and its implementation as set forth in the petition.

Following the petition review team evaluation process, staff conducted two Petitioner Interviews on December 11, 2009 and December 14, 2009, in an attempt to clarify various aspects of the petition, as well as to evaluate the capacity of the petitioners to successfully implement the program as set forth in the petition.

Community School for Creative Education proposes to open in fall, 2010 as a direct-funded charter school, operating in District 2. The school proposes to serve 100 students in grades K-3 in its first year. Following a period of increased and subsequently reduced enrollment, Community School for Creative Education seeks to serve up to approximately 270 by year 7 and reduce to approximately 205 students in grades K-8 by year 12. The school intends to operate in a facility yet to be determined; which includes a request to the district for provision of facilities under Prop. 39.

The staff recommendation proposed herein recommends that the OUSD Board of Education **deny** the charter petition for the Community School for Creative Education (CSCE) based on the findings set forth in this report which detail that the petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all of the 16 elements required by the Charter Schools Act; and due to the nature of the discrepancies and inconsistencies within the petition as detailed in this report, the petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.

Strengths within the charter petition and educational program set forth in the petition worthy of future consideration by the Board of Education are outlined below.

FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Staff evaluation of the charter petition as submitted for the Community School for Creative Education charter school, as well as staff evaluation of the capacity of the petitioning group, including the proposed governing board members, has identified meaningful areas for future consideration.

Educational Program

The petition sets forth a premise under which the blending and appropriate adaptation of the Waldorf approach to education with rigorous standards-based instructional approaches, to include the use of Open Court Reading, may provide a means by which students that have historically under-achieved academically may be successful.

The petition provides an articulation of learning opportunities for students that provide an uncommon approach to public education which, if successfully implemented, may prove to provide a meaningful option for Oakland families. This includes the use of storytelling and retelling, drawing, painting, handwork such as knitting and modeling, music and dance as aspects of the core instructional model which are intended to address varied learning modalities and increase access for a broad range of learners.

Petition Excerpt (p. 33):

“While based on the principles of the global Waldorf school movement, the Community School for Creative Education embraces a contemporary interpretation of the Waldorf educational philosophy which will be crafted to meet the specific needs of the target student population of Oakland to fulfill the school’s mission to provide a rigorous college-preparatory academic program and achieve proficiency on the California State Content and Performance Standards. The CSCE is dedicated to offering a strong curriculum by blending Waldorf with current educational best practices and programs.”

The petition includes a commitment to evaluating and monitoring student academic progress through a range of approaches including the use of both standardized assessments such as state tests and curriculum embedded assessments; as well as through the use of more performance based assessments including rubrics, portfolios and the “main lesson book” common in Waldorf schools which act as a vehicle for students to demonstrate their learning.

Organizational Viability

Staff remains impressed by the level of commitment and sincerity with which the petitioning group has put forth its efforts to develop a sound educational program. Notwithstanding the extensive findings set forth in this report in support of a denial recommendation, staff believes that the will, skill and capacity necessary to further develop an educational program that would otherwise contain the likelihood of successfully meeting the needs of the target population outlined in the proposed charter petition exists within the petitioning group including its proposed governing board members.

The petitioning group is comprised of experienced educators in both traditional public school settings, charter school setting and public and private Waldorf school settings. The petitioning group includes parents and community members of Oakland with a commitment to the mission of the proposed charter school, as well as individuals who possess many of the technical skills necessary to effectively operate a charter school.

[SEE TABLE I BELOW]

Notwithstanding the aforementioned considerations, pursuant to the petition review process and the standards and criteria set forth in statute and by the Oakland Unified School District, identified herein are key factual findings that represent critical shortcomings within the charter petition as submitted. Additionally presented here are findings indicating inconsistencies and discrepancies in the development of the educational program likely to significantly impact the petitioning group's ability to successfully implement the program as set forth in the petition.

TABLE I

Petitioning Group

1) The petitioning group includes the following key individuals;

- Dr. Ida Oberman,
- Mrs. Emma Paulino,
- Mrs. Monica Alexandra,
- Mrs. Velia Navarro,
- Mr. RH Jones,
- Ms. Samantha Lehman,
- Ms. Nhan Le,
- Mrs. Guadalupe Barrera,
- Ms Ixone Oyarzabal,
- Ms. Nuria Martinez,
- Ms Dolores Nice Siegenthaler
- Mrs. Maricela Alejo

2) The Governing Board of Community School for Creative Education

- **Mr. Abe Doctolero**, Contra Costa County Office of Education — **Board President**
Mr. Doctolero is Director of Curriculum & Instruction at the Contra Costa County Office of Education. Previously, he has served as school principal and teacher in Bay Area urban school settings. Director Doctolero brings particular expertise in curriculum and assessment, and governance.
- **Mr. Chris Dailey**, Esquire — **Board Vice President**
Mr. Dailey brings to the CSCE team a depth of experience in Finance, Business Management and Law. After a number of years working on Wall Street as a fixed income institutional salesman, he went on to launch two start-up technology companies. He is currently involved in launching his third company and practices law part-time in NY and CA.
- **Ms. Kathy Gower**, Barfield School of Sunbridge College — **Board Treasurer**
Dr Gower brings extensive financial expertise. Dr. Gower serves as lecturer and organizational consultant in the area of early child hood and serves on the board of the Sophia Project. Dr. Gower has offered financial oversight to a number of not for profit organizations including Sophia Project

and the San Francisco Waldorf School.

- ***Ms. Cheryl Eining (Emerita)***

John Morse Waldorf Methods School Principal Cheryl Eining (Emerita) brings extensive knowledge in urban school administration, bilingual/multicultural education, and in Waldorf education. An educator for thirty-nine years, Principal Eining has served as Principal of John Morse Waldorf Methods School for the past eight years in Sacramento City Unified School District.

- ***Ms. Mary Desta Franklin***

Ms. Mary Desta Franklin, a long-time Oakland resident, is a lifelong community organizer and educator. Ms. Franklin is a certified Oakland Community Organizations (OCO) leader and was part of the ASCEND and ARISE design teams. Ms. Franklin brings deep knowledge of leadership development and of the community CSCE aims to serve.

- ***Ms Helen Lubin, Center for Speech and Drama, Rudolf Steiner College***

Founder of the North American Center for Speech and Drama, Ms Lubin has served as Waldorf speech educator for over thirty years. A speech trainer who has offered professional development to Waldorf schools public and private around the globe, Ms Lubin is a regular teacher of teachers at John Morse Waldorf School. Ms. Lubin brings deep educational expertise in curriculum and instruction.

- ***Mr. John Lundell, CoWare, Inc.***

Dr. Lundell brings expertise in business management. Dr. Lundell received his Ph.D. in electrical engineering from Stanford. During 1985 to 1989 he helped launch a startup, Tomex, doing seismic imaging for oil field exploration. From 1989 to present, he has worked on modeling and simulating digital communications links, from satellites to cellular networks, at three separate companies, Comdisco Systems, Cadence Design Systems Inc. and most recently at CoWare. Dr. Lundell brings knowledge in technology, data analysis and facilities.

- ***Ms. Lynne Newton, Waldorf School of Mendocino County***

Ms. Newton is a teacher at the Waldorf School of Mendocino County. An Oakland native, Ms. Newton is an experienced teacher in the method of Waldorf, in which the CSCE grounds itself. Ms. Newton has taken one class through 1st to 8th once and 6th to 8th grade twice. As of 2008, Ms. Newton has taken a new first grade of which she's now the second grade teacher. Ms Newton also brings an international perspective. She has taught at the Waldorf School of Nairobi in Kenya. Ms. Newton brings expertise in curriculum, instruction and Waldorf education.

- ***Dr. Jorge Ruiz de Velasco, Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity and Diversity, UC Berkeley***

Dr. Jorge Ruiz de Velasco is Associate Director, and Director of Education at the Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute. Prior to his Berkeley appointment, Dr. Ruiz de Velasco Jorge served as Director of the Institute for Research on Education Policy and Practice at the Stanford School of Education. He has also served as a Senior Program Officer at both the James Irvine Foundation and the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, as a Senior Research Associate at the Urban Institute in Washington, DC, and as a civil rights attorney for the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights in Washington. Dr Ruiz de Velasco brings experience in curriculum and instruction, working with the targeted student population, and administration.

- ***Associate Pastor Marjorie Wilkes, Plymouth Church, Oakland***

Ms. Marjorie Wilkes co-founded and co-directed the West Oakland Community School, a charter middle school focused on college preparation, leadership development, and African American

history and culture. Ms. Wilkes currently serves as Associate Pastor of Oakland's Plymouth Church. Her wide areas of expertise include organizational growth and development, program design and evaluation, fundraising and community relations. She has dedicated her career to improving educational opportunities for low-income children of color.

FINDINGS IN SUPPORT OF RECOMMENDATION

**Community School for Creative Education
Charter Petition Request
Submitted: October 28, 2009**

Pursuant to decision-making on behalf of the Board of Education of the Oakland Unified School District with respect to the charter petition request for the establishment of the Community School for Creative Education charter school; the following findings pursuant to Education Code §47605 as factual findings in support of the denial of the charter petition.

The petition as well as the petitioner responses during the petitioner interviews contain conflicting and confusing descriptions of aspects of the educational program, required to be reasonably comprehensive in their description pursuant to Education Code 547605, which meaningfully interfere with a clear understanding of how the program is intended to be implemented or what the content of the educational program is intended to be, leading to a determination that the petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition.

Petition states;

“Rather than depend solely on small reading groups during open access time in the Open Court curriculum, CSCE will structure this time to provide explicit skill and strategy development through Reader’s Workshop (p. 107).”

>

“For example, the use of *guided reading groups* combined with *acting, movement* and *reciting* would provide an accessible artistic approach to the material being learned (p. 160).”

It not clear how the school defines “guided reading” as the definition may differ greatly within schools. It is not clear how the approach to reading groups will occur given the statements made above.

Petition states;

9:35-11:05am

Direct Instruction in Reading and Writing

Preparing to Read, Reading & Responding, Language Arts (Open Court curriculum)

(Modes: Teacher read aloud, choral reading, guided reading, individual reading)

Workbooks as needed (p. 256)

>

Responses during the petitioner interview stated that this period is to be utilized for the Main Lesson Block, a 3-4 week period of study to be focused on each content area, including mathematics, science, and history/social studies.

Petition states;

1:10-1:55

Writer’s Workshop

Use Open Court goals for Open Court/Waldorf content

>

Responses during the petitioner interview stated that Open Court writing curriculum will not be used in the school.

The aforementioned references within the petition and statements made during the petitioner interviews do not support a clear understanding of the intended content outlined in the Sample Schedule contained in the petition.

Petition states;

9:35-11:05am

Direct Instruction in Reading and Writing

Preparing to Read, Reading & Responding, Language Arts (Open Court curriculum)

(Modes: Teacher read aloud, choral reading, guided reading, individual reading)

Workbooks as needed (p. 256)

>

Direct Instruct II

(9:05-11:05)

Whole class instruction: Comprehension Skills and Strategies

Reader's Workshop: Guided Reading, Word Study, Independent Reading, Workbook or Portfolio Work (Suggestions for these are in Open Court manuals) (p. 262)

>

Petition Appendix 9 puts forth a pacing chart that represents the Open Court reading lessons in their entirety from the 3rd grade Open Court Reading curriculum being utilized throughout the year.

>

"The day's lesson plan begins with the *Main Lesson*, introducing new concepts or subject areas when the child's mind is fresh. This extended lesson will be the academic cornerstone upon which the day is built. The subjects (language arts, science, mathematics, and social studies) will be taught during a 3-4 week instructional *block*, often to be continued later in the term. Presentation in the *block system* emphasizes in-depth learning – giving the children time to internalize and accelerate ...digest what has been learned (p. 84)"

The petition and appendices do not sufficiently reconcile the proposed use of Open Court reading curriculum and the proposed use of the Waldorf Main Lesson Block to deliver the Main Lesson Subjects.

Petition states;

8:30-9:30

English Language Development

Review, New, Do or alternate days: Review/Do; New/Do (p. 256)

>

Eng. Lang. Dev

(8:30-9:00)

Storytelling/Review

Portfolio Page (p. 262)

This is a discrepancy in the intended approach to the ELD curriculum that is not otherwise resolved within the petition or during the petitioner interviews.

The charter petition states that 6+1 Trait Writing Model will be utilized for the writing curriculum. (p. 110)

>

The petition also states that Open Court will be utilized during the "Direct Instruction in Reading and Writing" block from 9:35-11:05 (Appendix 8).

>

The petition also states that the school will "use Open Court goals for Open Court/Waldorf content during the Writing Workshop to be held for 45 minutes two times a week in the afternoon."

>

Petition states;

"Writing workshop should include spelling/word study, grammar, and writing time, as indicated by Open Court (p. 264)"

>

Responses during the petitioner interview on December 11, 2009 stated that the Open Court Writing Curriculum is weak and not intended for use.

The petition states that “Step Up to Writing” will be used as part of the curriculum to increase writing fluency and effective communication. This statement is made under the heading “What are scientifically based instructional methods to meet student needs so students acquire important skills & how will they ensure that students meet state learning standards? (p. 157).”

>

Responses during the petitioner interview on December 11, 2009 stated that a decision was made not to use the “Step Up to Writing” curriculum.

The petition contains conflicting information regarding the intended writing curriculum. The petition does not clarify if 6+1 Writing Traits is used commonly in Waldorf schools and to what extent this approach to writing is undertaken in Waldorf schools, nor how it will be approached in this charter school.

Petition states;

“As research shows, such focus on experiential learning in one’s own community through meaningful service offers critical academic support.” (p. 85) Service learning is mentioned once amid cooking and gardening as “hands-on activities” (p. 83) and is mentioned once as a means of “Building Relationship Between Family/Community and School” (p. 85).

>

No other description of the school’s proposed service learning is given except to state: “Teachers and the CSCE Parent Council will work together to integrate into the curriculum, developmentally appropriate service learning.” (p. 85)

>

Additionally, it is not clear who the “CSCE Parent Council” refers to given that the charter petition references the following; *Parent Action Committee, Family Resource Advisory Committee, School Site Council, and English Learner Advisory Council.*

The petition does not provide a description of the intended service learning program. There is no evidence provided as to the extent to which the program component has been developed.

[Sample Lesson] (p. 264)

English Language Development: (30 minutes)

Theme: Courage/Friendship

This section picks up on courage as the theme (Michaelmas) and combines it with the “Friendship” theme of Open Court.

* Given the reference within the sample lesson to Michaelmas it is not clear what the intended celebration of Michaelmas is to be as practiced in Waldorf schools. Given the lack of articulation within the petition regarding Celebrations/Festivals it is unclear to what extent traditional Waldorf celebrations will occur in the school.

In the book Waldorf Education, A Family Guide (1995), typical Waldorf education includes All Hallow’s Eve, intended to “remind us of our dual citizenship; here and in the spiritual worlds.” (p. 148) Waldorf education, as presented in this guide book may include the celebration of Michaelmas, an autumn festival celebrated on September 29th “named for the Archangel Michael, conqueror of the powers of darkness, the harvester of the deeds of the human soul.” (p. 145) Included in the guide book for parents an excerpt from the Marin Waldorf School Parent Handbook. This excerpt describes the use of the Advent Wreath and Advent Calendar in the classroom during the winter time leading up to December 25 where a large window in the advent calendar is “opened to reveal the child in the manger with the rainbow arching over him.” (p. 156).

>

Additional Celebrations outlined in the guide book include “The Christmas Festival” and “The Day of the Holy Kings”. Festivals of Easter and Passover are described as “the victory of good over evil, of light over darkness, of life over death.” Rudolf Steiner is quoted here in the guide book. “Festivals are meant to link the human soul with all that lives and weaves in the great universe. We feel our souls expanding in a new way during these days at the beginning of spring...It is at this time of year, the time of Passover and Easter, that human souls can find their lives...in the innermost core of being, a fount of eternal, divine existence.”

>

Celebrations such as May Day are described in which the May Pole Dance is performed. “Eventually the celebrations were emancipated from their ‘pagan’ origins and large May poles, cut from the tallest trees which could be found, were erected in England’s public squares or occasionally before churches, to ward off evil spirits that might abound at this time, during the transition between darkness to light”. The guide book includes descriptions of the Celebrations of the Pentecost, occurring “50 days after the Resurrection of Jesus, celebrated on Easter,” and the Celebration of St. John’s Tide associated with the Summer Solstice and John the Baptist.

>

The petition as submitted states:

“Festivals and Other Special Events

CSCE values community learning in many forms and it is much more than just the cultural events as referenced in curriculum connections it is also important to make time for celebration. Careful attention will be given to the celebration of festivals and holidays with special attention assigned to events that can be appropriately observed in the school setting and to events that recognize the world’s diversity of celebration.” (p. 126)

>

During the petitioner interview with the founding group that occurred on December 11, 2009, respondents stated that the intent is to engage families in identifying celebrations that are valued and celebrated within the community.

No other description is given as to the extent to which the school will engage in Festivals and Celebrations similar to those outlined in the book Waldorf Education, A Family Guide. Little to no evidence has been provided in the charter petition or in the petitioner interview responses indicating critical thought having been given to the modification of Festivals and Celebrations necessary to accommodate a public school setting.

Schedules provided on pages 254 and 256 are inconsistent with the program design described on pages 96 through 103 or 262.

>

Sample Schedules provided do not provide any transition time as offered in other parts of the daily schedule, such as the 5 minutes provided for between 9:30 and 9:35, 11:05 and 11:10, 12:00 and 12:05, 1:55 and 2:00. The use of transition times however is inconsistent elsewhere, such as the period following Direct Instruction at 8:30am, the period following lunch at 12:45pm, and the period following Drop Everything And Read at 1:10pm. (p. 256)

The inconsistencies and discrepancies in the proposed schedules meaningfully impact the evaluation of the proposed educational program.

The petition states that the school will form an SSC and ELAC. These bodies are not required under charter law and present possibly conflicting roles with other bodies presented within the petition including the Parent Teacher Representatives, CPAC (Community School for Creative Education Parent Action Committee) and the Family Resource Center and its Advisory Committee.

>

(CDE Website) **Q.13. Are charter schools required to have a school site council or a Single Plan for Student Achievement?** No. *EC Section 47610* (Outside Source) exempts charter schools from most *EC* sections, including the requirement for the “Single Plan for Student Achievement” and “school site councils” referenced in *EC Section 64001*. (Outside Source)

The petition proposes a function for the SSC and ELAC that involves the approval of site plans and categorical budgets that are not consistent with charter law and expectations for charter schools in CA.

Petition states that the Family Resource Center will be staffed with a Family Resource Center Manager; however staff was unable to locate with the proposed budget evidence of funding for this position (p. 418).

>

The staffing assumptions (p. 399) do not contemplate the position of the Family Resource Center Manager as stated in the Governance section of the petition (p. 174).

The petition does not provide the funding necessary to employ the proposed Family Resource Center Manager.

The school has proposed to employ only a .5 clerical staff for the duration of the proposed five year charter term without further description of how the day to day operations of the school will be met.

>

No additional accommodation is proposed to ensure the smooth and effective operation of the school.

The absence of additional administrative support is particularly problematic considering the demands of a new school and is additionally problematic given the absence of an allocation for funding to staff the Family Resource Center.

[Letter of Support provided within petition submission]

“A school that inspires the whole child – intellectually, emotionally, and spiritually – would be a welcome contrast to the open court system that teaches to the test.”

>

The aforementioned statement contained within one of the letters of support for the school’s charter petition raises questions regarding the understanding by the community of the proposed program or the manner in which the proposed program is being described publicly, given the extent to which Open Court is proposed to be a prominent feature within the school’s curriculum.

Measurable Pupil Outcomes

Petition includes various charts outlining proposed assessment tools and proposed outcomes to be met by the school that include inconsistencies. The presentation of these various tables are not coherent and do not lend themselves to the high degree of clear accountability for which charter schools are founded under Charter Law Intent EC 47605 “*Move from a rule based to a performance based accountability system*”.

The petition presents two conflicting or otherwise confusing stated Measurable Pupil Outcomes beginning on pages 150 and 295.

P. 150	P. 295
Language Arts: Beginning in 3 rd grade, in 2010, 40% of pupils per grade, will score a 3 or better on a 4 point	Language Arts 65% of pupils, per grade, will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric on written work and portfolios; students will

standards-aligned rubric on written work and portfolios; by 8 th grade, students will meet or exceed in performance compared to peer alike district schools.	score a B or better on quizzes and tests
Mathematics: Beginning in third grade, in 2010, 33% of students will score 80% or better on quizzes and tests; students will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on mathematics project; 34% of students will score proficient on the CST in Year 1.	Mathematics 60% of students will score a B or better on quizzes and tests; students will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric on mathematics project
History/Social Sciences: Beginning in 7 th grade, 2014, 78% of students, per grade, will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned scale on written work and portfolios; 80% of students will score 80 or better on quizzes and tests; 35% will score proficient on CST in Year 1.	History/ Social Sciences 65% of students, per grade, will score a 3 on a 4 point scale on written work and portfolios; students will score a B or better on quizzes and tests
Science: Beginning in 5 th grade, 2012, 50% of students, per grade, will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on written work and portfolio; students will score 80% or better on quizzes and tests; 34% of students will score proficient on CST in Year 1.	Science 65% of students, per grade, will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric on written work and portfolio; students will score a B or better on quizzes and tests
Physical Education: Beginning in 2 nd grade, 50% of students will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on class projects; No mention is made of “class projects” within the charter petition. The section describing the Physical Education program component focuses primarily on the benefits of physical activity, the use of competition in the 5 th and 6 th grade through Olympic or Medieval sports. The proposed schedule shows gym/movement occurring two times weekly for 45 minutes. (p. 256)	Physical Education [Blank]
Visual and Performing Arts Beginning in 2 nd grade, 2010, 80% of students will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on class projects; students will score 80% or better on tests and quizzes; program will include acting and	Visual and Performing Arts Students will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric on class projects; students will score 80% or better on tests and quizzes; program will include acting and performance.

performance.	
<p>World Language</p> <p>50% of pupils, per grade, will score 80% or better on subject assessments</p>	<p>World Languages</p> <p>50% of the students will pass the class with a 3.0 GPA 50% of pupils, per grade, will score a B or better on quizzes, tests and subject assessments</p>
<p>Lifelong Learning Skills</p> <p>Students will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric in monthly observational assessment built by CSCE and aligned to Standards</p>	<p>Lifelong Learning Skills</p> <p>[Blank]</p>
<p>Social Interpersonal Skills</p> <p>Beginning in Kindergarten, students will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric in trimester observational assessment built from Waldorf Child Study Descriptive Tool adapted in collaboration with Association of Public Waldorf Schools & California Charter Schools Association Zoom Data Director Waldorf Charter Partners</p>	<p>Social Interpersonal Skills</p> <p>Students will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric in a monthly observation protocol;</p>

The petition does not sufficiently or clearly describe the curriculum intended for use in the core subjects, as well as the non-core subjects which are required to be reasonably comprehensive in their description pursuant to Education Code §47605.

Waldorf Education

Waldorf education is referenced as the foundation upon which is built the approach to the curriculum and content, school structure design and instructional approach. The Waldorf approach to education is mentioned at various points during the charter petition with respect to pedagogy of hand, heart and head. The approach of going from the whole, to the part, and back to the whole is stated as indicative of the Waldorf approach and the integration of Blooms Taxonomy of beginning and ending instruction with synthesis (considered a higher order thinking strategy). Various references are given of these features throughout the petition. The few curricular examples provided within the petition however, do not effectively reflect this approach. The content of the curriculum outlined in the petition is particularly vague except that the petition affirms its intent to incorporate CA State Standards. However, the petition does not set forth a clear description of how the Waldorf approach to the development of the curriculum will achieve this outcome.

Open Court

The petition states:

“reading and writing at CSCE will be taught with strong emphasis on rich oral vocabulary, writing and reading that blends the structure and content of Open Court Reading Program and Waldorf-inspired practices.” (p. 97)

“CSCE is taking the best of Open Court and is strategically using its freedom to embed it in other best practices, aligned to or already part of the Waldorf suite of strategies. [...] CSCE has very consciously chosen to engage in high quality implementation of the Open Court curriculum, building on the OUSD Rubric.” (p. 97)

Neither the petition nor the responses provided during the petitioner interview held on December 11 and 14, 2009 clarify the extent to which the proposed educational program will utilize the Open Court Curriculum. Attached here is an outline of the contents of the Open Court Curriculum. (SEE ATTACHMENT III) The educational program as set forth in the charter petition references the following considerations for the use of Open Court that are not reasonably comprehensive:

“Strategically enhancing strategies commonly used in Waldorf schools with systematic direct literacy instruction through a curriculum such as Open Court for greater explicitness (p. 42)”

“Carefully developed and developmentally appropriate standard texts, such as Open Court Readers (see Literacy Section below for detail) will be used as resources for the children (p. 84).”

“CSCE has very consciously chosen to engage in high quality implementation of the Open Court curriculum, building on the OUSD Rubric (p. 93)”

“Guided by the California Standards, reading and writing at the CSCE will be taught with strong emphasis on rich oral vocabulary, writing and reading that blends the structure and content of the Open Court Reading Program and Waldorf-inspired practices (p. 97).”

“Open Court skills development tools enhance Waldorf strategies in whole language. It does it well. CSCE is not an Open Court curriculum we are blending Waldorf and Open Court. CSCE enhances its repertoire of strategies commonly tested in Waldorf schools and draws on Open Court for skills development in order to best serve all its students. Waldorf provides the how these skills are embedded and taught (p. 97).”

“The language arts program at the CSCE will provide students with direct instruction in reading development, utilizing key components of the Open Court Reading program: phonics, spelling, grammar, and vocabulary development (p. 98).”

“In addition to the two reasons noted above: the need for direct instruction tools and the value of working with the program our colleague schools and district have chosen, Open Court offers consistency and equity across schools (p. 100).”

“The sound/spelling cards and other materials from the Open Court Reading program are used to illustrate the specific way in which the sound just practiced through song and alliteration is written (p. 103).”*

*** It should be noted that it was stated explicitly during the petitioner interview held on December 14, 2009 that CSCE classrooms will not be using the sound/spelling cards from Open Court.**

[Referred to under Professional Development within the petition] “Teachers will continue to understand the research base that supports Open Court Reading as well as understand which elements of OCR complement Waldorf-inspired principles, strengthening overall grade level goals (p. 106).”

“The comprehension curriculum will emphasize the most common comprehension strategies outlined in Open Court in addition to QAR (Question Answer Relationship – T. Raphael, 1982, 1986) and other inquiry science, or metacognitive strategies, suggested by the work of the Strategic Literacy Initiative (WestEd, 2009) developed by Ruth Schoenbach and colleagues (mentioned above in discussion of CSCE Principle 3, Rigor, above) whom we cite above as aligned to the CSCE principle for blending meaning making with skill development through inquiry science (p. 107).”

“...while we are aligning ourselves with the district focus on Open Court, we recognize we have to do more work with that to bring it to a new level of explicitness. We think Waldorf is uniquely positioned to complement Open Court. We believe that Waldorf methods in combination with Open Court’s structures will uniquely position CSCE to serve our students well (p. 159).”

9:35-11:05

Direct Instruction in Reading and Writing *

Preparing to Read, Reading & Responding, Language Arts (Open Court curriculum)

(Modes: Teacher read aloud, choral reading, guided reading, individual reading)

Workbooks as needed (p. 256)

*** Responses during the petitioner interview stated that this block will be utilized to implement the Waldorf approach to the Main Lesson Block, a 3-4 week rotation of core content to include Language Arts, mathematics, science, and history/social studies.**

1:10-1:55

Writer’s Workshop *

Use Open Court goals for Open Court/Waldorf content

*** Responses during the petitioner interview stated that Open Court writing curriculum will not be used in the school.**

[SAMPLE LESSON] Appendix 10

“Direct Instruction II: This section of the morning will move to the specific reading instruction depicted in Open Court. The 120 minute time slot* includes time for whole class instruction, three guided reading groups, independent activities, and a whole class concluding/reflection time. I suggest that a listening center be set up in the room where students can listen to teacher recorded readings from the Open Court anthology, as well as other books. This center can be utilized during independent reading time. During the 80 minute workshop time, students should be assigned to move through the different activities. During Guided Reading**, students should read from a variety of leveled text, including the literature anthology if it is at an appropriate level for the student. (The first two stories in the Open Court series level at 3.5 and 2.8 respectively. They will be way too difficult for some beginning 3rd graders to do other than just follow along. . .).”***

*** The petition puts forth conflicting periods of time allocated to this instructional period ranging from 75 minutes to 120 minutes.**

**** The petition proposes to utilize Guided Reading through the use of leveled texts. However; he petition does not sufficiently describe the intended approach to Guided Reading, or its alignment with, integration of or potential conflict with the use of both the Open Court Curriculum and Waldorf methods. Successful use of Guided Reading strategies requires substantial planning, preparation and teacher training that is not otherwise accounted for within the petition.**

***** As part of the only SAMPLE LESSON provided within the petition, this statement is included regarding the potential pitfalls or risks of using the Open Court reading selections, but nonetheless includes in the proposed 3rd Grade ELA Pacing Charter Waldorf/Open Appendix 9 the use of every reading selection from Open Court Reading Lessons included in that curriculum for that grade level (p. 257).**

Little evidence of the proposed Waldorf blending appears present in the Sample Lesson with respect to the use of Open Court Reading. The Sample Lesson suggests an approach that exemplifies little difference from standard implementation of an Open Court Reading lesson.

The sample lesson provided within the petition is the only evidence of the extent to which the curriculum has been developed to demonstrate how Waldorf methods and Open Court will be “blended.” Responses during the petitioner interviews stated that at this time this is the extent to which the curricular blending has been developed.

The petition does not set forth a coherent description of the Waldorf and Open Court blending which is highlighted as a key feature in achieving the otherwise unprecedented innovation within the US of effectively delivering a Waldorf inspired educational approach to predominantly low-income, second language learners.

The responses during the petitioner interviews indicate that this aspect of the curriculum innovation is yet to be developed. The charter petition sets forth an argument for the rationale based on the success of Waldorf methods and curriculum and the success of the Open Court Reading curriculum, but the petition does not effectively articulate how the school intends to “blend” the two in order to provide a cohesive learning experience for students. The lack of clarity

is compounded by the intent to utilize the Literacy period for purposes of implementing the Waldorf inspired Main Lesson Block, as well as by the discrepancies on the amount of time allocated to the Literacy period.

Mathematics

The intended curriculum for math is not provided within the petition. The petition references only the use of "Waldorf curriculum guidelines, tested strategies and lesson plans as the basis for the math curriculum's design (p. 111)." Reference is made in the petition to see an example of math curriculum through Fabrie, Gottenbos & York, 2009 (p. 111). Research into this area revealed a series of publications entitled "Making Math Meaningful Series". The books outlined include guidebooks for grades one through five and workbooks for students and teacher in grades 6 through 8. It is not clear what the research base is for the "Making Math Meaningful Series", or the evidence base of success in teaching students to mastery of the CA Content Standards for Mathematics; particularly given the target population.

One source located by staff quotes the following description of the curriculum background in reference to the middle school mathematics curriculum;

"Making Math Meaningful - A Middle School Math Curriculum for Teachers and Parents, a book that makes available the material I have discovered and developed while teaching middle school math for several years in a Waldorf school."

The following are biographies of the authors of the mathematics curriculum proposed in the petition as the exemplar for the math curriculum to be used in the CSCE program:

About the Authors Nettie Fabrie is a trained Waldorf teacher and remedial specialist from the Netherlands. From 1976 - 1993 she was a class teacher at the Brabant Waldorf School in Eindhoven. From 1995 - 1999 she taught history and art history in the high school. Nettie has mentored teachers in Holland, the Czech Republic and the US. She is on the core faculty of Sound Circle Center, co-directs the Grade School Teacher Training and SCC's Mentorship Seminar, and is coordinator of the Remedial Program at Seattle Waldorf School.

Wim Gottenbos taught in Dutch public schools for 12 years before training and becoming a Waldorf teacher. Since then he has taken two classes 1st - 8th grade in Holland, trained and worked as a Remedial Specialist and teacher mentor. He carried two classes at the Seattle Waldorf School, one from 4th to 8th grade and another for 6th, 7th and 8th grade. In the fall of 2009 he will start again with a 1st grade class.

Jamie York's search for meaningful education led him to Shining Mountain Waldorf School (in Boulder, Colorado), where he started teaching math in 1994. In addition to teaching middle and high school math, Jamie consults at Waldorf schools and teaches math workshops across North America. In the summer, he serves on the faculty at the Center of Anthroposophy (in Wilton, NH) as part of their Waldorf High School Teacher Education Program.

No further information was obtained by staff regarding the source, development, or effectiveness of the proposed "Making Math Meaningful" curriculum. Given that the petition states that the mathematics curriculum is "currently under design", it is not clear to what extent the school intended to draw from, replicate or innovate the aforementioned curriculum for purposes of implementation in the CSCE charter school.

Science

Petition states:

“In its science curriculum, currently under design, CSCE builds on the Waldorf curriculum guidelines, tested strategies and lesson plans (see for example <http://www.waldorfwitoutwalls.com/books/science/>) and draws from strong collaboration with partner California Waldorf charter schools Novato Charter, John Morse and Woodland Star, and our urban Waldorf partner in Germany, the Free Intercultural Waldorfschool, Mannheim (for their work with in Waldorf strategies for an urban multilingual multiethnic urban community) (p. 112).”

The link provided within the petition referencing an example of the proposed science curriculum represents a 16 page booklet entitled “Science As Phenomena” intended for homeschoolers: <http://www.waldorfwitoutwalls.com/books/science/>

The aforementioned science curriculum sample was purchased by staff for review. An analysis of this curriculum suggests that this sample does not adequately address how students will attain mastery of the CA State Content Standards for Science. The proposed sample provides particularly vague descriptions of the curriculum over-all. In some case there are a few explicit descriptions of a proposed activity, however the booklet as a whole provides very limited scope and sequence of a science curriculum. Most entire grade levels received treatment on one page or less.

The following is an excerpt of the first Main Lesson Block proposed for 3rd grade:

“It is nice to start the homes main lesson block with a painting of a big yellow ball in the middle of the paper. At the bottom paint some blue-green earth. Then, using red or gold, paint a simple human figure, arms and legs outstretched, nearly as big as the yellow ball, and superimposed on it. In one upper corner paint a moon and a few stars; in the other, a golden sun. With the painting goes this poem:

*Out of the earth with heaven’s help,
From water, fire, air and earth,
Is fashioned a house for every soul
To dwell in from time of birth*

Without discussion, this introduces the idea of our bodies as a home in which we dwell as spiritual beings.” (p. 9)

The excerpt provided here raises questions about the nature of the arts-infused curriculum and given the absence of a reasonably comprehensive description of the arts-infused aspect of the proposed program it is not clear what is to be inferred by the lesson description above. The content of the curriculum as it pertains to the CA content standards for Science in the 3rd grade is unclear. The excerpt provided here raises questions regarding the appropriate use of references to “heaven”, “soul”, and “spiritual beings” in the lesson. [SEE ATTACHMENT I]

The following is the Table of Contents found within the proposed exemplar of the school’s science curriculum “Science As Phenomenon”.

Table of Contents

- Philosophy of Waldorf Science
- Waldorf science curriculum
- Early childhood and Kindergarten
- Basic Waldorf "Schooltime" Schedule
- Grade 1

- Nature integrated into Math and Reading Instruction
- Home life activity
 - Sprouting, Gardening, Cooking, Toymaking, Pets, Sky watching, Trips
- Grade 2
 - Animal Stories as main lesson
 - Poetry
 - Home life activity
 - Sprouting, Gardening, Cooking, Toymaking, Pets, Sky watching, Trips
- Grade 3
 - Integration of Social Studies, Science, Math and Literacy
 - Food
 - Farming
 - Gardening
 - Cooking
 - Clothing
 - Farming (silk, cotton, flax, wool)
 - Knitting, crochet, sewing, weaving
 - Natural versus man-made fiber
 - Dyeing
 - Shelter
 - History
 - Relationship to climate
- Grade 4
 - Man and Animal
- Grade 5
 - Botany
 - Veil painting
 - Zoology
- Grade 6
 - Physics
 - Earth Science
 - Astronomy (geocentric theory)
- Grade 7
 - Anatomy
 - Physics
 - Chemistry of Combustion
 - Astronomy (Heliocentric theory)
- Grade 8
 - Anatomy (muscles and senses)
 - Physics
 - Meteorology
 - Chemistry
- Bibliography

The curriculum outlined above does not align to the CA State Content Standards for Science and no description within the petition reconciles how this alignment will occur if curriculum such as this exemplar are intended for use within the school's program.

Petition states;

“Science lessons sometimes stand on their-own and sometimes are related thematically and in an interdisciplinary way with other main lesson subjects. A wide range of sciences are taught, including

geology, meteorology, biology and astronomy. (See Appendix 7 & 8, Sample Curriculum, for detail.) Some Science activities exceed the state standards. They include observation of the environment, the practices of gardening, composting, recycling; cooking, field trips where astronomy, mountaineering, survival skills are learned (p. 114).”

The science curriculum “Science As Phenomena” referenced in the petition does not provide clear evidence that it is aligned to CA State Standards or that it “exceeds state standards” as described in the petition.

SEE CA STATE CONTENT STANDARDS FOR SCIENCE:
<http://www.cde.ca.gov/BE/ST/SS/documents/sciencestnd.pdf>

History/Social Studies

The charter petition in this section inaccurately cuts and pastes the same introductory paragraph from the petition section that references “Science”. This section references a link that is associated with the same science text referenced within the science section of the charter petition. A review of the resources available through this same web link does not evidence any available resources for the instruction of History/Social Studies.

In this section the petition restates the title headings found in the CA State Content Standards for History/Social Studies. The petition does not reference any curriculum or provide a reasonably comprehensive description of how the specific History/Social Studies curriculum that is intended for use for all grades Kindergarten through 8th grade will be developed. The petition in this section primarily sets forth that legends and literature will be the basis for the methodology of teaching History/Social Studies. Given the example provided for in section of the charter petition pertaining to the intended science curriculum, it is not otherwise assumed that the proposed curriculum for History/Social Studies will necessarily align to the CA Content Standards for History/Social Studies.

Thinking Maps®

The charter petition references the CSCE website on page 53 under a section which describes the school’s cross-cultural efforts; www.communityschoolforcreativeeducation.org. A review of the school’s website provides information regarding the proposed charter school’s program. The website section entitled “Instructional Approach” includes a three paragraph description of the school’s intended instructional approach which focuses the entire first paragraph on the use of Thinking Maps® and the subsequent paragraphs on the “main lesson block” and “main lesson book”.

The petition itself makes very little mention of the intended use of “Thinking Maps®”.

The petition as submitted mentions Thinking Maps® under the section entitled “Plans for Students Who Are Academically High Achieving”. The petition states;

“They [teachers] will use the classes’ Thinking Maps® to provide high achieving students with tools for them to use to organize their thoughts and engage in level-appropriate projects using graphic organizers, other pre-writing activities and writing activities.” (p. 130)

The CSCE website cites Thinking Maps’® “strong results in urban districts matching the demographics of Oakland’s San Antonio district, such as the Long Beach Unified School District.” Given the very limited mention within the charter petition, it is unclear what role Thinking Maps® is intended to play in the curriculum and what the intended support and training will be for teachers to ensure their effective utilization.

Thinking Maps® are only referenced only once more in a table regarding supporting students to meet state learning standards alongside “Step Up to Writing”. The petitioning group stated in the petitioner interview held on December 11, 2009, that it no longer intended to use “Step Up to Writing”.

Middle Grades

The school proposes to operate a charter school to serve grades K through 8, opening with grades K through 3 and growing one grade each year. In the section of the petition describing Public School Educational Choices in the San Antonio neighborhood, a great deal of treatment is given to the academic performance of Roosevelt Middle School intended to demonstrate the need for expanded middle school choices in that neighborhood (p. 76-79). Although the petition attempts to make a case for the need to provide expanded middle school choices, the description of the educational program for middle grades (6-8) is largely absent from the petition. The school’s intended middle grades curriculum and program is particularly vague when mentioned at all. It is not clear what the plan is for the development of this aspect of the school’s program.

There is no description of the manner in which the school’s educational program will meet the academic, social, and emotional needs of early adolescence. The proposed program does not describe how the school climate or instructional approach has considered the unique needs of students ages 11-14. The proposed program does not discuss how the school will prepare students for entry into high school. It is not clear if the school expects to enroll new students in its upper grades and if so, how the unique needs of these late entry students will be addressed given the school’s uniquely Waldorf inspired approach. The petition does not describe how success in Algebra will or will not be achieved by the end of 8th grade.

With respect to the school’s educational program, explicit mention of grades 6-8 occurs only in the section regarding History/Social Studies (p. 114). The petition in this section provides a brief overview of the CA Content Standards for History/Social Studies to be covered in grades 6-8.

Petition does not clearly and coherently describe the educational program to include an understanding of the manner in which the core content will be delivered.

Petition states that CSCE will be among the “very first to offer a Waldorf inspired option to an urban community such as Oakland.” (p. 52).

This statement reflects the context within which the proposed educational program is being developed. The contents throughout the charter petition with respect to “what it means for CSCE to be Waldorf inspired” is not sufficiently comprehensive. Many aspects of Waldorf education are not addressed. Particularly given the proposed benefits of a Waldorf education stated throughout the petition, a clear understanding of the ways in which the school will and will not reflect universal aspects of Waldorf education are a necessity in order to effectively evaluate the soundness of the proposed educational program.

The petition offers a “thumbnail on Waldorf education and what it means for CSCE to be Waldorf inspired.” (p. 52)

In an effort to better understand the intended use of Waldorf methods in the school, staff reviewed the CSCE website (*referenced on Page 53 of the petition regarding the school’s cross-cultural efforts*). The website provides links intended to assist the visitor in understanding more about Waldorf education. Video clip links contained in the website are (1) a demonstration of painting watercolor; (2) a demonstration of a teacher’s chalk art done on a chalkboard; and (3) a demonstration regarding how to “Waldorfize” your lesson, which is conducted by a mother at home with three children at a kitchen table.

A video clip link regarding literacy located on the CSCE website emphasizes the use of lines and forms to be taught well into 1st grade prior to teaching actual letters and the writing of the alphabet. The video describes this strategy as an effort to recapitulate the experience of early man in the learning of the written language through methods for teaching literacy used in Waldorf schools.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OE_1A5Hn6lk

The process for literacy instruction detailed here is not represented in the text of the charter petition as submitted to the district which includes a more formalized approach to literacy development. The manner in which the Waldorf approach depicted in the video will be fostered can only be inferred through an evaluation of the petition, but is never made explicit in the charter petition.

The CSCE website includes links to Waldorf resources for parents that predominantly focus on Waldorf homeschooling.

Included as a link is a website that is entitled the Waldorf and Earthschooling channel. It is not clear if the concept of “Earthschooling” is to be understood synonymously with Waldorf education or as an extension, modification, or redefinition of the Waldorf approach.

It is unclear how these video links illustrate the intended curriculum in the CSCE charter school.

While the aforementioned aspects of the intended CSCE educational program derive not from the charter petition itself, but from the petitioning group’s website; it has been nonetheless important to review these materials in an effort to exhaust opportunities to better comprehend the intended educational program of the proposed charter school.

Signature Features: Instructional Coherence / Equity Pedagogy

The petition states that a “signature feature” of Waldorf education embraced by CSCE is “instructional coherence” and “equity pedagogy”. (p. 56)

The petition states;

“The CSCE curriculum enhances direct instruction with Waldorf methods. Waldorf lesson and school design instructional tools are embedded in the curriculum design as a vehicle to accelerate student learning in a developmentally appropriate way.”

The petition goes on to state;

“The ultimate goal of equity pedagogy is to focus on prevention, intervention, and acceleration for all students. The aim is to create an infrastructure that provides staff routine and systematic ways to identify students in need early on so that they can be provided with appropriate interventions. The goal in equity pedagogy is to provide an instructional frame and holistic strategies that allow educators to develop a solid core program for all students that focuses on preventing academic failure and supports all to succeed through ongoing, student-focused rich differentiation. This principle means for CSCE that it must focus on offering a clearly articulated coherent program that provides tracks for advancement and acceleration.” (p. 51).

The petition does not again refer to the topic of equity pedagogy.

The petition mentions the work of Zaretta Hammond regarding “equity pedagogy” and it was stated during the petitioner interview that Zaretta Hammond intends to collaborate with the charter school in the development of its curriculum. Given the explicit nature of Zaretta Hammond’s work as exemplified by her article *“Briefing Paper: Towards an Equity Pedagogy Framework: Understanding Academic Acceleration as a Model For School Improvement”*; it is important to note that no mention is made in the charter petition of the explicit strategies set forth by Zaretta Hammond in her articulation of an Equity Pedagogy Framework. No proposed plan is provided within the petition detailing the intended collaboration with Zaretta Hammond regarding the topic of “equity pedagogy”.

“**Instructional Program Coherence**” is emphasized in the school’s theory of action.

The school’s proposed curriculum is largely vague or is frequently referenced as “currently under design”. The proposed curriculum for Language Arts provides a single sample of a 3rd grade lesson that contains discrepancies from the narrative description within petition and does not sufficiently exemplify the over-all educational program proposed. A sample standards map for kindergarten is provided but lacks specificity of the lesson content and does not sufficiently represent the proposed educational program for grades 1-8.

The charter petition does not contain a reasonably comprehensive description of the instructional program coherence necessary to ensure state standards will be mastered and that students who are classified as English Language Learners and students from low socio-economic backgrounds or are not achieving academically will be effectively supported to achieve at high levels through the continuum of the school’s proposed educational program.

Main Lesson

The charter petition describes the Main Lesson aspect of the program as follows:

“After personally greeting each student with a handshake, the teacher will start the day with opening activities designed to stimulate and inspire the students to engage in new learning, master standards

and make meaning. The day's lesson plan begins with the *Main Lesson*, introducing new concepts or subject areas when the child's mind is fresh. This extended lesson will be the academic cornerstone upon which the day is built. The subjects (language arts, science, mathematics, and social studies) will be taught during a 3-4 week instructional *block*, often to be continued later in the term. Presentation in the *block system* emphasizes in-depth learning – giving the children time to internalize and accelerate ...digest what has been learned (p. 84)"

The proposed structure of 3-4 week blocks receives no further elaboration. The Main Lesson Subjects are described on pages 96 through 117. The proposed Main Lesson Subjects are as follows:

- a. Literacy
- b. Reading Comprehension
- c. Writing
- d. Mathematics
- e. Science
- f. History/Social Studies
- g. Performing Arts
- h. Computer Technology

The proposed schedule in Appendix 8 offers only an example of English Language Arts to occur during the period of the day designated as the Main Lesson block. Responses during the petitioner interviews on December 11 and 14, 2009, stated that the Main Lesson block is intended to occur during the time frame characterized as the Literacy block in the morning. It is unclear whether this is intended to include the proposed ELD period as well. The literacy block is referenced as a two-hour period in the narrative of the petition, but is scheduled as an approximately 90 minute block (10-15 minutes of which is assigned to movement/snack) in the Appendix 8.

Pursuant to the charter petition, these Main Lesson Subjects are to occur in a *block system* of 3-4 week instructional blocks. It is unclear what the frequency will be of the contents listed above, or the extent of the treatment to which each of the Main Lesson Subjects outlined above will be given.

The petition provides a sample scope and sequence of the Main Lessons for 3rd grade, focusing on the Language Arts skills identified in Open Court. This sample provides only an overview specific to Open Court within the Main Lesson structure and does not exemplify how the standards are to be met in each of the Main Lesson Subjects to be taught. This sample is additionally complicated by the fact that the Sample Lesson for 3rd grade provided in the petition describing what is to occur during this Main Lesson Block is described as "specific reading instruction depicted in Open Court" (p. 262). The petition does not provide a reasonably comprehensive description of the manner in which the various Waldorf inspired Main Lesson Subjects described in the petition will occur during the course of the year.

The proposed Sample Schedule for 3rd grade in Appendix 8 states that students receive 2 hours of ELA instruction daily, 50 minutes of mathematics instruction daily, and 1 hour of ELD instruction daily. However, the schedule actually only accommodates 1 ½ hours of ELA instruction (9:35-11:05) which is to include 10-15 minutes of movement/snack at the end of the period and a recess from 10:30-10:45am (p. 315), reducing the time to approximately 60-65 minutes. If the Sample Lesson is intended to characterize the use of time, the literacy block remains at 90-95 minutes vs. the repeated references to a 2-hour literacy block.

Based on petitioner responses during the petitioner interview on December 11, 2009, the Main Lesson Block is intended to occur during this time. The Sample Schedule does not account for what

happens during the course of the year when the Main Lesson Block is intended to provide instruction for each of the various Main Lesson Subjects outlined in the petition.

Kindergarten

The Standards Map Inspired by Waldorf K-8 (excerpt, K) (p. 276) provides a general description of the kindergarten classroom. It does not link the experience in this classroom to the description of the school day provided as an example in Sample Schedules located in Appendix 7 & 8. The associated standards map provides only titles of the intended activities:

- Circle Time: Inside PE
- Free Play
- Cooking & Baking
- Painting-Beeswax Modeling
- Drawing & Writing
- Oral, Written & Dramatic Literature
- Craft Activity from a representation culture
- Practical Work Activities
- Festivals & Celebration of Birthday's & National Holidays and Background

The map provides little description of the proposed activities themselves. The petition provides no description of the manner in which Circle Time, Free Play, Cooking & Baking, Beeswax Modeling, Drawing, Crafts, and Practical Work is to occur. While these areas appear to be central to the Waldorf experience and comprise a substantial portion of the proposed Kindergarten curriculum, the petition does not provide a reasonably comprehensive description of how these subject areas will occur within the Kindergarten curriculum.

An example of the objectives provided for Drawing and Writing are as follows:

“Proficiency with Observation; similarities & differences in plants & animals; forms of plants and animals; explore common objects with 5 senses; & describe same; color; dexterity & self confidence; writing words & brief sentences; writing legibly; dexterity & confidence; sense of above/below, left/right; attention to form & proper spacing; spelling based on sounds & knowledge of letter names; sound/spelling correspondences”

The standards map provided includes no description of how students will be supported to meet the proposed objectives outlined in the standards map.

The petition does not clarify, given the absence of identified curriculum for kindergarten if it is incumbent on the incoming kindergarten teacher to create the whole of the curriculum to be taught in his or her classroom.

Child Study

The petition references multiple approaches to the concept of a child study that comes from traditional Waldorf settings developed through Christof Wiechert, Thanh Cherry, and Patricia Carini. Research cited in the petition for this area was not easily located by staff. Information that staff was able to locate provided vague or sufficiently differing approaches to the use of child study as it relates to the development of “Individual Learning Plans” as set forth in the petition.

Responses during the petitioner interviews held on December 11 and 14, 2009, additionally presented a conflicting or under-developed understanding of the expectations for the school's intended approach to the concept of a “child study.” The role of parents within the proposed child study process differed in

terms their participation or not. It is unclear based on the petition and the petitioner responses to what extent the school expects to utilize existing approaches to “child study” as referenced during the Petitioner Interview held on December 11, 2009 or intends to develop its own approach as it appears in the petition.

The petition makes reference to the “Waldorf Review of the Child process” as a means of studying the quality of teacher’s “instructional conversations with students to determine better ways to engage students in more rigorous thinking about the texts they read (p. 109).” Staff could find no information regarding such a Waldorf process. It is assumed that this statement is intended to refer to the concept of the Waldorf inspired “child study”, but this is unclear.

Use of a “4 point rubric in trimester observational assessment built from Waldorf Child Study Descriptive Tool adapted in collaboration with the Association of Public Waldorf Schools & California Charter Schools Association Zoom Data Director Waldorf Charter Partners (p. 154).” is referenced within the petition as being one of the intended methods of assessment. No evidence was provided in the petition that illustrates the proposed rubric mention of whether or not the rubric exists or is yet to be developed.

The petition sets forth that the curriculum for English Language Arts, mathematics, history/social studies, and science, among others, will be developed, in some cases "in full", during the summer of 2010. The petition does not sufficiently describe a plan for the development of the curriculum that is yet to be developed.

Petitioner responses during the petitioner interview on December 11, 2009, indicate that much of the existing Waldorf curriculum will be utilized in the CSCE program and will be "appropriately adapted" to meet the needs of the student population. During the petitioner interview on December 14, 2009, it was stated that the adaptation of the Waldorf curriculum to meet the needs of English Language Learners and academically low achieving students is to be considered the "innovation" of the school, vs. a replication of existing practices.

Curriculum Planning

The Oakland Unified School District Petition Evaluation Rubric provides the following criteria for aspects of the proposed curriculum that are "yet to be developed":

Excerpt from the OUSD Petition Evaluation Rubric (p. 7)

1. Plan: *Is there a sound curriculum development plan?*

A thorough, persuasive plan for development including the research base to be considered and foundation materials;

2. Schedule: *Is there a well-defined, realistic schedule?*

A realistic, time-specific development schedule; and

3. Responsibilities: *Are the development responsibilities clear and manageable?*

Identification of individuals responsible for development and evidence that they are well-qualified for the task.

Pursuant to these criteria, the charter petition provides the following description of its plan to develop its curriculum.

Petition states:

"Schedule to develop a full menu of CSCE Pacing Charts. See Appendix 9 for the OUSD Pacing Chart Grade 3. Pacing charts in Mathematics and Science will be developed in the CSCE start up phase, January 2010 – July 2010. They will be developed by three prospective faculty with support of Cal TEACH Monterey Literacy Coach Dr. Connie Davidson , BayCES Literacy Coach Zaretta Hammond and through Rudolf Steiner College with Waldorf Educator and Easter University Literacy Professor Dr. Linda Williams and others." (p. 159)

"A teacher and the director of the Free Intercultural Waldorf school [Germany] have agreed to serve as sounding board to CSCE as we build our language program." (p. 38)

Literacy:

"Plan to Plan. The faculty will develop the curriculum in the summer of 2010 with support from its Partner schools, and Rudolf Steiner College and CalTEACH Monterey coaches." (p. 110)

Mathematics:

“In its mathematics curriculum, currently under design, CSCE builds on the Waldorf curriculum guidelines, tested strategies and lesson plans [...] to meet California standards benchmarks and align with the National Council for Teacher of Mathematics Standards.” (p. 111)

No exemplars of the mathematics curriculum appropriately adapted to meet the needs of the target population are provided in the petition.

The petition provides the following description of its plan to develop the mathematics curriculum:

“**Plan to Plan.** The faculty will develop the curriculum in full in the summer of 2010 with support of its Partner schools, and Rudolph Steiner College and CalTEACH Monterey coaches.” (p. 112)

Science:

The petition provides the following description of its plan to develop the science curriculum:

“**Plan to Plan.** The faculty will develop the curriculum in full in the summer of 2010 with support of its Partner schools, and Rudolf Steiner College and Cal TEACH Monterey coaches.”

Culturally Rich

The petition as submitted states the following with respect to the principle of Relevance: Culturally Rich: (p. 44)

“This principle requires for CSCE that attention to the linguistically and culturally diverse backgrounds of students will be an explicit priority in all the school’s educational decision-making, from determining student’s readiness for learning to designing the curricula, selecting instructional materials, appraising performance, developing appropriate programs and teaching techniques for students of different cultural backgrounds, and delivering appropriate robust professional development to teachers.”

Given the description above of the requisite steps necessary for effectively ensuring that the educational program is relevant and culturally rich for students, the petition as submitted does not provide a description of how the curriculum will be designed, instructional materials, selected programs developed and teaching techniques chosen in a manner that will achieve this outcome.

Petition states:

“As the key is to make the approach a “living one” as Steiner put it, the task is finding the local cultural heritage appropriate fairy tales, legends, myths, stories which are retold, or uses as the basis of play, for the younger classes.”

The petition provides no description of how this is likely to occur.

Developmentally Appropriate

The petition states that in order for Relationships to optimally matter (identified as the first of 6 Principles in the CSCE Theory of Action), they must be Developmentally Appropriate.

This section and the petition as a whole lacks any reference to the stages of child development proposed by Rudolph Steiner and Waldorf education as described for example in the book Waldorf Education: A Family Guide. It is unclear whether or not the developmental approach to education as it occurs in a

traditional Waldorf setting is to be adhered to explicitly, in general or will be “appropriately adapted” to meet the needs of students the school intends to serve.

The book Waldorf Education: A Family Guide (1995) which includes many examples derived from Waldorf schools in Northern California, states that “According to Steiner’s philosophy, man is a threefold being of spirit, soul, and body whose capacities unfold in three developmental stages on the path to adulthood: early childhood, middle childhood, and adolescence (p. 8)” The aforementioned statement is followed by a description of the nursery-kindergarten environment and the activities one is likely to see in that classroom setting based on the developmental philosophy of Steiner’s schools. “The environment should offer the child plenty of opportunities for meaningful imitation and creative play.” (p. 9) “Drawing the child’s energies away from this fundamental task to meet premature intellectual demands robs the child of the health and vitality he or she will need later in life.” (p. 9)

During the petitioner interview with the proposed governing board on December 14, 2009, it was stated that the school would “still not focus on reading until students loose their baby teeth.”

Petition states;

“Writing will be taught before formal reading instruction and will first be introduced through pictures, drawing, and movement.” (p. 94)

Staff acquired curriculum entitled Waldorf Reading For Homeschoolers originating from the same curriculum source/author as the proposed sample science curriculum Science As Phenomena referenced within the petition. The following is a description of Reading Readiness articulated in Waldorf Reading For Homeschoolers:

“Reading is not required in Waldorf schools until the end of grade 3. The Waldorf curriculum is based on the developmental interests of children, and does not require reading in the early grades. Material is presented by the teacher in dramatic, interesting ways and children make use of the material in their play and hands-on dramatic and artistic activities.

[...]

Waldorf schools have several rules-of-thumb to determine readiness for first grade in a child.

Physical development:

Change in teeth – Steiner’s theory was that a child was ready for academic learning, including reading when he was getting his second teeth. Throughout history that has happened around age 7.”

While this section of the petition defines developmentally appropriate as a “developmental view of the child” and emphasis is given to the role of “child-initiated play” for the young child, this section does not define clarify what if any the role of the Waldorf approach to the developmental stages of children will play in the school’s educational program.

Petition states:

“Carefully developed and developmentally appropriate standards texts, such as Open Court Readers (...) will be used as resources for the children.” (p. 84)

The petition does not link the assumed developmentally appropriate aspects of the Open Court curriculum with the child development philosophy of Waldorf education as set forth by Rudolph Steiner to ensure alignment of the chosen curricular resource to the school’s over-arching educational philosophy.

The petition sets forth measurable pupil outcomes that are not sufficiently clear, and do not include instruments of measure that contain a reasonably comprehensive description so as to ensure their validity and reliability.

Petition states:

“CSCE is working together with other Alliance-member Waldorf charters to build benchmark tests for participating Waldorf charters under the auspices of California Charter School Association’s *Zoom Schools* program.” (p. 37)

“To determine students’ level of proficiency in ELA and math, CSCE will use trimester benchmark tests and a reading levels test assessed on benchmark books (fiction and nonfiction) identified at the middle and end of each grade level.” (p. 159)

These instruments of measure are not further described to sufficiently allow for evaluation of their appropriate use within the school’s program.

Measurable Pupil Outcomes

The proposed measurable pupil outcomes on pages 150 through 158 include reference to measurable pupil outcomes that are confusingly worded and do not clearly evidence targets that ensure yearly growth in student performance.

Examples are as follows:

Language Arts:

“Beginning in 3rd grade, in 2010, 40% of pupils per grade will score a 3 or better on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on written work and portfolios; by 8th grade, students will meet or exceed in performance compared to peer alike district schools.”

Mathematics:

“Beginning in third grade, in 2010, 33% of students will score 80% or better on quizzes and tests; students will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on mathematics project; 34% of students will score proficient on the CST in Year 1.”

History/Social Sciences:

“Beginning in 7th grade, 2014, 78% of students, per grade, will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned scale on written work and portfolios; 80% of students will score 80 or better on quizzes and tests; 35% will score proficient on CST in Year 1.”

Science:

“Beginning in 5th grade, 2012, 50% of students, per grade, will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on written work and portfolio; students will score 80% or better on quizzes and tests; 34% of students will score proficient on CST in Year 1.”

Physical Education:*

“Beginning in 2nd grade, 50% of students will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on class projects;”

*** No mention is made of “class projects” within the charter petition. The section describing the Physical Education program component focuses primarily on the benefits of physical activity, the use of competition in the 5th and 6th grade through Olympic or Medieval sports. The proposed schedule shows gym/movement occurring two times weekly for 45 minutes (p. 256).**

Visual and Performing Arts

“Beginning in 2nd grade, 2010, 80% of students will score a 3 on a 4 point standards-aligned rubric on class projects; students will score 80% or better on tests and quizzes; program will include acting and performance.”

World Language

“50% of pupils, per grade, will score 80% or better on subject assessments”

Lifelong Learning Skills

“Students will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric in monthly observational assessment built by CSCE and aligned to Standards”

Social Interpersonal Skills

“Beginning in Kindergarten, students will score a 3 on a 4 point rubric in trimester observational assessment built from Waldorf Child Study Descriptive Tool adapted in collaboration with Association of Public Waldorf Schools & California Charter Schools Association Zoom Data Director Waldorf Charter Partners”

Objective Rubrics

The petition states:

“See Appendix 18 for “description and evidence of ‘objective rubrics’.” (p. 154)

Appendix 18 provides no description of the “objective rubric”. This Appendix sets forth “Tools to Measure Student Outcomes” which include conflicting outcomes as compared to those set forth in the petition beginning on page 146. These discrepancies are detailed further in this report.

The 4 point standards-aligned rubric referenced throughout the Measurable Pupil Outcomes section of the petition or is evidence of its development is not present within the petition.

Petition references through pages 150 through 158 the use of “standards-aligned rubrics,” however no examples are provided to demonstrate the extent of their development or their proposed alignment to standards. At one point it is stated that “Students will demonstrate successful completion of the Language Arts program by presenting a portfolio with satisfactory evaluation measured with an objective rubric.” (p. 150). It is unclear what is meant by *satisfactory evaluation* nor is there evidence of the *objective rubric* to be utilized. On page 151 the petition states that in Mathematics students “will demonstrate successful completion of the Math program by presenting a portfolio with appropriate evaluation

measured with an objective rubric.” It is unclear what is meant by *appropriate evaluation* and whether or this is similar to “satisfactory evaluation.” It is also unclear what performance level pursuant to the proposed rubric this is meant to reference.

The petition does not describe what will be considered with respect to English Language Learner students regarding the development of the *objective rubric*. It is also unclear what role the CA State ELD standards will play in the development of “standards-aligned rubrics” as referenced throughout the petition. It is also unclear how the concept of Developmentally Appropriate curricula will be applied to the design of standards aligned rubrics for each grade level (p. 45).

Benchmark Assessments

Appendix 12 states that “benchmark assessments” will be utilized to learn more about the needs of students. In the petition section titled “D. Methods of Assessment” (p. 160) no mention is made of “benchmark assessments.” “Trimester Exams” are referenced in this section however this is not elaborated upon except to indicate that they occur three times a year for students in grades 2-8, and a target of 1 year’s growth of the student’s score or more if needed to reach proficiency.

“Performance Assessments” are referenced throughout the section describing the methods of assessment on pages 154 through 157; however the use of “Trimester tests” is referenced in the section describing the methods of assessment for “Math” on page 158. Performance Assessments (“benchmarks”) is mentioned here only in the row specifically for “students with learning handicaps need specialized programs.”

It is therefore unclear what the school intends to implement with respect to Performance Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, and/or Trimester Exams (tests) as these various methods are merely mentioned but are not elaborated upon. No evidence is provided as to the extent to which these methods of assessment have been developed, or who will develop these assessments; except in those cases where the petition states:

“Benchmarks are determined by teachers and administrators to ensure that State Content and Performance Standards are being met throughout the year. The benchmarks are aligned with the State, District, and CSCE standards.” (p. 161)

Open Court Assessment

The use of Open Court assessments is mentioned only once in the petition within a list of assessments referring to the manner in which student progress will be monitored for those students who are academically low achieving (p. 129).

The use of Open Court assessments is not otherwise mentioned in the petition section regarding “Methods of Assessment” (p. 160-165). It is not clear whether or not or the extent to which Open Court assessments, a key feature in the over-all monitoring of effective Open Court implementation, is intended to occur in the proposed program.

Writing Proficiency

The petition puts forth a chart defining the Performance Goals for Writing Proficiency as defined by “scoring a 4 on a 4 point scale, grades 4 and seven.” (p. 146) Additionally the petition states that student progress will be monitored on a daily, weekly, and trimester basis to “ensure that students become more adept as writers and grow capable of mastering the STAR Writing Test.” (p. 146)

There is no further clarification as to what the intended instrument is that will apply the 4 point scale or how this does or does not correspond to the STAR Writing Test. The table included on page 146 outlines proficiency rates for all grades three through seven making unclear the statement above which intends for focus on grades “4 and seven” exclusively.

Portfolio Assessments

At various points in the charter petition as submitted, the petition references Portfolio Assessments. No elaboration, however, is given to this assessment system. The only description of this system of assessment is as follows:

“Comprehensive student portfolios will include sample main lesson books, practice papers, written work, artwork, and other as appropriate.” (p. 160, 165)

The petition states on pages 150 through 158 that Portfolio Assessments will be a primary tool for determining the extent to which students have achieved the proposed learning outcomes in Language Arts, History/Social Sciences, and Science. The petition states that “portfolios will be assessed according to school-wide rubrics with input from the classroom teacher and specialty teachers.” (p. 160)

No exemplars or reasonably comprehensive descriptions are provided to demonstrate the extent to which this system of assessment has been developed, or to provide evidence of the validity and reliability of the proposed rubrics, or how it aligns to the knowledge, skills and attitudes set forth as goals of the educational program.

Diagnostics

Petition refers to the use of “screening tests,” “language record,” “Informal Reading Record,” “Running Record,” “CSCE ELA benchmark test.” No explicit description of this assessment is given. The petition states on two occasions that “screening” and “diagnostics” will occur, but it is unclear how these differ or may be repetitive.

Given the petition’s assertion of the importance of the school’s “developmental view of the child (p. 46)”, as well as the developmental stages of children articulated by Rudolph Steiner, particularly as they relate to reading, it is entirely unclear how the school’s proposed system of diagnostic assessments will reflect this Waldorf inspired philosophy.

“(a) Post Admission Diagnostic. A language record will be started for every child, including mother tongue and every language they know... A simple set of diagnostic tests will be conducted for phonemic skills, fluency and comprehension. The tests will include an Informal Reading Inventory such as Running Record and the CSCE ELA benchmark test to measure comprehension. This record will become part of the student’s portfolio. All incoming students will be screened at the beginning of the school year to determine if they are reading at or near grade level expectation. They will be screened for specific literacy/reading issues that are common to the target population. The data serves to establish whether students are continuing to make progress and at what pace.” (p. 100)

“(b) Diagnostic Testing. If students are not reading at grade level based on the screening test, teachers will conduct a simple set of diagnostic assessments such as informal reading inventory (Running Record) to determine the student’s knowledge of sound-spelling correspondences, fluency rate and specific reading challenges identify specific learning targets.” (p. 100)

“Diagnostic Screening. All students will be screened using grade level text to determine if they are reading at or near grade level. They are screened for specific literacy/reading issues that are common to the target population.” (p. 105)

“Diagnostic Testing. If students are not reading at grade level based on the screening test, teachers conduct an informal reading inventory (running record) to determine the student’s fluency rate and specific reading challenges identify specific learning targets.” (p. 105)

“**Universal diagnostic** of all incoming students. That information will allow teachers to adjust instruction and provide appropriate scaffolds and supports in the general education program. This happens after admissions.” (p. 128)

“Upon arrival all pupils will receive a diagnostic screening (see Appendix 6d for detail)[*], generally at the beginning of each school year, to determine a baseline and establish the pupil learning profile.” (p. 300)

** No Appendix 6d exists.*

Petition sets forth School-wide Performance Goals - % students school-wide are Proficient/Advanced on CST.

The chart on page 146 proposes that 78% of students in year 2014-2015 will be Proficient/Advanced in History 8th Grade. Based on the school’s enrollment plan the school will not begin instructing students in grade 8 until 2015-2016 (p. 56).

The petition sets forth that the proposed charter school will be one of the "very first of its kind" in the United States. The petitioner interview responses indicate that the school intends to innovate the Waldorf approach to education by "appropriately adapting" it to specifically meet the needs of English Language Learners, students from predominantly low-income backgrounds, and students who are significantly behind academically.

The petition does not sufficiently set forth a clear description of how this appropriate adaptation is going to occur. The petition does not adequately describe the way in which the educational program will appropriately adapt the Waldorf approach to meet the unique needs of the target student population.

Petition states that CSCE will be among the "very first to offer a Waldorf inspired option to an urban community such as Oakland (p. 52)."

English Language Learners

Petition outlines a target population that is likely to be predominantly English Language Learners, and many may be recent arrivals to this country (p. 59).

The responses provided during the petitioner interviews held on December 11 and 14, 2009 indicate that public Waldorf schools currently exist and examples of those operating in Northern California are identified as partner schools to CSCE. It was also stated that these partner schools differ in that they serve a far fewer number of English Language learners than the target population of the CSCE, as well as far fewer students representing low socio-economic status.

The petitioners stated during the petitioner interviews held on December 11 and 14, 2009, that for this reason the curriculum must be "appropriately adapted" to respond to the needs of this population. When asked whether or not this aspect of the Waldorf curriculum was likely to be "replicated based on existing models vs. innovated," it was stated by the petitioners that this was to be an innovation of the Waldorf curriculum.

One Waldorf school in Germany however was noted by the petitioning group as having been successful with a population of low income, second language learners. It is not clear, as set forth in the petition, how this school in Germany will serve as an exemplar for the school's intended educational program.

The petition states;

"Plan for English Language Learners:

The curriculum for the ELD period is built around state ELD standards and focuses on developing students' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. The ELD period will use the Sheltered Instruction and Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model as an instructional frame (p. 131)"

This section of the petition goes on to describe the SIOP model (p. 131).

No curriculum for the ELD period is provided within the petition.

Sample lesson provided in the petition does not adequately illustrate an ELD lesson design that would sufficiently reflect this SIOP instructional model. The aforementioned Sample Lesson is the only example provided in the petition to illustrate the intended content for the ELD Block referred to earlier in the narrative.

[Sample Lesson] English Language Development: (30 minutes)

“This section of the morning should include storytelling with the teacher telling and the students retelling/reviewing the next day. The mode of review can vary (and perhaps the storytelling itself, occasionally) but can include oral retelling, pantomime, drama, quickwrites or quickdraws, or quickmodels (beeswax, clay). The first 15 minutes should be the storytelling or retelling. The final 15 minutes should be a journal experience where students write or draw around a specific prompt provided by the teacher. (Students will be able to complete these during Reading Workshop.) Friday can be a discussion, review of the story heard that week. (p. 264)”

The petition refers later in the petition to the ELD period as follows;

“The focus of instruction during the ELD period and during Tier II intervention periods will be on word parts (root words, prefixes, and suffixes) and high utility academic vocabulary, beginning with cognates where appropriate (p. 132).”

The Sample Lesson provided in the petition does not evidence the proposed structure and content of the ELD period as characterized by the description above (p. 132).

The petition sets forth that the ELD Block will occur for **one hour** on page 256 and for **thirty minutes** on page 262.

(p. 256)	(p. 262)
8:30-9:30 English Language Development <i>Review, New, Do or alternate days: Review/Do; New/Do</i>	Eng. Lang. Dev (8:30-9:00) Storytelling/Review Portfolio Page [...] English Language Development: (30 minutes)

Petition states;

“The diversity profile signals the central importance on the part of CSCE to ensure English learners receive the supports to access the curriculum, master the dominant language and deepen their relationship to their own language and culture.” (p. 59)

The petition does not make clear how this is intended or likely to occur.

Progress Profile

“For each student designated an English Language Learner, the CSCE will start the English Language Development Progress Profile, employing a tool (see Appendix 29 for Progress Profile) adapted from Alhambra Unified School District, which ranked in the top 10 of districts around the state 2005-2006 in the gains for English Language Learners. (p. 133)”

The Progress Profile Tool provided as an exemplar in the Appendix of the petition refers to the use of the *English Language Development, Progress Profile, K-8, Teacher’s Guide*.

The petition makes no reference to this *Teacher’s Guide*, training in the use of the assessment tool, supporting conditions for its use, or the meaning of the following Outcome goal as it pertains to the tool:

“Progress Profile: 55% of the students will score at or above grade level on average in the first year, 2010 (p. 299).”

No further mention is made of the Alhambra Unified School District or its practices with respect to English Language Learners; however its success with English Language Learners is referenced as the rationale for the selection of the Progress Profile structure proposed within the petition.

Pull-out Program

It is unclear what the research base is for the proposed pull-out program for ELL students. Research on pull-out programs often indicates that this is a less effective strategy for supporting ELL students. The proposed pull-out method is referenced repeatedly in the charter petition (p. 130, 131, 133, 134).

The following is taken from a University of Michigan description of ESL programs(emphasis added):

*The 30-45 minutes seems insufficient time for instruction to many ESL teachers (Duke & Mabbot, 2001). ESL teachers often work a variety of students, speaking different languages, of different ages and often at different schools (Ovando & Collier, 1998). While each of these students are attending ESL, they will all be missing different subjects in their main class, making it difficult for ESL teachers to incorporate content-based lessons into the ESL curriculum (Ovando & Collier, 1998). As a consequence, students pulled out for ESL help are forced to miss instruction time in their mainstream classes (Duke & Mabbot, 2001). **These difficulties are accentuated by the fact that pull-out programs are the most expensive and least effective model of the ESL and bilingual education programs (Ovando & Collier, 1998).***

In the section of the charter petition describing the Plan for Students Who Are Academically Low Achieving” (p. 126 – 130) it is proposed that students will receive as part of the Tier II intervention a “Resource Pull-out” which will occur “after main lesson during drawing/painting/handwork” portion of the schedule.

While the petition emphasizes the inherent values and benefits of this approach to learning (drawing/painting/handwork) and focuses the needs within the target population to be well served by this approach, the petition nonetheless proposes to remove students from this aspect of the curriculum when they are not progressing academically. The proposal to remove students from the unique drawing/painting/handwork section of the curriculum for academic pull-out appears to diminish greatly the assumed added value of these subjects for the target population set forth in the charter petition on pages 117 through 122.

Additionally, given that the petition states that the student population the school aims to serve is “disproportionately... English Language Learners, ...may be recent arrivals to this country,...and nearly three quarters will come to CSCE below or far below grade level in English Language Arts and Mathematics”, it is unclear how the school intends to address the likelihood that many students will not demonstrate progress on the formative assessments referred to in Appendix 13 and may thus be referred to Tier II intervention, such as the proposed Pull-out Resource program.

Extended learning time

The petition references utilizing the universal access time during the Open Court block as well as during pull-out or afterschool tutoring for the “learning challenge-Extended learning time” of 30 additional minutes, 5 days a week for 10-12 weeks (p. 128).

It is unclear what is meant by the 30 additional minutes of available time referenced here. It is unclear what is meant by the Open Court block. If the reference is intended to refer to the 90 minute Direct Instruction in Reading and Writing period proposed in the sample schedule of Appendix 8, the petition

does not clarify at what point the “universal access” portion of the Open Court curriculum is to occur in order to allow for the proposed intervention of 30 minutes of “learning challenge-Extended learning time”. It is equally unclear how this will occur in the context of the Open Court Block when it is explicitly intended to serve as the Main Lesson Block unique to the Waldorf inspired approach set forth in the charter.

Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI)

The CSCE website states;

“Computer technology will be used beginning in fourth grade for projects such as class newspapers, research products, class websites and email regarding class events. Computer assisted instruction will be the main method of instruction for students with little or beginning English skills. Computer assisted instruction (CAI) will provide extra support for academically low achieving students.”

>

Petition states;

“Computer technology will be used beginning in fifth grade for projects such as class newspapers, research products, class websites and email regarding class events.” (p. 116)

No mention is made within the petition of Computer Assisted Instruction to be used for students with “little or beginning English skills” or to provide “extra support for students that are academically low achieving.”

The petition sets forth a description of a target population that is focused on the San Antonio neighborhood, characterized by the data of two elementary schools and one middle school; one of which is located outside the boundaries of the proposed San Antonio target neighborhood as set forth in the charter. The petition emphasizes the low academic performance and conditions of two elementary schools at the expense of describing the performance and conditions of multiple schools located within the target neighborhood.

The skewed analysis and interpretation of the target student population likely to enroll in the school presents issues that are particularly problematic given the deficiencies in the presentation of the proposed curriculum.

Enrollment / Target Population

Data provided in the petition as submitted describe only district schools in characterizing the needs of the students in the San Antonio. The petition describes the Public Educational Choices as follows:

"No public elementary schools in the San Antonio – and only a few in Oakland – are focused on arts-infused developmentally appropriate, highly personal, culturally rich, and arts-infused curriculum, rigorous, instruction coupled with ongoing assessment, professional learning communities and meaningful parent and community involvement."

The petition defines the target population as families in San Antonio. This is defined as 27th Avenue to Lakeshore, 880 to just below Highway 13. (p. 57)

Subsequent to this characterization of the public education choices in the San Antonio, the petition provides academic performance data for only two schools, Garfield Elementary and Lazear Elementary. Given the boundary of the San Antonio described above, it is unclear why the petition does not present consideration for the performance of students in the following public schools that operate within these boundaries; La Escuelita, Cleveland, Bella Vista, Manzanita Seed, Manzanita Community, and Franklin Elementary.

Given the boundaries presented, it is not clear why Lazear Elementary is given substantial treatment as it falls outside of the San Antonio boundaries. Between Lazear and Garfield Elementary operates Think College Now, International Community School, World Academy and Achieve Academy. Though also outside of the proposed San Antonio boundaries, these two schools are nonetheless closer to the residents of the San Antonio neighborhood than Lazear Elementary, however there is no mention of the performance of these schools within the petition.

The focus on only the performance of two public school options at the expense of any consideration of other public educational choices presents a skewed characterization of the San Antonio neighborhood. Given the emphasis within the petition to meeting the needs of the "target population of San Antonio" the underdeveloped and/or skewed characterization of the target population raises questions about the underlying assumptions held by the petitioning groups as they relate to the students the school is likely to serve. The need to recruit and retain students in grades K-3 in year one and to continue to recruit sufficient families in order to sustain the school's educational program over time requires an accurate and thoughtful consideration of the public school options particularly to demonstrate a likelihood of attracting meaningfully interested families to the program.

This is greatly increased by the fact that an analysis of the signatures provided in the petition as submitted represent only the following meaningfully interested families eligible to enroll in year one;

Grade Level	Signatures	Projected Enrollment
Kindergarten	17	40
1 st Grade	12	20
2 nd Grade	4	20
3 rd Grade	9	20
Additional eligible signatures represented in electronic version of petition as submitted	2 (2 nd grade)	
Total	51	100

While it is not assumed that the school will be unable to attract sufficient families by the proposed start of operation, the ability to do so is not bolstered by the approach to analyzing the target population as set forth in the petition.

The petition states that the “school will open with 20 students in each grade from kindergarten through third grade”, yet the table directly below this statement in the petition states that the school will enroll 40 students in kindergarten in year one. The petition states that the school will ultimately serve 205 students in grades kindergarten through eighth grade. Based on an evaluation of the table representing the school’s projected enrollment and the description of the assumed grade level projections in the petition narrative, at no time does the school achieve a 205 student enrollment over a 13 year period as shown below. (p. 56)

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Year 8	Year 9	Year 10	Year 11	Year 12	Year 13
K	40	40	40	40	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
1	20	40	40	40	40	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
2	20	20	40	40	40	40	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
3	20	20	20	40	40	40	40	20	20	20	20	20	20
4		22	22	22	40	40	40	40	22	22	22	22	22
5			22	22	22	40	40	40	40	22	22	22	22
6				25	25	25	40	40	40	40	25	25	25
7					25	25	25	40	40	40	40	25	25
8						25	25	25	40	40	40	40	25
	100	142	184	229	252	275	270	265	262	244	229	214	199

The charter petition summarizes its analysis of “why CSCE’s design offer a particularly strong match to meet the needs and build on the assets of San Antonio’s children, families and district.” This summary provides only the statement that “among the choices portrayed, the data suggests that another small school aiming to offer a safe, culturally rich and rigorous option to the children of San Antonio would be a valuable addition to the community, to fellow schools and the district (p. 79).”

As was stated previously, the “choices portrayed” were skewed at the expense of numerous educational choices available in the San Antonio. No data within the petition is provided that correlates this analysis.

The petition sets forth that the petitioning group proposes to open a preschool in fall 2011 but does not provide evidence of sufficient or thoughtful preliminary planning to evidence likelihood that this effort will be successfully undertaken and/or not impede the effective implementation of the K-8 charter school proposed in the petition.

Petition states;

“The CSCE aims to open its Partnership Pre-School beyond its second year of operation 2011-2012 (p. 248).” The petition sets forth statements in the Appendix 5 (p. 248-249) of the petition regarding the planning and preparation for the opening of the preschool including statements that indicate the engagement of the school’s governing board; “Because preschool licensure is more detailed, the CSCE Board has agreed to time the launch of the preschool in the school’s second year running (p. 249).”

During the petitioner interview held on December 14, 2009 the governing board president stated that the governing board has had no discussion whatsoever of the proposed preschool. Additional questions posed regarding the nature of the proposed preschool were met with responses that indicate no planning or discussion of the preschool has occurred, including who will operate the preschool or where it will be located.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Oakland Unified School District's State Administrator/Board of Education **deny** the charter petition to establish the Community School for Creative Education pursuant to the California Charter Schools Act.

The factual findings illustrated in this report demonstrate that:

Pursuant to *California Education Code §47605*, the petitioners are demonstrably unlikely to successfully implement the program set forth in the petition; and the petition does not contain reasonably comprehensive descriptions of all of the 16 elements required by the California Charter Schools Act.

ATTACHMENT II: Science Curriculum Sample



Science As Phenomena

Book

SCIENCE AS PHENOMENA

for

HOMESCHOOLERS

Barbara Dewey, M.S.
Educational Consultant
89900 Mill Hill Road
Bowerston OH 44695
740-269-3038

<http://www.waldorfwitouthwalls.com>
barbara@waldorfwitouthwalls.com

Revised 4/05

GRADE THREE

Grade three is when all the practical experiences of the kindergarten come together in several thorough main lesson blocks, involving food, clothing and shelter. Again, these studies are interdisciplinary, including science, social studies, reading, math and spelling. Main lesson blocks would probably include Gardening, Farming, Cooking, Homes/Building, Clothing, and in the U.S. a block on Native Americans (which might include a great deal about all of the other blocks).

The children have experienced living within a certain system of food, clothing and shelter. Now it is time for them to understand that all human beings have these needs, but fulfill their needs in different ways, depending on climate, what is available to them, and their way of life. How they obtain food often dictates the kind of homes they build. Thus social studies is an integral part of the study of science at this level, and much more meaningful if presented in this way. Various tribes of Native Americans provide this contrast in an integrated way.

It is nice to start the Homes main lesson block with a painting of a big yellow ball in the middle of the paper. At the bottom paint some blue-green earth. Then, using red or gold, paint a simple human figure, arms and legs outstretched, nearly as big as the yellow ball, and superimposed on it. In one upper corner paint a moon and a few stars; in the other, a golden sun. With the painting goes this poem:

Out of the earth with heaven's help,
From water, fire, air and earth,
Is fashioned a house for every soul
To dwell in from time of birth.

Without any discussion, this introduces the idea of our bodies as a home in which we dwell as spiritual beings.

It is good then to introduce nomads and some of the ways they make moveable homes: the Plains Indian teepee and Eskimo igloo. Then the Japanese paper house, houses on sticks, earth, adobe and thatch homes, etc. See A World of Homes, by Burns. Many of these are great fun to build as models, using a little math, and measurement in the process. It is important to present all the information in a kind of story form so that the child gets an imagination of what it would be like to live in each situation. You can gear your bedtime reading to include stories about children who live in each situation. That is one of the advantages of homeschooling!

Another main lesson block would be how a modern American home is built. (see Walker) You can actually do it, either as a model or build a playhouse. Working with carpentry tools is very good preparation for the later study of physics. Field trips to watch an architect, surveyor, and/or a building site would be a good idea. This again can include a lot of math: the child can draw a floor plan of her own house or a dream house on graph paper.

Your main lesson on Farming could include the reading of Farmer Boy, by Laura Ingalls Wilder. At home, that book combined with a trip or an experience on a real farm would make a fine main lesson block. If your child can read, there are lots of story books about life on a farm. Here is a poem about farming:

The patient beasts go forth to feed
And needful food the earth to yield,
The farmer flings the fruitful seed
Afar upon the furrowed field.

The sun sends warmth on earth and seed,
And showers slake the thirsty soil,
For heaven is mindful of their need,
And man has blessing on his toil.

Gardening is a block that is really fun to do at home, whether you have space for a garden or just a windowsill. If you have very little space, grow some Chinese mung bean or alfalfa sprouts seeds (available at your health food store). Use two tablespoons of alfalfa seeds, or ¼ cup mung beans. Soak overnight in a quart jar covered with a piece of screen or cheese cloth, then rinse and drain twice daily for about 5 days. Then eat!

See if you can find a community garden nearby which you can join and contribute to the community as well as get some great lessons and some good food to eat!

Grow some pole bean vines around a window, or some radishes. Both grow fairly quickly. You can do your planting during your gardening block and then use the harvest when you do your food and cooking block. There is a wonderful little book called The Carrot Seed (in your local library or interlibrary loan), which tells the story of what is needed for a plant to grow. This block gives wonderful opportunities for crayon and colored pencil drawings of what is happening with the plants, day by day, and for some good journaling. It makes a beautiful main lesson book.

If you have some outdoor space, use some of the ideas from Sunflower Houses, along with the above.

You can integrate much of your study of food into the farming and gardening blocks, and/or you can have a separate block including cooking. At home, if your child is included in the family shopping and meal preparation, you may not want to make this a main lesson at all. You don't have to make a main lesson book out of everything. Some seem rather contrived when done at home with only one child!

Clothing can be a lot of fun, especially if you have done the knitting and crochet in grades one and two. Now your child can really make a piece of clothing, like a hat or mittens. You can visit a sheep farm and watch shearing, visit a spinner, and try spinning yourself. Get a book about cotton from the library and read about how cotton is grown, harvested and made into clothing. Read about rayon. Get a little loom and do some weaving. Go to a fabric store and see whether the fabric is woven or knit. Sew a simple piece of clothing from a pattern with your child. Gather some local plants for dyeing. See Colors from Nature. A lot of what happens in dyeing is very good preparation for the later study of chemistry.

Grade three is probably one of the most fun to teach, if you are willing to learn a lot yourself as you go along!

Teacher's Edition

- Available for Levels K-6
- Provides the information necessary for teaching systematic, explicit skills instruction centered around quality literature selections
- Lesson plans indicate the goals and objectives for each lesson as well as detailed suggestions for carrying out the lessons in the most efficient way
- Guidance is offered for all students—those who are especially quick to learn, those who proceed at a moderate pace, and those who are struggling whether because they simply need more time or because they are new to the language

Big Books and Little Books

- Available for Levels K-1
- Gives students the opportunity to explore a variety of literature
- Enables students to read literature written by trade book authors by the middle of first grade
- Designed for shared reading experiences, they allow students the experience of fine literature, expressive illustrations, and lively story discussion even before they are prepared to read the stories themselves
- Through these oversized anthologies, students are introduced to stories, poetry, songs, and nonfiction
- By the time students are given books they can read, they are comfortable and familiar with the medium and can concentrate on reading, learning from, and enjoying the literature
- The following is a list of Big Book/ Little Book units that are available: **Kindergarten** -*Alphabet Book; Pickled Peppers; Pictures Tell Stories; School; Shadows; Finding Friends; Stick To It; The Wind; Red, White, and Blue; Teamwork; By the Sea* **Level 1-** *Let's Read; Animals; Our Neighborhood; Weather; Things That Go; Journeys*
- Big Books and Little Books are available individually or in a package containing 1 copy of each title

Pre-Decodable and Decodable Texts

- Available in Levels K-3
- Individual (1 copy of each book) and Classroom Sets (6 copies of each book) are available. These also come in a tear-out format in which books are made by students to use **during class** or **take home** to practice with parents. Takehomes are available in 4-color or black and white versions
- Decodable texts are stories made up of a large number of words that contain specific sound/ spellings that the students are learning, along with some high utility, or high frequency words such as the, a, have, which are necessary to write comprehensible and interesting text
- Starting at Kindergarten, Pre-Decodable text is written in Rebus, and later in Kindergarten, the students move into Decodable text
- At first grade, we offer two books to teach each sound and spelling. The first book provides the core instruction for reinforcing the sound/and its spellings. This book is shown in its entirety in the Teacher Edition. The second book provides the needed practice for making sure all students move to fluency

First and Second Readers

- **First and Second Readers 1st Grade** Stories are based on the Weather (First Reader) and Journey (Second Reader) themes. These readers transition students from reading decodable and

- **First Reader 2nd Grade** is for review and reinforcement of skills, and is used during the **Getting Started** Lessons at the beginning of Second Grade

Student Anthologies

- Available in Levels 1-6
- Two anthologies for each level, Levels 1-3 and a single anthology for each level, Levels 4-6
- Literature in the student anthologies is organized by themes
- Each theme gives the readers a point of reference from which to think, discuss, and learn
- Sequenced in a way that enables students to progressively deepen their insights
- Each selection adds more information or a different perspective to a student's growing body of knowledge
- Reflects various types of writing, including fiction and nonfiction, all building on the unit theme
- Level K units: School; Shadows; Finding Friends; The Wind; Stick to It; Red White and Blue; Teamwork; By the Sea
- Level 1 units: Let's Read!; Animals; Things That Go; Our Neighborhood At Work; Weather; Journeys; Keep Trying; Games; Being Afraid; Homes
- Level 2 units: Sharing Stories; Kindness; Look Again; Fossils; Courage; Our Country And Its People
- Level 3 units: Friendship; City Wildlife; Imagination; Money; Storytelling; Country Life
- Level 4 units: Risks and Consequences; Dollars and Sense; From Mystery To Medicine; Survival; Communication; A Changing America
- Level 5 units: Cooperation And Competition; Astronomy; Heritage; Making a New Nation; Going West; Journeys and Quests
- Level 6 units: Perseverance; Ancient Civilizations; Taking a Stand; Beyond The Notes; Ecology; A Question Of Value

Reading, Phonemic Awareness, and Phonics Package

- Available for Level K
- Contains all of the materials needed to make the phonics and story thinking instruction accessible to the children
- Alphabet Sound Cards
- Alphabet Sound Card Stories Audiocassette
- Pocket Chart
- Letter Cards
- Word Cards
- Picture Cards
- Alphabet Flash Cards
- High Frequency Word Cards
- Story Line Big Book
- Story Starter Cards
- Thought Cards
- Game Mats with playing pieces
- Lion Puppet
- Storythinking Crowns
- *Willy the Wisher* book
- Kindergarten Blackline Masters

Reading and Phonics Package

- Available for Levels 1-3

- Gives students more practice in blending, recognizing sounds and spellings, and learning high-frequency words
- Sound/ Spelling Cards for the wall
- Individual cards for use during Workshop time
- Lion Puppet that is used during segmentation exercises
- Individual letter cards that are used during the Dictation and Spelling activities

Sounds and Letters Workbook

- Available for Level K
- Supports the phonemic awareness lessons in kindergarten

Language Arts Skills Workbook

- Available for Level K
- Offers support for the language arts lessons in kindergarten
- Alternate formats for these components are **blackline masters** and **Teacher's Annotated Editions**

Phonics Skills Workbook

- Available for Level 1
- Supports the phonics lessons in Level 1
- Alternate formats for these components are **blackline masters** and **Teacher's Annotated Editions**
- Available for Level 1
- Supports the phonics lessons in Level 1
- Alternate formats for these components are **blackline masters** and **Teacher's Annotated Editions**

Comprehension and Language Arts Workbook

- Available for Levels 1-6
- Supports both the comprehension and language arts lessons
- Alternate formats for these components are **blackline masters** and **Teacher's Annotated Editions**

Inquiry Journal

- Available for Levels 2-6
- Supports the Inquiry and Investigation lessons
- Alternate formats for these components are blackline masters and Teacher's Annotated Editions

Unit Assessment

- Available for Levels K-6
- Unit Assessments test every aspect of *Open Court Reading* from Phonemic Awareness to Language Arts
- There is one workbook for kindergarten, five for Level 1 (one for the Big Book units and one each for the Anthology units), one for each unit in Levels 2-6
- Alternate formats for these components are blackline masters and Teacher's Annotated Editions

Part 1 Lesson Cards

- Available for Levels K-3
- 2-6 sided cards that contain the instruction from Part 1 of all lessons
- For the teacher's convenience while standing at the board or front of the classroom

Desk Strips

- Available for Levels K-3 in packages of 12
- Shows the entire set of Alphabet Sound Cards for kindergarten and the entire set of the Sound/Spelling Cards for Levels 1-3
- Cards will always be in eyesight for every student's easy reference

Transparencies

- Available for Levels K-6
- Offers support for both Reading and Language Arts
- Each is hole-punched and in a binder for easy access

Spelling and Vocabulary Skills Workbook

- Available for Levels 1-6 in a consumable workbook or blackline master format
- Supports the spelling and vocabulary lessons in Part 3
- Annotated Teacher's Edition also available

Writer's Workbook

- Available for Levels K-6 in a consumable workbook or blackline master format
- Provides reinforcement and practice of skills throughout the lesson
- Annotated Teacher's Edition also available

Language Arts Big Book

- Available for Levels K-1
- The instruction for the Part 3 lessons is found in these Big Books

Language Arts Handbook

- Available for Levels 2-6
- The instruction to support the Part 3 lessons for writing, grammar, usage, and mechanics is found in these handbooks

Challenge Workbooks

- Available for Levels K-6 in a consumable workbook or blackline master format
- For students who need to push their skills further
- Contains practice for skills taught in all three parts of each lesson
- Annotated Teacher's Edition is also available

Reteach Workbooks

- Available for Levels K-6 in a consumable workbook or blackline master format
- For students who need to review one more time the skills that have been taught
- Each activity is presented in an easy to follow format
- Annotated Teacher's Edition is also available

Intervention Support

- Available for Levels K-6
- Intervention Workbook available in a consumable workbook or blackline master format, contains activities that support each intervention lesson
- Annotated Teacher's Edition is also available
- Intervention Guide contains instructional support that parallels each *Open Court Reading* lesson
- Intervention Bibliography contains lists of trade books that align with each theme
- Support items can be used to help develop print awareness or to practice fluency

English-Language Development Support

- Available for Levels K-6
- ELD Teacher's Guide parallels each lesson in the *Open Court Reading* Teacher's Edition
- ELD Workbook in a consumable or blackline master format with activities that support each lesson
- Annotated Teacher's Edition
- ELD Glossary is available to help the teacher teach words that are hard for English-Language Learners to visualize

Cumulative Folders

- Available for Levels K-6 in packages of 12
- Used by teachers for storing each student's assessments and assessment records

Writing Folders

- Available for Levels K-6
- Used by students to store their drafts, published works, notes, etc.

Home Connections

- Available for Levels K-6
- Blackline masters that teachers can send home to keep parents up-to-date on what is happening in their child's reading class

Science/Social Studies Connection Center

- Available for Levels K-6
- Contains a set of cards and a blackline master book
- Connects the units to specific science and social studies activities