



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2013-2014

**PAVE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT**

2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

School Information for the 2013-2014 School Year

Name of Charter School	PAVE Academy Charter School
Board Chair(s)	Scott Whitworth
School Leader(s)	Jeremy Abarno (K-4), Jill Glassbrook (5-6)
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 15
Physical Address(es)	732 Henry Street, Brooklyn 11231
Facility Owner(s)	DOE (this site is a Charter Partnership building)

School Profile

- PAVE Academy Charter School (PAVE) is an elementary and middle school which served 365 students¹ in grades K-6 during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in 2008-2009, and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's anticipated full grade span is K-8 which it expects to reach in the 2015-2016 school year. The school is located in a non DOE-operated facility in Brooklyn within Community School District (CSD) 15.²
- PAVE enrolls new students in kindergarten, but backfills empty seats in all grades. There were 951 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.³ The average attendance rate for the 2013-2014 school year to date as reported in February 2014 was 94%.⁴
- PAVE was renewed during the 2012-2013 school year for a period of five years, and is consistent with the terms of its renewal application.
- The school leadership has been stable. Jeremy Abarno, Elementary School Principal, has been with the school since 2010. Jill Glassbrook, Middle School Principal, joined the school last year as the school expanded into middle school grades. Cooper Westendarp, the school's current Chief Operating and Financial Officer, began as the school's Founding Director of Finance and Operations. Spencer Robertson, the school's Founder, continues to serve as the school's Executive Director.
- PAVE had a student to teacher ratio of 14:1 in the 2013-2014 school year, and served 13 sections across all grades, with an average class size of 27.⁵
- The lottery preferences for PAVE's 2013-2014 school year included the New York State Charter Schools Act required preferences of returning students, students residing in the community school district of the school's location and siblings of students already enrolled in the charter school.⁶

¹ Enrollment reflects ATS data from 10/31/13.

² NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System database.

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

⁴ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

⁵ Self-reported information given on 9/12/14.

⁶ PAVE Academy Charter School's 2013-2014 application.

Part 2: Summary of Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?

Overview of School-Specific Data through 2012-2013

Students scoring at or above Level 3 on the NYS assessment, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
PAVE Academy Charter School	-	35.1%	57.1%	20.9%
CSD 15	-	56.1%	60.2%	40.6%
Difference from CSD 15	-	-21.0	-3.1	-19.7
NYC	-	48.1%	50.6%	28.0%
Difference from NYC	-	-13.0	6.5	-7.1
New York State	-	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%
Difference from New York State	-	-17.7	2.0	-10.2

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
PAVE Academy Charter School	-	62.2%	94.3%	58.1%
CSD 15	-	64.8%	73.5%	44.5%
Difference from CSD 15	-	-2.6	20.8	13.6
NYC	-	54.8%	61.3%	32.7%
Difference from NYC	-	7.4	33.0	25.4
New York State	-	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%
Difference from New York State	-	-1.1	29.5	27.0

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served.

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	C	A	B
Student Progress	-	C	B	C
Student Performance	-	B	A	A
School Environment	-	A	A	A
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	-	2.9	3.0

Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals

- PAVE, according to its 2012-2013 Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED), met two of eight of its academic performance goals identified in its charter. Of the other six goals, the school did not meet five, and one was not determined because data was not available by time of submission.

Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment⁷

- PAVE's curriculum is in its third year and is aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). The school continues to refine and strengthen curricular content in both ELA and math.
- In math, PAVE continues to use Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI).
- The school developed new internal Data Analysis Reports (DARs) to provide analyses of individual students, by standard, along with longitudinal comparisons, which further school staff ability to deliver data-driven instruction. Each cycle produces a variety of tailored data, projections, and metrics for progress and success which the teachers can then use to focus on possible causes of data results and what aspects of instruction need to change for students to comprehend the concepts and demonstrate knowledge in future assessments.
- The school continues to use Amplify mCLASS Beacon (formerly Wireless Generation) to collect, analyze, and report out Common Core standard aligned student achievement data.
- The unit and interim assessments have been clearly aligned to each other and to the CCLS.
- PAVE continues to use its Response to Intervention (RtI) program to ensure that all students in need of intervention are thriving. Additionally, during the 2013-2014 school year, the school instituted a robust intervention tracking system that isolates and meets different student needs. This includes a six cycle per year approach, in which students' needs are being continually gauged.
- The school employs Learning Support Coordinators, Intervention Specialists, and an ELL Coordinator to provide learning supports.
- Due to the emphasis on data-driven instruction, the school focuses professional development on ensuring teachers are informed of the ways data is collected and opportunities for analysis.
- School leadership has redesigned lesson planning templates to incorporate specific prompts that will help teachers serve specific needs of individual students.
- The Principal or Academic Dean observes teachers to verify that they are carrying out the strategies to target specific assessment items that they developed during data meetings.

⁷ Self-reported information from school-submitted self-evaluation form on 3/25/14.

Essential Question 2: Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

After reviewing information and documentation concerning Board turnover, Board minutes, reporting structure, organizational chart, annual accountability reporting documents, Board agendas, and the school's website, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The Board has nine board members, all voting, with the exception of the Executive Director, who serves on the Board as an ex-officio member. The Board's Chair, Scott Whitworth, has served on the Board since 2010.
- As recorded in Board minutes, the Board experienced turnover of two members resigning during the 2013-2014 school year.
- As recorded in the Board's minutes, there is a clear reporting structure with school leadership providing regular updates on academic, financial, and operational performance to the Board and its committees.

School Climate & Community Engagement

After reviewing information and documentation concerning leadership turnover, staff turnover, attendance rate, student turnover, NYC School Survey results and response rates, and PTO meetings, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The school has experienced no leadership turnover with both the elementary school and middle school principals, Jeremy Abarno and Jill Glassbrook, respectively, leading the school.
- Instructional staff turnover was 7%, with three out of 30 instructional staff choosing not to return for the 2013-2014 school year from the prior year, and one instructional staff member asked not to return. As of February 2014, during the 2013-2014 school year, three instructional staff have left the school.⁸
- As of February 2014, average daily attendance for students during that school year was at 94%, which is lower than the school's charter goal of at least 95%.⁹
- Student turnover was 6.7% of students from the prior school year who did not return at the start of the 2013-2014 school year, and 10.1% of the students left the school between the start of the school year and February 2014.¹⁰
- The school did not report that they have a parent teacher organization (PTO) and no evidence was found in the school's ACR self-evaluation, Board minutes, or website.

2012-2013 NYC School Survey Results¹¹

Categories	Result	Community	Response Rate	Citywide Rate
Academic Expectations	Above Average	Parents	83%	54%
Communication	Above Average	Teachers	100%	83%
Engagement	Average	Students	N/A	83%
Safety & Respect	Above Average			

⁸ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

⁹ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

¹⁰ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

¹¹ Results are particular to the school type as identified in the 2013 School Survey.

Financial Health

Near-term financial obligations:

- Based on the FY13 financial audit and follow up, the school's current ratio indicated an ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit and follow up, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover at least one month of its operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-2014 budget to actual enrollment as of the last day of school revealed that the school had not met its enrollment target, indicating a variance from projected general education revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

Financial sustainability based on current practices:

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus over the three audited fiscal years, and in FY13 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated overall positive cash flow from FY11 to FY13, though the school had negative cash flow in FY12.

Annual Independent Financial Audit

- An independent audit performed for FY 13 showed no material findings.

Essential Question 3: Compliance with charter and all applicable laws and regulations?

After a review of documentation submitted for the NYC DOE annual accountability reporting requirements for the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE finds the following:

Board Compliance

The Board is in compliance with:

- The Board's membership size falls within the range of no fewer than seven and no more than 13, as outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board has held the number of Board meetings, a minimum of nine, as outlined in its bylaws. Based on submitted Board minutes, the Board held nine meetings for the 2013-2014 school year, in which quorum was reached.

The Board is out of compliance with:

- Currently, officer positions outlined in the Board's bylaws are filled, with the exception of the Vice Chair and Secretary positions.

School Compliance

The school is in compliance with (as reviewed during May 2014):

- All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification.
- The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.
- The school has posted its annual audit to its website, as specified in charter law.
- The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- The school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 2, 2014 adhering to charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1.
- The school has posted its 2013-2013 NYSED Annual Report to its website, as specified in charter law.

The school is out of compliance with:

- None of the school leaders were trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department as of May 2014.

Essential Question 4: What are the school’s plans for the next charter term?

As reported by the school’s leadership, the following is noted:

- Although PAVE is at its full grade span of K-8, the Board of Trustees is considering replicating the school by opening a second school with a similar model in North Carolina.

Enrollment and Retention Targets

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, “to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets” for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate “Repeated failure to comply with the requirement” as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate “that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students” in the event it has not yet met its targets.
 - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school’s performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
- In school year 2013-2014 (as well as the prior three years), PAVE served a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to the CSD 15 average, but a lower percentage than the citywide average. The school served students with disabilities and English Language Learner students at lower rates than the CSD 15 and citywide averages.

Special Populations

School	Free and Reduced Price Lunch					Students with Disabilities					English Language Learners				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
		87.7%	59.9%	58.5%	59.5%	63.6%	14.5%	16.4%	12.9%	15.1%	17.0%	2.2%	4.0%	5.4%	4.7%
CSD 15	49.9%	55.0%	53.3%	51.4%	55.0%	18.7%	18.2%	17.6%	17.4%	17.8%	19.1%	19.5%	19.4%	19.7%	19.4%
NYC	62.1%	65.3%	68.1%	69.8%	73.5%	15.9%	15.9%	15.7%	16.1%	17.1%	16.1%	16.1%	15.5%	15.0%	14.7%

Additional Enrollment Information					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	K-2	K-3	K-4	K-5	K-6
CSD(s)	15	15	15	15	15

Comparisons to both the CSD(s) and City are made against students in grades K-8, 9-12 or K-12 depending on the grades the school served in each school year. Special population figures are as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.