



**STATEN ISLAND COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL  
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR  
DECEMBER 2014**

# Table of Contents

<b>PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
I.    CHARTER SCHOOL OVERVIEW: .....	2
<i>Background Information .....</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Overview of School-Specific Data .....</i>	<i>3</i>
II.   RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE .....	6
<b>PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>PART 4: FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<i>Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? ...</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<b>PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS .....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA .....</b>	<b>49</b>

## Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

### I. Charter School Overview:

#### Background Information

Staten Island Community Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Ellen Icolari
School Leader(s)	Dr. Nicole Richardson Garcia – Principal and Chief Academic Officer Lorna Harris – Chief Operating Officer
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 31
Physical Address(es)	320 St. Marks Place, Staten Island (Kindergarten)
	309 St Paul's Avenue, Staten Island (Grades 1-5)
Facility Owner(s)	Private
School Opened For Instruction	2010-2011
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	12/14/2014
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-5
Current Authorized Enrollment	330
Proposed New Charter Term	1.5 years [December 15, 2014 – June 30, 2016]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-5
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	330
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	2-3 (two sections per grade across all grades but one to accommodate for one larger incoming cohort) <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Please see the Additional Enrollment Data table on page 13 for more information.

## Overview of School-Specific Data

### School Evaluation of Academic Goals as stated in Annual Report to NYSED and Renewal Application to NYC DOE

Academic Goal Analysis					
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	Cumulative Charter Term Total
Total Achievable Goals	18	18	18	18	72
# Met	2	3	3	0	8
# Partially Met	0	0	0	0	0
# Not Met	2	7	9	10	28
# Not Applicable *	14	8	6	8	36
% Met	11%	17%	17%	0%	11%
% Partially Met	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% Not Met	11%	39%	50%	56%	39%
% Not Applicable *	78%	44%	33%	44%	50%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	50%	30%	25%	0%	22%

\* Some goals may not be applicable in all years. For example, goals related to the NYC Progress Report are not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year as Progress Reports were not issued that year. Please refer to Part IV, Mission and Academic Goals for more information.

### ES/MS students scoring at or above Level 3 on NYS assessments, compared to CSD, NYC and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>	-	-	9.3%	22.5%
CSD 31	-	-	32.8%	35.4%
Difference from CSD 31 *	-	-	-23.5	-12.9
NYC	-	-	28.1%	30.5%
Difference from NYC *	-	-	-18.8	-8.0
New York State **	-	-	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-	-	-21.8	-8.1

<b>% Proficient in Mathematics</b>				
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>	-	-	13.0%	19.5%
CSD 31	-	-	37.4%	43.5%
Difference from CSD 31 *	-	-	-24.4	-24.0
NYC	-	-	33.1%	39.3%
Difference from NYC *	-	-	-20.1	-19.8
New York State **	-	-	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-	-	-18.1	-16.7

\* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served. CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.

\*\* New York State proficiency rates were taken from data.nysed.gov.

### Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

<b>Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts</b>				
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School – All Students</b>	-	-	-	<b>51.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	-	-	-	10.4%
City Percent of Range - All Students	-	-	-	10.6%
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School – School's Lowest Third</b>	-	-	-	<b>54.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	-	-	0.0%
City Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	-	-	0.0%

<b>Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics</b>				
	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>	<b>2013-2014</b>
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School – All Students</b>	-	-	-	<b>42.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	-	-	-	11.3%
City Percent of Range- All Students	-	-	-	6.0%
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School – School's Lowest Third</b>	-	-	-	<b>56.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	-	-	19.1%
City Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	-	-	10.2%

A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A peer/city percent of range of 50% represents the position of the average and can be interpreted as a school outperforming 50% of their peer group/city.

### Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	-	0.0%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	-
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	-	-	25.0%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	-	33.3%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	-
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	-	-	21.7%

\* Defined as students with a placement in Self-Contained, ICT, or SETSS.

## II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 1.5 year short term renewal with an academic performance condition.

The academic performance condition is as follows:

**Academic Performance Conditions:**

- The school must demonstrate academic growth, as measured by the school's median adjusted growth percentile in ELA, for each year of the charter term. The median adjusted growth percentile for the school's students will be at or above 50 percent of city percent of range for ELA in each year of the charter term.
- The school must demonstrate academic growth, as measured by the school's median adjusted growth percentile in math, for each year of the charter term. The median adjusted growth percentile for the school's students will be at or above 50 percent of city percent of range for math in each year of the charter term.

**Global Condition**

By the time of evaluation for renewal, the School must have met or exceeded 70 percent of the applicable DOE mandated goals, as well as all applicable absolute performance goals, as set forth herein in Exhibit D in order to be eligible for renewal. Failure to meet at least 70 percent of the mandated goals may result in NYC DOE recommendation to the Regents for non-renewal at the conclusion of the charter term.

### **A. Academic Performance**

At the time of this school's renewal, Staten Island Community Charter School ("SICCS") has not yet demonstrated academic success.

#### **New York Charter Schools Act**

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include:

#### **§ 2850 (2)**

- (a) Improve student learning and achievement;
- (b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- (c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- (d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- (e) Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system; and
- (f) Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems by holding the schools established under this article accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

Available data for Staten Island Community Charter School indicate that the school has made some progress towards meeting these objectives.

#### **Mission and Vision**

Staten Island Community Charter School's mission is to provide an exemplary K - 8 education program for students on the North Shore of Staten Island, a program designed to produce a community of smart, responsible, creative, citizens who will graduate ready to attend college preparatory high schools. The school offers an instructional program that is aligned to the NYS Common Core Learning Standards. Staten Island Community will hold expectations high and inspire student achievement by cultivating close relationships between the school administration, students, teachers and parents.



### **School Specific Academic Performance**

Staten Island Community Charter School entered its fifth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. As a result, the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has two years of New York State (NYS) assessment data and four years of other academic data, such as data obtained from internal assessments and attendance information, to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of students at SICCS.

SICCS has consistently performed below Community School District (CSD) 31 and New York City averages on NYS assessments during the current charter term.

Beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, NYS assessments were aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (“CCLS”). As such, proficiency rates for school years prior to the 2012-2013 school year are not directly comparable. However, as the school had its first year of testing in 2012-2013, all proficiency results are aligned to the CCLS.

In 2012-2013, only 13.0% of SICCS’s students were proficient in math. SICCS’s math proficiency was higher than 15% of elementary schools citywide. However, when compared to elementary schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools) SICCS outperformed only 5% of similar schools. In 2012-2013, only 9.3% of SICCS’s students demonstrated proficiency in state tests in ELA. With this level of proficiency, SICCS outperformed just 15% of elementary schools citywide. Additionally, SICCS only outperformed 8% of its peer schools.

The following year, in 2013-2014, only 19.5% of SICCS’s students were proficient in math. SICCS’s math proficiency was higher than 23% of elementary schools citywide. However, when compared to elementary schools with student populations most like its own, SICCS outperformed only 10% of similar schools. In 2013-2014, only 22.5% of SICCS’s students demonstrated proficiency in state tests in ELA. With this level of proficiency, SICCS outperformed just 47% of elementary schools citywide. Additionally, SICCS only outperformed 38% of its peer schools.

Over the four years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, Staten Island Community Charter School has met only 22% of its applicable academic charter goals.<sup>2,3</sup> In its most recent year, 2013-2014, SICCS met zero of 10 applicable academic charter goals. The school has demonstrated a trend of decreased achievement of its stated charter goals over the four years of the charter term under review.

In 2013-2014, SICCS’ English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile was 51% with a City Percent of Range of 10.6%, placing the school in the bottom 5% of elementary schools citywide.<sup>4</sup> SICCS’s Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile was 42% with a City Percent of Range of 6.0%, which also placed the school in the bottom 5% of elementary schools citywide.

---

<sup>2</sup> This calculation does not include goals which have not been evaluated (not applicable) either as a result of the goal no longer being measurable (e.g. NYC DOE Progress Report grades for the 2013-2014 school year and beyond) or the goal not yet measurable for the school at the time of the annual reporting (e.g. high school graduation rate for an academic year in which the school was not serving grade 12 students).

<sup>3</sup> It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school’s actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and Math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

<sup>4</sup> A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A percentile rank provides the percentage of schools that score the same or lower than the school under consideration. A City Percent of Range of 10.6% indicates that the school fell only 10.6% inside the range around the average (i.e. more than one standard deviation below the average), while a Citywide percentile of 5% indicates that only 5% of schools serving similar grade levels scored below the school.

As indicated in Appendix A, third grade ELA proficiency increased by 21.9 percentage points from the 2012-2013 school year to the 2013-2014 school year. The gap in third grade ELA proficiency between that of the school and CSD 31 shrank by 18.9 percentage points over that time period. As indicated in Appendix A, third grade math proficiency increased by 10.7 percentage points from the 2012-2013 school year to the 2013-2014 school year. The gap in third grade math proficiency between that of the school and CSD 31 shrank by 4.7 percentage points over that same period.

Reports from past NYC DOE visits to Staten Island Community Charter School indicate that in the first two years of the charter the school provided a safe environment conducive to learning. In a visit to the school in April 2012, reviewers noted that “the school uses the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP) and the use of Peace Corners was evident in observed classrooms.

The school also implemented Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) with consultants providing in-service training and follow up. Each grade has created a plan with specific rules and consequences that are posted consistently throughout the school. Observed teachers established clear routines and procedures, which students appeared to have internalized. For example, one teacher had a behavior log book that students were expected to sign if they misbehaved. Positive reinforcement of expected behaviors was observed in most classrooms.”

On the school’s 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, Staten Island Community Charter School received a C grade in all sections except School Environment, for which they received a B grade. In 2012-2013, the school was classified by the NYC DOE as an Early Childhood School; Early Childhood schools do not receive a percentile rank therefore no percentile rank was included in the Progress Report.

NYC DOE Progress Reports graded each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and were based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores were based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of 40 schools with similar student populations and to all schools citywide. The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report was the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constituted 60% of a school’s grade. The grade in this section was primarily based on median adjusted growth percentiles,<sup>5</sup> which measure students’ growth on state tests relative to other students with the same prior-year score. Although the NYC DOE Progress Report was discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, individual academic performance metrics from the former NYC DOE Progress Report are included in this renewal report for all years for which data was available in the current charter term.

### **Closing the Achievement Gap**

NYC DOE-authorized charter schools are also assessed based on their ability to close the achievement gap for specific student populations. In school years prior to the 2013-2014 school year, schools received additional credit on the NYC DOE Progress Report for progress and performance of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, charter schools will be assessed on the actual performance as well as the academic growth of students in these populations compared with public school students in the CSD and throughout New York City.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 21.7% of Staten Island Community Charter School’s students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places SICCS above 4% of elementary schools citywide. Similarly, 25% of

---

<sup>5</sup> A student’s growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. To evaluate a school on its students’ growth percentile, the NYC DOE uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students’ demographic characteristics and reflect average differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The NYC DOE evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

SICCS students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores. This places SICCS above only 1% of all elementary schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 33.3% of SICCS's students with disabilities<sup>6</sup> experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places SICCS above 24% of elementary schools citywide. However, 0% of SICCS's students with disabilities experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores. This places SICCS above 0% of all elementary schools citywide.

SICCS did not serve the minimum number of students designated as English Language Learners to receive data on the percent of English Language Learner students who experienced growth in math or ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting scores.

---

<sup>6</sup> Defined as students with a placement in Self-Contained, ICT, or SETSS

## **B. Governance, Operations & Finances**

Staten Island Community Charter School is a partially operationally sound and fiscally viable organization. This assessment was made based on a review of the following indicators of operational and fiscal viability:

- Staten Island Community Charter School's FY11 mid-year, FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- Staten Island Community Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- Staten Island Community Charter School's 2014-2015 student/family handbook;
- Staten Island Community Charter School's FY15 budget;
- Staten Island Community Charter School's Board of Trustees financial disclosure forms;
- Staten Island Community Charter School's Board of Trustees minutes;
- Staten Island Community Charter School's Board of Trustees by-laws; and
- Staten Island Community Charter School's self-reported staffing data.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has partially maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. Although Board member size does fall within the range outlined in the school's charter, there is no evidence of active committees on the Board. In addition, there has been turnover on the board since the school's founding – between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years the Board lost three members and gained two new members. Required documentation for these additions and resignations was only submitted to the NYC DOE for one board member change. To date, the Board has six active board members as evidenced by the school's website and minutes. Based on this level of Board membership, quorum at Board meetings was achieved for all Board meetings in the 2013-2014 school year.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has not yet developed a stable school culture, but recently made efforts towards developing a stable school culture by hiring a new principal and Chief Operating Officer. The school principal, Michael Courtney, was terminated in December 2013; a new principal was not appointed until May 2014, leaving the school without a principal for five months. A former Board member, Lorna Harris, resigned from the Board to join the school as a full-time Director of Institutional Advancement and External Affairs in August 2013. Later that year, after Dr. Courtney was terminated, to ensure the school had operational stability until an instructional leader was employed, the Board appointed Lorna interim Chief Operating Officer (CEO). The school has also experienced significant turnover in instructional staff; of 32 instructional staff members in 2013-2014, 22 instructional staff members, or 68%, resigned.<sup>7</sup>

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has at least 116 days of unrestricted cash on hand to meet obligations. Based on the fiscal year 2014 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations and its current ratio of 5.09 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.

Overall, the school is financially sustainable based on its current practices.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits.

## **C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations**

Over the charter term, Staten Island Community Charter School has been compliant with most applicable laws and regulations.

The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification. The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff

---

<sup>7</sup> Reflects self-reported data submitted with Renewal Application in November 2014

members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools.

The school has submitted its required safety plan. 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 submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.

For the 2014-2015 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 9, 2014 adhering to charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1. Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently adhere to this requirement.

One or more of the school leaders were trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.

The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be out of compliance with federal law related to students with disabilities and due process regulations.

Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently submit complete invoicing and reconciliation documents by the associated deadlines.

As of the review in November 2014, all staff members except for one have appropriate fingerprint clearance. There is one staff member whose fingerprint clearance is outstanding.

Although the Board held the required number of meetings per the Board's bylaws in all years of the charter term (10 meetings per year), the Board has not held the number of board meetings required by the Charter School Act, which requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months per year.

Board agenda items and minutes have been made available to the public for inspection via posting on the school's website. All Board members have submitted financial disclosure forms as part of the 2013 NYSED Annual Report; however, the Board did not consistently submit board resignation notices or new board member credentials within the required five days of change to the Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) for review and, if necessary, approval.

#### **D. Plans for Next Charter Term**

Staten Island Community Charter School's mission is to provide an exemplary K - 8 education program for students on the North Shore of Staten Island, a program designed to produce a community of smart, responsible, creative, citizens who will graduate ready to attend college preparatory high schools. The school offers an instructional program that is aligned to the NYS Common Core Learning Standards. Staten Island Community will hold expectations high and inspire student achievement by cultivating close relationships between the school administration, students, teachers and parents. In an effort to stabilize and strengthen the structure of its elementary school grades, the Board has decided not to extend its programming to include middle school next school year and for the foreseeable future.

## Part 2: School Overview and History

Staten Island Community Charter School is an elementary school serving 326 students<sup>8</sup> in grades kindergarten through five during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2010-2011 school-year with kindergarten and first grades and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's authorized full grade span is grades kindergarten through five, which it reached this school year, 2014-2015. The school's current charter term expires on December 14, 2014.<sup>9</sup> The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in two privately operated facilities in Community School District 31, in Staten Island.

Staten Island Community Charter School is an elementary school located on the North Shore of Staten Island. The school offers an instructional program that is aligned to the New York State Common Core Learning Standards and the school sets out to produce a community of smart, responsible and creative citizens. The school offers instruction in a second language beginning in kindergarten and has an enriched academic program that moves students out of the classroom and into the community through collaborations with Staten Island Museum and other cultural institutions throughout New York City.

To reach its goals, the school partners with a paid services vendor, Charter School Business Management. Charter School Business Management provides, via contract with the school, back office support and other financial supportive services. SICCS manages student information via the DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system and invoices through the NYC DOE vendor portal. The annual budget is created by the Board of Trustees of the school. SICCS's Board of Trustees is solely responsible for complying with all requirements of grants for the school, the school's governing charter, and all applicable laws.

Staten Island Community Charter School's Board of Trustees is led by chair Ellen Icolari. Ms. Icolari is the school's founder as well as a member of the school's Board. The elementary school is led by Principal/Chief Academic Officer Dr. Nicole Richardson-Garcia, who joined the school in May 2014. The principal, Michael Courtney, was terminated from his position as principal in December 2013. The school also has a Chief Operating Officer, Lorna Harris, who was initially a Board member but resigned from the Board in August 2013 to join the school as a full-time employee immediately after that.

The school typically enrolls new students in kindergarten through a lottery and backfills empty spaces that become available from the wait list, in lower grades only. There were 553 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery.<sup>10</sup>

Over the charter term, the school enrolled and served students as follows with average class size and section count noted for the most recently completed school year, 2013-2014.

---

<sup>8</sup> ATS data as of October 31, 2014

<sup>9</sup> NYC DOE internal data

<sup>10</sup> Reflects self-reported data submitted with the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

## Enrollment

Grade-Level Annual Enrollment *	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Kindergarten	70	49	55	54
Grade 1	27	75	55	52
Grade 2	-	49	78	54
Grade 3	-	-	50	79
Grade 4	-	-	-	54
Grade 5	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Enrollment</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>293</b>

\* Enrollment figures reflect ATS data as of October 31 for each school year with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.

## Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	2	27
Grade 1	2	26
Grade 2	2	27
Grade 3	3	26
Grade 4	2	27
Grade 5	-	-
<b>Students Admitted Through The Lottery</b>	<b>56</b>	

\* Lottery and section count information are based on self-reported data from the 2013-2014 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. Average Class Sizes were determined by dividing ATS enrollment as of October 31, 2013 by the appropriate grade-level section count.

Please see additional demographic data in Section 4 of this report for information regarding the enrollment of special populations at Staten Island Community Charter School. This information includes enrollment data for the percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners and students with disabilities as compared to the CSD and citywide averages, as well as proposed targets established by the New York State Education Department (NYSED).<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, Board of Regents authorized charter schools, including those authorized by the NYC DOE, will be held accountable to enrollment targets once established by NYSED for students with disabilities, English Language Learner students, and students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch.

## Part 3: Renewal Report Overview

### Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding the charter school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during the current charter term, including but not limited to oversight visits, annual reports, and formal correspondence between the school and its authorizer, the NYC DOE, all of which are conducted in order to evaluate and monitor the charter school's academic, fiscal, and operational performance. Additionally, the NYC DOE incorporates into this report its findings from the renewal application process, which includes a written application, a report on student achievement data and a school visit by the Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) and other staff from the NYC DOE.

Upon review of all relevant materials, a recommendation is made to the NYC DOE Chancellor. The Chancellor's determination, and the findings on which that decision is based, are then submitted to the New York State Board of Regents.

### Is the school an academic success?

To assess whether a school is an academic success, the NYC DOE considers performance measures including, but not limited to, the following (as appropriate for grades served):

- New York State ELA and Math assessment absolute results;
- New York State Regents exams passage rates;
- Comparative proficiency for elementary and middle schools, including growth rates for ELA and Math proficiency;
- Comparative graduation rates and Regents completion rates for high schools;
- Closing the achievement gap performance relative to CSD or New York City public schools;
- New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) or other approved alternate assessments; and
- Performance data pertaining to college and career readiness.

Academic success is rated as **Demonstrated, Partially Demonstrated, or Not Yet Demonstrated.**

### Is the school a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization, OSDCP focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the National Association of Charter School Authorizer's Core Performance Framework.<sup>12</sup>

The NYC DOE considers a variety of supporting materials and data, including but not limited to the following:

- Board of Trustee bylaws;
- Board of Trustee meeting minutes;
- Annual Reports submitted by the school to the New York State Education Department (NYSED);
- NYC DOE School Surveys;
- Data collection sheets provided by schools;
- Student, staff, and Board turnover rates;
- Audits of authorized enrollment numbers; and
- Annual financial audits.

A school's Governance Structure & Organizational Design and Climate & Community Engagement are rated as **Developed, Partially Developed, or Not Yet Developed.** A school's Financial Health is rated to

---

<sup>12</sup> Please refer to the following website for more information:  
[http://nacsa.mycrowdwisdom.com/diweb/catalog/item/id/126547/q/%20q=performance\\*20framework&c=82](http://nacsa.mycrowdwisdom.com/diweb/catalog/item/id/126547/q/%20q=performance*20framework&c=82)

indicate whether there are concerns about the near-term financial obligations and the financial sustainability of the school.

**Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?**

As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with relevant laws and regulations as identified in the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework.

**Staff Representatives**

The following experts participated in the review of this school, including the renewal visit to the school conducted over two separate occasions: June 3, 2014 and September 17, 2014:

- Sonya Hooks, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Andrea McLean, former Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kim Wong, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Meera Jain, Director of Evaluation and Policy, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Caitlin Robisch, Director of Analytics, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Paul Yen, Data Analyst, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships

## Part 4: Findings

### Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal, Staten Island Community Charter School has not yet demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

#### High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has four years of academic performance data and two years of New York State (NYS) assessment data at the time of this report. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A.

NOTE: The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 ELA and math proficiency percentages should not be compared directly with prior-year results. Unlike prior years, proficiency on the NYS assessments for ELA and math in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 were based on the Common Core Learning Standards – a more demanding set of knowledge and skills necessary for 21<sup>st</sup> century college and career readiness. However, as SICCS had its first year of testing in 2012-2013, all proficiency results are aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards.

#### ES/MS students scoring at or above Level 3 on NYS assessments, compared to CSD, NYC and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>	-	-	9.3%	22.5%
CSD 31	-	-	32.8%	35.4%
Difference from CSD 31 *	-	-	-23.5	-12.9
NYC	-	-	28.1%	30.5%
Difference from NYC *	-	-	-18.8	-8.0
New York State **	-	-	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-	-	-21.8	-8.1

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>	-	-	13.0%	19.5%
CSD 31	-	-	37.4%	43.5%
Difference from CSD 31 *	-	-	-24.4	-24.0
NYC	-	-	33.1%	39.3%
Difference from NYC *	-	-	-20.1	-19.8
New York State **	-	-	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-	-	-18.1	-16.7

\* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served. CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.

\*\* New York State proficiency rates were taken from data.nysed.gov.

### Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Elementary School Progress Report Grades	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Overall Grade	-	-	C	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	-	-	C	
Student Performance	-	-	C	
School Environment	-	-	B	

### Mission and Academic Goals

According to the school's Renewal Application submitted to the NYC DOE, as well as annual reports submitted to the New York State Education Department (NYSED), over each of the four years in the charter term during which the school was open, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- 2 of 4 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 3 of 10 in the second year,
- 3 of 12 in the third year,<sup>13</sup> and
- 0 of 10 in the fourth year.

### Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals \*

Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1. 80% of students in grades kindergarten through two will reach exit benchmark level for the grade or better as measured by the spring reading assessment using the Fountas and Pinnell Reading Assessment System. Constitutes a performance level of 3 (on grade level).	Met	Met	Not Met	Not Met
2. 80% of third through fifth graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met
3. 80% of students in grades kindergarten through two will master grade level math skills as measured by summative assessments provided by Sadlier – Oxford: Progress in Mathematics and teacher-created summative assessments.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A
4. 80% of third through fifth graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met

<sup>13</sup> It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and Math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that refer to comparative academic performance of the school (e.g. to the Community School District) were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

Academic Goals		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
5.	85% of fourth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6.	85% of fifth graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7.	Students will exhibit improved performance on Fountas and Pinnell Reading Assessment System.	Met	Met	Met	Not Met
8.	Grade-level cohorts of the same students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met
9.	Grade-level cohorts of the same students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Math exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Math exam.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met
10.	Students will perform in the top quartile of their graduation cohort on Terra Nova exam - ELA.	N/A	Not Met	Not Met	N/A
11.	The percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will place the school in the top quartile among peer schools.	N/A	N/A	Not Met	Not Met
12.	Students will perform in the top quartile of their graduation cohort on Terra Nova exam - Math.	N/A	Not Met	Not Met	N/A
13.	The percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will place the school in the top quartile among peer schools.	N/A	N/A	Not Met	Not Met
14.	The school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Annual Report.	N/A	Met	Met	N/A
15.	80% of students in grades kindergarten through two will master grade level math skills as measured by summative assessments provided by Math in Focus.	N/A	Not Met	Not Met	N/A
16.	80% of students in grades kindergarten through two will master grade level ELA skills as measured by summative assessments.	N/A	Not Met	Not Met	N/A
17.	Each year, beginning in Grade 1, grade level cohorts of students will reduce by one-half the gap between their average score in the previous year's administration of a nationally norm referenced ELA and Math test (such as the Terra Nova) and [an average NCE of 50] in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds the national average in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year. <sup>14</sup>	N/A	Not Met	Met	Not Met
18.	The school will have a daily student attendance rate of at least 95%.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

<sup>14</sup> Please note that the goal supplied by the school to both the NYC DOE and NYSED reads as follows: "Each year, beginning in grade 1, grade level cohorts of students will reduce by one-half the gap between their average score in the previous year's administration of a nationally norm referenced ELA and Math test (such as the Terra Nova) and their average score in the current year. If a grade-level cohort exceeds the national average in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year." The NYC DOE has interpreted this goal to refer to a reduction in the gap between previous year's average NCE and an average NCE of 50 in the current year.

\* Goals were self-reported by the school in the school's Renewal Application submitted to NYC DOE and 2013-2014 Annual Report documentation submitted to NYSED.

## Responsive Education Program

One of the school's academic goals during the course of its charter term was to administer the Terra Nova exam in Reading and Math in order to analyze student proficiency and progress in ELA and math. The school set a goal to reduce by one-half the gap between its average score on the previous year's administration of the exam and an average Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) of 50 on the current year's exam. Students performing at grade level on the TerraNova Assessments achieve an NCE of 50 or above.<sup>15</sup> The following data was reported by the school:<sup>16</sup>

- The school submitted no documentation to the NYC DOE related to the 2011-2012 TerraNova test administration(s).
- In 2012-2013 the school administered the TerraNova in both the Fall and the Spring in order to measure growth. The school met its goal of reducing by one-half the gap between its baseline average score in the earlier administration of the exam and an NCE of 50.

Grade Level	ELA			Math		
	Average Fall NCE	Goal	Average Spring NCE	Average Fall NCE	Goal	Average Spring NCE
1	37.0	43.5	51.0	34.2	42.1	46.2
2	45.2	47.6	52.4	43.3	46.7	54.0
3	45.1	47.6	48.7	40.4	45.2	54.0

- In 2013-2014 the school did not meet its goal of reducing by one-half the gap between its baseline average score in the earlier administration of the exam and an NCE of 50.<sup>17</sup>

Grade Level	ELA			Math		
	Previous Year's Average NCE	Goal	Current Year's Average NCE	Previous Year's Average NCE	Goal	Current Year's Average NCE
3	48.7	49.4	48.5	54.0	54+	46.8

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on June 3, 2014 and September 17, 2014. Based on discussion, document review and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**
  - The school adopted the Understanding by Design curriculum design and planning framework which focuses on helping students come to an understanding of important ideas and transfer their learning to new situations that support a real world connection.

<sup>15</sup> NCE is the Normal Curve Equivalent. This curve was designed to be used in the evaluation of compensatory education and other special programs. The range is from 1 to 99 and coincides with the NP scale at 1, 50, and 99. NCEs are normalized equal interval scores and are not recommended for use in reporting individual student scores since the NCE is easily confused with the NP.

<sup>16</sup> Progress towards this goal was self-reported by the school to the NYC DOE as part of its Renewal Application, as well as to NYSED for the 2013-2014 Annual Report.

<sup>17</sup> Due to a change in state regulation, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals. As such, only the school's third grade results are applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.

- School leadership reported hiring consultants to develop curriculum maps and detailed monthly unit plans in which Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) are used to ensure adequate coverage of topics and rigor.
- School leadership reported that the school has been focused on building student's writing and reading skills to be better prepared for CCLS through:
  - Building test taking strategies and stamina and
  - Teaching students close reading techniques, practicing text annotation, and RACE response.
- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**
  - SICCS uses an integrated co-teaching (ICT) model to support the mainstream education of students with special needs. A special education teacher works at each grade level in a collaborative setting with a general education teacher; teachers work as a team to provide instruction to all students, modifying instruction and accommodating students with an Individual Education Program (IEP).
  - There is a teacher assistant in classes that do not have an ICT teacher.
  - Classroom teachers and teaching assistants engage with Response to Intervention; struggling students are identified for Tier 2 (classroom teachers) or Tier 3 (Title I/ Academic Intervention Services Teacher) services through interim and local assessment data. Strategies are employed daily and progress is monitored by the teachers and the school's Student Success Team.
  - An English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher works collaboratively with classroom teachers to provide language support to qualifying students that are non-native English speakers. The instructor provides a combination of push-in and pull-out instruction; student learning is aligned to both content objectives and language objectives.
  - A Title I Teacher services students that are both economically disadvantaged and working below academic benchmarks. This teacher provides a combination of push-in and pull-out instruction; academic gaps are identified and lessons are designed to fill these gaps and support students as they work their way towards meeting grade-level expectations.
  - An Academic Intervention Services (AIS) teacher serves students that may or may not be economically disadvantaged but are working below academic benchmarks. This teacher provides a combination of push-in and pull-out instruction; academic gaps are identified and lessons are designed to fill these gaps and support students as they work their way towards meeting grade-level expectations.
  - Special Education Teachers, the Title I Teacher, the ESL Teacher and the AIS Teacher work collaboratively with the Director of Teaching and Learning, the academic consultants and the Special Education Consultant to analyze assessments to identify student need, to develop interventions for at-risk students and to progress monitor results towards reaching academic goals.
  - A Student Success Team meets on a weekly basis and provides a forum through which teachers can present the challenges of a struggling student and receive recommended interventions from a panel of experts, including the Director of Teaching and Learning, the Dean of Students/ Social Worker, Special Education Consultant, Speech and Language Teacher and School Nurse.
  - The Director of Teaching and Learning, academic consultants and the Special Education consultant work closely with the Special Education Teachers, the Title I Teacher, the ESL Teacher and the AIS Teacher to plan targeted instruction and track student growth.
  - Professional development throughout the year has focused on topics such as Ready to Learn (RTL), strategies to support at-risk students, and differentiated strategies to support student learning.
  - The school has developed a more comprehensive system to collect and analyze student data and use it to improve student achievement. Each year the school has moved deeper into this process. Teachers administer a range of formative and summative assessments to evaluate student mastery of key standards.

- The school is assessing all students using i-Ready, a computer assisted diagnostic system that assesses students and provides computer-assisted interventions. The computer assisted intervention program will inform the school's planning for a new summer program and an afterschool program for 2014-2015 school year.
- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**
  - During the renewal visit, 20 classrooms in grades kindergarten through five were observed with the school's leadership team.
  - In all observed classes, there were two teachers co-teaching following either Integrated Co-Teaching with one general education teacher and one Special Education teacher or with a lead teacher and teacher assistant.
  - Class-sizes ranged from 19 to 22 students in size.
  - Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations included some basic fact recall, but mostly challenged students to demonstrate understanding or to analyze and apply. Teachers asked students to identify the rising action/climax/feeling action and students were able to articulate expectations.
  - In most rooms, checks for understanding that included questioning, polling, classwork, teacher observation, and frequent use of student turn and talk, were observed.
  - In most observed classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, and products, through small group instruction or independent practice, was observed. These were consistent with the school model.
  - In all observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
  - In most observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were off task for a short duration.
  - Based on debriefs with the school's leadership team members after classroom visits, all classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.
- The school replaced Measures of Academic Progress (MAP) testing with i-Ready, a computer-based diagnostic tool that supports the use of computer-based lessons and practice activities for students. The i-Ready system supports students in the acquisition of skills identified as gaps during the diagnostic test and tracks progress towards these skills/ goals.
  - All of the school's current students will be tested in the spring using i-Ready; results will be used for placement purposes for the upcoming school year and shared with teachers for support and guidance with summer curriculum writing and planning.
- The school established a more comprehensive system to administer and collect student data, analyze student data and use it to improve student achievement for the 2014-2015 academic year.
  - A data cycle was created where teachers review a dashboard on a monthly basis. The data is initially presented to the school data team and reviewed. This is then shared in grade team meetings and content meetings as well as in full staff discussions. The data is reviewed by the academic team and finally presented to the board each month.

## **Learning Environment**

NYC DOE representatives conducted interviews with 12 teachers. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received school-based professional development both in the summer and weekly during the school year, with the school administration providing resources.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through both formal (i.e. CCLS-based tests and TerraNova) and informal assessments (i.e. observational notes and exit slips assessments) for groupings and lesson planning.

- According to the 2013-2014 School Survey Report, most parents strongly agree that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child and that the school has high expectations for their child.<sup>18</sup>
- According to the 2013-2014 School Survey Report, 48% of teachers agree with the statement “at my school order and discipline are maintained” and 76% disagree with the statement “at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school.”<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 59% of parent respondents strongly agree that SICCS has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 38% agree with the statement. Similarly, 59% of parent respondents strongly agree that SICCS has high expectations for their child; another 38% agree with the statement.

<sup>19</sup> According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 4% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at SICCS; another 44% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 4% strongly agree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; another 20% agree with the statement.

## **Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?**

### **Governance Structure & Organizational Design**

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has partially developed its governance structure and organizational design.

On September 17, 2014 as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE met with a representation of the school's Board of Trustees independent of the school leadership team. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has six active members. This level of membership is consistent within the levels established in the Board's by laws: a minimum of five members and maximum of 11.
- The Board's Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer, specified positions in the bylaws, are currently filled with no vacancies.
- The Board's bylaws reference functioning committees, including an Executive Committee, Academic Committee, Finance Committee, and Nominating Committee; however, neither the meeting minutes nor the board roster indicates that these committees are active.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes across 24 meetings reviewed.
- Between the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school year, the board gained three new members and lost three members. Required documentation for these changes was submitted for only one of these Board member changes.
- The Principal/CAO and Chief Operating Officer (COO) update the Board on academic progress, operations, and financial standing at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes. The Principal and Chief Operating Officer update the Board at standing monthly meetings.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organization chart.
- The school's founder, Ellen Icolari, is still a member of the school's Board.
- The former principal, Michael Courtney was terminated from his position as principal in December 2013, and the school was without a principal from December 2013 until May 2014.
- The new school leader, Dr. Nicole Richardson-Garcia, joined the school in May 2014.
- The school leadership team provides monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes. However, when the school was without a principal from December 2013 until May 2014, the Board relied on Lorna Harris, former Board member and now Chief Operating Officer, to provide monthly updates on academic, financial, and operational performance to Board and its committees.

### **School Climate & Community Engagement**

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has not developed a stable school culture.

- To date, the school has not met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95%. Average daily attendance for students over the four year charter term is 92.9% according to the data in the table below.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> The table reflects school self-reported attendance data for school years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 and attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) database for school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. Please note that the school self-reported different attendance rates than those recorded in ATS for the last two years, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The school self-reported attendance rates of 93.2% and 93.6% for school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, respectively. The table reflects ATS data for those years.

## Average Attendance

Elementary School Attendance				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School *</b>	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>92.1%</b>	<b>92.9%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>
NYC **	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	-0.2	-1.8	-0.7	0.3

\* Attendance was self-reported by the school for school years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. For school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 attendance was taken from ATS.

\*\* NYC attendance figures reflect average attendance across all general education district schools as reflected in ATS.

- Staff turnover has not been consistent over the charter term. In year one, year two, and year three of the charter term (2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013), 29%, 21%, and 4% of instructional staff did not return, either by choice or request at the start of the following school year. However, for the most recent period, staff turnover was 68%.<sup>21</sup>
- Student mobility is presented below for the charter term without comparison to other schools, the CSD or NYC, as final student retention goals were not established by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term. Based on the NYC DOE's evaluation and not in comparison to any other school, the CSD or NYC averages, the school has had challenges with retaining students.

## Mobility

Student Mobility out of Staten Island Community Charter School *				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Number of Students who Left the School	22	37	32	42
Percent of Students who Left the School	22.7%	21.4%	13.4%	15.6%

\* Figures are based on student enrollment as of October 31 for each respective school year with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012. Students in terminal grades are not included.

- The NYC DOE has made changes to the NYC School Survey during the entirety of the retrospective charter term. Questions asked have been altered, added or deleted from year to year. Also, beginning with the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, survey categories are no longer measured in total points out of 10 possible points. To allow for consistency during the evaluated charter term, selected questions, consistent with the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework, were identified as relevant for charter schools. These are presented below for the duration of the retrospective charter term.
- NYC School Survey Response Rates should be comparable over time, however, as the measurement of these has remained consistent. Response rates for parents, teachers and students (if participating) are presented below for each year of the charter term. For each year of the charter term for which data is available, the response rates for SICCS parents and teachers are above NYC averages. In addition, SICCS response rates for both parents and teachers have increased over the charter term with 100% of teachers participating in 2013-2014.

<sup>21</sup> Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form in November 2014

## NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree						
Survey Question		Staten Island Community Charter School				Citywide Average
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students *	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	-	-	-	-	-
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	-	-	-	-	-
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	-	-	-	-	-
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	98%	95%	99%	97%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	99%	92%	96%	97%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	100%	95%	97%	96%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	100%	82%	100%	48%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	100%	88%	91%	60%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	100%	94%	100%	91%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	-	100%	100%	60%	81%

\* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.

\*\* This question was phrased as "My teachers inspire me to learn" in the 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 School Surveys.

\*\*\* This question was not introduced until the 2011-2012 School Survey.

## NYC School Survey Results

		Response Rates			
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students *	Staten Island Community Charter School	-	-	-	-
	NYC	-	-	-	-
Parents	Staten Island Community Charter School	62%	70%	85%	91%
	NYC	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	Staten Island Community Charter School	88%	94%	96%	100%
	NYC	82%	81%	83%	81%

\* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.

- The school's charter goals include, "parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect." The school met this goal in the 2012-2013 school year. This goal is not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school's charter goals include, "staff will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect." The school partially met this goal in the 2012-2013 school year. This goal is not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.

As part of the renewal process, representatives for the NYC DOE have collected evidence relevant to the school's climate and community engagement over the school's charter term. Based on discussion, document collection and review, and observation, the following was noted:

- An internal survey performed by the school during the 2012-2013 school year indicated that 95% of parents were either satisfied or very satisfied with their child's education. (Less than 50% of the schools' families participated in the survey.)
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing on September 17, 2014 at Staten Island Community Charter School located at 309 St. Paul's Avenue, Staten Island, NY 10304 in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 35 participants attended the hearing, 16 speaking in support of the school's renewal and zero speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents/guardians from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to parents/guardians were made during November 2014 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 95% provided positive feedback regarding the school.

## Financial Health

**Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations.**

- Based on the fiscal year 2014 (FY14) financial audit, the school's current ratio of 5.09 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school had sufficient cash to cover its operating expenses with 116 days of unrestricted cash on hand allowing for at least two months of operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of September 30, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

## Financial Sustainability

**Overall, the school is financially sustainable based on its current practices.**

- Based on the financial audits from mid-year FY11 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus over these audited fiscal years, and in FY14 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.15 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from mid-year FY11 through FY14, the school generated overall positive cash flow from FY12 to FY14 and the school had positive cash flow in each measurable year.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits.

### **Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?**

Over the charter term, Staten Island Community Charter School has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations, but not others.

As of the review in November 2014, the Board of Trustees for Staten Island Community Charter School is in compliance with:

- **Membership size.** Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws: a minimum of five and maximum of 11 members.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.<sup>22</sup>
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has consistently made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting on Staten Island Community Charter School's website.
- **Timely submission of documents.** The Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term.

As of the review in November 2014, the Board of Trustees for Staten Island Community Charter School is out of compliance with:

- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** The board has not consistently submitted board resignation notices or new board member credentials within the required five days of change to OSDCP for review and if necessary, approval.
- **Required number of monthly meetings.** The school's bylaws indicate that the Board is to hold 10 meetings a year. In years one, two, and three of the charter term (2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013), the Board did hold the required number of monthly meetings, as evidenced by the Board Yearly Meeting Schedule and the posted meeting minutes. Required meetings are those which met quorum. In the 2013-2014 academic year, the Board has not held the number of board meetings required by the Charter School Act, which requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months per year.
- The school has not posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law.

As of the review in November 2014, the charter school is in compliance with:

- **Teacher certification.** The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification. The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Immunization.** The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.
- **Insurance.** The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2014-2015 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 9, 2014 adhering to charter law's requirement of

---

<sup>22</sup> Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

accepting applications up to at least April 1. Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently adhere to this requirement.

- **Fire Emergency.** One or more of the school leaders were trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.
- **Timely Submission of Invoicing and Reconciliation Documents.** Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently submit complete invoicing and reconciliation documents by the associated deadlines.

As of the review on November 2014, the charter school is out of compliance with:

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance, except for one. There is one staff member whose fingerprint clearance is outstanding.
- **Student Discipline Plan.** The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of their Student Discipline Policy for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be out of compliance with federal law related to students with disabilities and due process regulations.

### Enrollment and Retention Targets

- 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.
  - As of November 1, 2014, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act are still in a *proposed* status. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, however, these averages should not be assumed to be similar to the final enrollment targets to be released by NYSED.<sup>23</sup>
- In school year 2013-2014, Staten Island Community Charter School:
  - served a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to both the CSD 31 and citywide percentages;
  - served a smaller percentage of students with disabilities compared to both the CSD 31 and citywide percentages; and
  - served a smaller percentage of English Language Learner students compared to both the CSD 31 and citywide percentages.

---

<sup>23</sup> Please see the following website for more information: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/enrollment-retention-targets.html>

## Enrollment of Special Populations<sup>24</sup>

Special Population		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Proposed)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>	<b>70.1%</b>	<b>79.2%</b>	<b>82.8%</b>	<b>86.0%</b>	<b>60.2%</b>
	CSD 31	59.2%	61.8%	60.6%	60.8%	
	NYC	80.7%	83.3%	82.6%	82.4%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>	<b>11.3%</b>	<b>12.1%</b>	<b>14.7%</b>	<b>15.4%</b>	<b>19.8%</b>
	CSD 31	18.2%	19.6%	21.9%	24.3%	
	NYC	14.5%	15.2%	16.7%	19.3%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>4.6%</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>8.9%</b>
	CSD 31	10.5%	9.7%	8.8%	8.0%	
	NYC	20.2%	18.8%	17.7%	16.6%	

Additional Enrollment Information				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	K-1	K-2	K-3	K-4
CSD(s)	31	31	31	31

<sup>24</sup> Comparisons of a charter school's special populations to the CSD and City are made relative only to the grades served by the school. For example, if a charter school serves grades kindergarten through five, comparisons of that school's special populations will only be made relative to grades kindergarten through five in the CSD and citywide. CSD comparisons are particular to the grades served in each CSD each year. Enrollment rates reflect demographic characteristics as of June 1 and enrollment as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.

State enrollment targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific enrollment target. The CSD for a multi-district school is the primary CSD as determined by each school. The enrollment is determined by the total number of students enrolled as of October 31, 2013. Any school with an unusual grade configuration (i.e. K, 6-9) should use an available grade configuration provided by SED that is most aligned as determined by the NYC DOE, otherwise a school's actual grade span is used. For more information regarding SED's methodology behind the calculation of charter school enrollment and retention targets, please refer to the memo at <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2012Meetings/July2012/712brca11.pdf>.

#### **Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term?**

Staten Island Community Charter School's mission is to provide an exemplary K - 5 education program for students on the North Shore of Staten Island, a program designed to produce a community of smart, responsible, creative, citizens who will graduate ready to attend college preparatory high schools. The school offers an instructional program that is aligned to the NYS Common Core Learning Standards. Staten Island Community will hold expectations high and inspire student achievement by cultivating close relationships between the school administration, students, teachers and parents. In an effort to stabilize and strengthen the structure of its elementary school grades, the Board has decided not to extend its programming to include middle school next school year and for the foreseeable future.

## Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

### Renewal Process

In the final year of its charter, a NYC DOE Chancellor-authorized charter school seeking renewal must demonstrate its success during the current charter term and establish goals and objectives for the next charter term. Ultimately, the renewal process offers an opportunity for the school community to reflect on its experiences during its prior term, to make a compelling, evidence-based case that it has earned the privilege of an additional charter term, and, if renewed, to carry out an ambitious plan for the future.

The NYC DOE does not automatically grant charter renewal, and no charter operator is entitled to renewal. Rather, a school must prove that it has earned renewal and is worthy of continuing the privilege of educating New York City public school students. To make such determinations, the NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) renewal team performs a comprehensive review of the school's academic, operational and fiscal performance over the course of the charter which includes an analysis of the school's renewal application. This application is built around the four essential questions of the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework and includes a retrospective analysis of the school's prior track record as well as a prospective plan for the school. In reviewing this information, a school must be able to demonstrate that it can satisfy the four essential questions of the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization?
3. Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations?
4. What are the school's plans for its next charter term?

The school presents evidence to support their application for renewal by providing a compelling response to these overarching questions that demonstrates its students have made significant academic progress, is serving students equitably, has sustainable operations to be successful in the next charter term, and that the school has met the goals and objectives pledged in its current charter. In addition, the school will describe challenges it has faced during its charter term, the strategies that were used to address those challenges and the lessons learned.

While the academic performance of students is the foremost determining factor of a school's success, a school's ability to demonstrate an effective educational program, a financially and operationally viable organization, and a strong learning community with support from stakeholders are also important factors that inform a renewal decision. For more information on how OSDCP makes renewal recommendations to the Chancellor, please see the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework overview in Part 6 of this report.

### Statutory Basis for Renewal

The New York State Charter Schools Act ("the Act") authorizes the creation of a system of charter schools to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently of existing schools and school districts in order to accomplish the following objectives:

#### **§2850:**

- (a) Improve student learning and achievement;
- (b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- (c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- (d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- (e) Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system; and

- (f) Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools established under this article accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

When granted, a charter is valid for up to five years. For a school chartered under the Act to operate beyond the initial charter term, the school must seek and obtain renewal of its charter.<sup>25</sup>

The Act states the following regarding the renewal of a school's charter:

**§2851.4:**

Charters may be renewed, upon application, for a term of up to five years in accordance with the provisions of this article for the issuance of such charters pursuant to section twenty-eight hundred fifty-two of this article; provided, however, that a renewal application shall [also] include:

- (a) A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in the charter.
- (b) A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private. Such statement shall be in a form prescribed by the board of regents.
- (c) Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school required by subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty-seven of this article, including the charter school report cards and the certified financial statements.
- (d) Indications of parent and student satisfaction.
- (e) The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents or the board of trustees of the state university of New York, as applicable, of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal. When developing such targets, the board of regents and the board of trustees of the state university of New York shall ensure (1) that such enrollment targets are comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the charter school is located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.

Such renewal application shall be submitted to the charter entity no later than six months prior to the expiration of the charter; provided, however, that the charter entity may waive such deadline for good cause shown.

The determination of whether to approve a renewal application rests in the sole discretion of a charter school's authorizer.

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.<sup>26</sup> As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education ("NYC DOE") institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act's renewal standards:

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;

---

<sup>25</sup> See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

<sup>26</sup> See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction; and
- The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal.<sup>27</sup>

Where the NYC DOE approves a renewal application, it is required under the Act to submit the application and a proposed charter to the Board of Regents for its review and approval.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.

<sup>28</sup> See § 2852(5).

## Part 6: NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

The Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) team may recommend to the Chancellor three potential outcomes for charter schools applying for renewal: full-term renewal (with or without conditions), short-term renewal (with or without conditions), or non-renewal.

After the OSDCP renewal site visit, the OSDCP team incorporates its findings from the visit into this renewal report. The evidence and findings align to the four essential questions of our accountability framework and may include classroom observations, leadership interviews, assessment results, School Survey results, public hearings and other community feedback, as well as a variety of other data. Schools will be given the opportunity to correct factual errors in this report. If the OSDCP renewal team determines that renewal is not warranted, the school will be informed in writing of the reasons for the non-renewal. If OSDCP approves the renewal application and the Chancellor recommends renewal for the school, prior to the school's charter expiration date, OSDCP will send the renewal report and recommendation along with the school's renewal application and other supporting evidence to the Board of Regents for its approval.

### ***Full-Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions***

In cases where a school has demonstrated exceptional results with its students, a five-year renewal will be granted. A school must show that its program has clearly and consistently demonstrated high academic attainment and/or consistent and significant student academic progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has demonstrated operational viability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

### ***Short Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions***

In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has two years or fewer of state-assessment results, or where any school has demonstrated mixed academic results or has uncertain organizational or financial viability, a short-term renewal with or without conditions may be considered.

### ***Non-Renewal***

Renewal is not automatic. Schools that have not demonstrated significant progress or high levels of student achievement and/or are in violation of their charter will not be renewed.

### ***Grade Expansions or Enrollment Changes***

A school may seek material charter revisions as part of the renewal process. In the case of a grade expansion or change in authorized enrollment, these material charter revisions are considered separately from the charter renewal. Charter renewal, with or without conditions, is not a guarantee of approval for a proposed material charter revision.

## The NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

To help Chancellor-authorized charter schools better understand what we mean by success for charter schools, the OSDCP team has developed an Accountability Framework built around four essential questions for charter school renewal:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization?
3. Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations?
4. What are the school's plans for its next charter term?

Although academic performance is primary, the NYC DOE takes into account a wide variety of factors (as indicated by the framework strands and available evidence detail) when evaluating a school. These factors include academic, fiscal, operational and environmental indicators of a charter school's performance. Additionally, some of the indicators we evaluate relate to expected performance as defined in the New York State Charter Schools Act including evidence of improved student learning and achievement, special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure, use of different and innovative teaching methods, parent and student satisfaction, and enrollment and retention of special student populations. Further detail about the application of the framework to school reflection and evaluation is provided beginning on page 17 of the NYC DOE Chancellor-Authorized Schools Accountability Handbook for 2014-15.

What follows is a framework that outlines strands, indicators, and potential evidence for each of the four essential questions. The framework identifies what OSDCP looks at in determining whether a school is successful enough to earn a new charter term, with or without conditions, and the duration of the charter term recommended by NYC DOE. As schools use the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework, they should remember that charter schools exist to deliver improved student achievement for the students they serve, particularly at-risk students, so the schools are high-quality choices for families. This reminder should help a school apply this framework to its own performance analysis, underscoring the state and city's commitment to superior academic performance as the most important factor in a school's performance, while also recognizing the importance of closing the achievement gap and offering high-quality learning opportunities for all students.

### **1. Is the School an Academic Success?**

#### **1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement**

Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below:

- Meet absolute performance goals established in school charter
- Meet student progress goals established in school charter
- Meet other rigorous academic goals as stated on school charter
- Demonstrate increasing student achievement/growth
- Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students
- Are surpassing academic performance measures of DOE identified peer-schools
- Are surpassing academic performance measures compared with district/city proficiency averages

Evidence for success might include, but not be limited to, the following depending on school configurations:

- Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates
- Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results
- Grades 8-12 College Readiness Credit Accumulation
- Percentage of Students Applying to and Being Admitted to College
- Percentage of Students Taking AP Courses and/or Percentage of Students Passing AP Courses
- When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results
- Results on state accountability measures
- Charter School Academic Goals
- School-reported internal assessments
- NYC DOE Progress Reports or School Quality Reports<sup>29</sup>

### **1b. Instructionally Sound and Responsive Education Program**

Schools with successful education programs have many of the characteristics below:

- Are self-reflective and examine practice based on outcomes against goals
- Have well-thought out curricular programs that are aligned with NYS learning outcomes as described by state and Common Core Learning Standards
- Use instructional models and resources that are consistent with school mission and flexible in addressing the needs of all learners
- Have defined strategies that they can measure and monitor for closing the achievement gap
- Offer defined opportunities for remediation and acceleration
- Utilizes a coherent and effective interim assessment system (e.g., use of formative, interim, and summative assessment data) for monitoring progress, predicting performance, and adjusting instruction
- Have an effective process for supporting improved classroom instruction, including frequent observation and feedback
- Have effective strategies and quality instructional programs for addressing students with special needs and ELLs
- Use a defined process for evaluating and supporting curricular tasks, programs and resources for effectiveness and fit with school mission and goals

<sup>29</sup> Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE replaced the DOE Progress Report with the DOE School Quality Report. The 2012-2013 school year is the last year NYC public schools will have a Progress Report score. The Progress Report and School Quality Report contain similar indicators of performance.

Evidence for successful education programs, in addition to positive results, may include, but not be limited to, many of the following:

- Classroom observations
- Instructional planning documents (alignments, scope and sequences, curriculum maps, unit and lesson plans, etc.)
- Instructional leader and staff interviews
- Special Education/ELL progress monitoring documentation
- Professional development plans and resources
- Student/teacher schedules
- Student Intervention / Response to Intervention program description and resources
- Interim assessment results
- Data findings; adjusted lesson plans
- Self-assessment documentation

### **1c. Learning Environment**

Schools with successful learning environments have many of the characteristics below:

- Provide a safe, respectful, and stable academic environment conducive to student learning (one with efficient transitions and safe hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.)
- Have a strong academic culture that creates high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to consistently give their best effort academically and to actively engage in their own learning and the life of the school
- Use a comprehensive approach to student management, including positive behavioral expectations and a clear discipline policy to build and sustain a safe, orderly, and supportive classroom environment
- Have classrooms where academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Have formal or informal structures or programs in place that provide students opportunities to develop as individuals and citizens (for example: a character education, citizenship, or community involvement or service program)

Evidence for successful learning environments may include, but not be limited to, many of the following:

- Classroom observations
- NYC DOE School Survey results (students, parents and teachers)
- School mission and articulated values
- Student management plan (code of conduct, school values, discipline policy, positive incentive system, etc.)
- Student attendance and retention rates
- Student discipline data (referral, suspension, expulsion)
- Parent complaint/concern information
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Interviews with school leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, students
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)
- School calendar and class schedules

## 2. Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?

### 2a. Mission and Goals

Schools with a successful mission and goals have many of the characteristics below:

- Have an animated mission statement and clearly articulated goals (both academic and non-academic) that staff, students and community embrace
- Demonstrate an active self-evaluation process that involves regular monitoring, an examination of practices based on outcomes against goals, and reporting on progress towards school goals
- Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data

Evidence for a successful mission and goals might include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Mission Statement
- School charter and external documents (student/family handbooks, school website, etc.)
- Annual Reports, school improvement plans, leadership/Board reports
- Board agendas and minutes
- Parent, student, and teacher satisfaction surveys
- Participation at parent-teacher conferences, school advocacy events, participation in academic goal related programs
- Stakeholder interviews (board, parents, staff, students, etc.)

## 2b. Leadership and Governance Structure

Schools with successful leadership and governance structures have many of the characteristics below:

- Have a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations, with clear lines of accountability for the Board, school leadership and all staff
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate officers, committees, and a purposeful blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter
- Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly, but not limited to, Open-Meeting Law and conflict of interest laws, and is fully compliant with its Board approved by-laws (number of meetings, quorum, posting of calendar, agenda and minutes)
- Have a defined process for Board reflection on effectiveness, assessing developing needs, and plan for professional growth
- Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals and, if and when necessary, makes timely adjustments to that structure with proper notice to and approval by its authorizer
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provides regular feedback on instruction to teachers, including both formal and informal observations

Evidence for school governance and organizational design may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- School charter
- Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, calendar of meetings, meeting agenda and minutes
- Annual conflict of interest forms
- Board resources for evaluating school leadership and staff, including rubric/performance metrics
- Board resources for self-reflection and professional growth
- Board development plan
- Board interviews
- Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook and core operational policies
- School calendar
- Professional development plans
- Stakeholder interviews (board, school leadership and staff)

## 2c. School Climate and Community Engagement

Schools with a sustaining school climate and engaged parent and community support have many of the characteristics below:

- A healthy professional school climate that is collaborative, student-centered, and open to parents and community support
- Employ an effective means of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including, but not limited to, the NYC DOE School Survey
- Have effective home-school communication practices and engagement strategies to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children
- Strong community-based partnerships that support and advocate for the school
- Engage families actively in the life of the school, including advocacy, community engagement, and feedback on school policies and initiatives
- Have a clear procedure for parents and staff to express concerns to school leadership and the Board, as appropriate, including a clearly articulated escalation path to authorizer
- Share instructional and operational practices with the larger NYC school community and actively seek opportunities for partnering and collaboration
- Encourage professional conversations about effective performance and quality instruction among staff, through, for example, such means as regular and periodic teaming (grade level teams, data days, etc.) and peer observations
- Have systems in place to evaluate professional development effectiveness and provide ongoing support for school-wide and individual initiatives

Evidence for school climate and community engagement may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- NYC DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results
- Student retention and wait list data
- Staff retention data
- Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews
- Student and staff attendance rates
- Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences
- Parent association meeting calendar and minutes
- Community partnerships and sponsored programs
- Participation in NYC DOE initiatives and efforts to collaborate/partner with other NYC schools
- Parent and community feedback via public hearings, renewal calls to parents, etc.
- Community outreach documents (newsletters, announcements, invitations, etc.)
- School Professional Development Plan and staff feedback on professional development events
- Resources for evaluations and observations, scheduled opportunities for professional collaboration, staff feedback on professional development events
- Student/Family and Staff Handbooks

## 2d. Operational Health

Schools that are effective, sustainable organizations have many of the characteristics below:

- A safe, clean and appropriately resourced educational facility with all appropriate services specified in charter and mandated by appropriate law and regulations
- Demonstrate efficient and orderly daily operations
- Have appropriate insurance coverage and insurance and facility documents
- An effective process for recruiting, hiring, compensating, monitoring, supporting, and evaluating school leadership and staff
- A flexible, data-driven approach to professional development for all staff
- Consistently meet student enrollment and retention targets as established by SED (applicable to schools renewed after 2010)
- Communications with NYC DOE are timely, comprehensive, and appropriate
- If applicable, school relationship with a charter management organization identified in charter and supported by a management agreement that spells out services, responsibilities, accountability reporting, performance expectations, and fees

Evidence of an operationally viable organization may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Required facility documents (lease, certificate of occupancy, fire and safety inspections, etc.)
- Appropriate insurance documents
- Operational policies and procedures
- Operational organizational chart
- Secure storage areas for student and staff records
- Policies/protocols for maintaining secure records
- School safety plan
- Immunization completion rate information
- Appropriate AED/CPR certifications

## 2e. Financial Sustainability

Schools that are responsible stewards of public funds and are effective, sustainable organizations have many of the characteristics below:

- Maintain annual budgets that meet all short- and long-term financial responsibilities with available revenues
- Provide rigorous oversight of financial and operational responsibilities, at school leadership and Board levels, in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to short- and long-term decision-making
- Consistently clean financial audits and compliant escrow accounts
- If applicable, strong, accountable partnerships with management organizations and other partners and significant vendors to support delivery of charter school's design and academic program
- School leadership and Board maintain effective internal controls of finances to ensure integrity of financial management and a proactive approach to mitigating risk
- School leadership and Board oversee financial and operational responsibilities in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to decision-making
- Demonstrate financial planning for future school years, including per-pupil and space-related cost projections

Evidence for a financially sound, viable organization may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School budget, P&Ls, and monthly/quarterly cash-flow reports
- Financial audits, escrow accounts and other fiscal reporting documents
- Financial leader(s) resume and accountability documents
- Financial and operational organizational chart
- Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) for significant partnerships and vendor relationships

### 3. Is the School in Compliance with its Charter and All Applicable Laws and Regulations?

#### 3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with the school's charter and charter agreement have the characteristics below:

- Implement the key features of their charter as described in the original charter and, if appropriate, as modified in approved revisions to their charter, including but not limited to mission, academic program, school organization, grade configuration, enrollment, goals, etc.
- Ensure that up-to-date charter is available on request to staff, parents, and school community
- Implement comprehensive academic, behavioral, oversight, management, and operational policies and procedures that are substantially aligned with the charter and the school's stated mission and vision

Evidence for a school's compliance with the terms of its charter and charter agreement may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Authorized charter and signed agreement
- Charter revision request approval and documentation
- School mission
- School policies and procedures
- Annual Comprehensive Review reports
- Board meetings, agendas and minutes
- Leadership/Board and staff interviews
- Public hearings (renewal or material revision hearings)

#### 3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have the characteristics below:

- Meet all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, ELL and Special Education students to those of their community school district of location<sup>30</sup> or are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages for enrollment and retention
- Implement school policies related to student discipline and promotion and retention that are fully compliant with laws and regulations related to students with disabilities and due process regulations
- Conduct an independently verified fair and open lottery and manage enrollment process and annual waiting lists with integrity
- Employ instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and meet all certification requirements

<sup>30</sup> School-specific targets for enrollment and retention are to come from the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

Evidence for compliance with applicable federal and state law may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School reporting documents
- School's NYSED Annual Report
- Student recruitment plan and resources
- Student management policies and promotion and retention policies
- Student/Family Handbook
- Student discipline policy and records
- Parent complaint/grievance records
- Lottery policy, resources, and records; enrollment procedures and records
- Demographic data (school, district, and other as appropriate)
- Staff roster, fingerprint clearance for all staff, certification status of all instructional staff

### **3c. Applicable Regulations**

Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have the characteristics below:

- Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns
- Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and complete all other financial reporting as required
- Boards that meet requirements for size, meeting frequency, public notice, applicable open-meeting and conflict of interest regulations, as well as comply with NYC DOE OSDCP's requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members
- Inform NYC DOE OSDCP, and where required, receive OSDCP approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization
- Effectively engaged parent associations

Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School or building safety plan; appropriate inspection documents
- Annual audits, escrow accounts, other financial reporting documents
- Board roster, calendar, agenda and minutes, conflict of interest documents, notification of changes/approval of new member request documents
- Charter revision requests
- Revised or new contracts
- Parent association calendar of meetings, identified officers, parent association agenda and minutes, parent satisfaction survey results
- Stakeholder interviews

## 4. What Are the School's Plans for its Next Charter Term?

### 4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

In anticipation of a new charter term, a school may consider various growth options: replication, expansion to new grades or increased enrollment, or alteration of its model in some significant way. Successful schools generally have processes for:

- Conducting needs/opportunity assessments
- Forming Board and leadership committees or subcommittees to investigate options, develop action plans, ensure capacity and resources are aligned, etc.
- Engaging school community in articulating charter revisions (or a new charter in cases of replication) to determine community needs and to communicate regarding the school's proposed growth plans
- Ensuring that the final proposal is ambitious but realistic in its plans
- Creating a well-reasoned and documented prospective for the school's new charter term and, if applicable, a new charter proposal (for replication)

Evidence for likely success in planning for school growth in a new charter term may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Renewal application revised charter submission, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Charter revision or merger applications
- Leadership and Board interviews

### 4b. Organizational Sustainability

Successful schools consistently perform despite change. While there is no single path for ensuring sustainability, successful schools often have the following features:

- School anticipates organizational opportunities/needs and plans for resource development (for example, human resource policies for growing your own talent, or fundraising or budget management to take care of anticipated capital needs and to mitigate risks for the unexpected, or board development to bring new talent or specific needs-based expertise to the school)
- School develops contingency plans especially for facilities or financial scenarios

Evidence for organizational sustainability may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Charter renewal application
- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organizational chart
- Staff rosters
- Staff handbook
- Leadership and staff interviews
- Budget

#### **4c. School or Model Improvements**

Successful schools are thoughtful about the continued appropriateness of school design features and elements of their models. They:

- Review performance carefully and even without major changes through expansion or replication, are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success
- Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission

Evidence for successful improvements to a school's program or model may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Renewal application revised charter including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and Board interviews
- Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) with partners or important vendors

## Appendix A: School Performance Data

### Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>				
Grade 3	-	-	9.3%	31.2%
Grade 4	-	-	-	9.6%
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 31 *</b>				
Grade 3	-	-	-23.5	-4.6
Grade 4	-	-	-	-25.5
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM NYC</b>				
Grade 3	-	-	-18.8	1.3
Grade 4	-	-	-	-21.5

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Staten Island Community Charter School</b>				
Grade 3	-	-	13.0%	23.7%
Grade 4	-	-	-	13.5%
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 31 *</b>				
Grade 3	-	-	-24.4	-19.7
Grade 4	-	-	-	-30.2
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM NYC</b>				
Grade 3	-	-	-20.1	-15.0
Grade 4	-	-	-	-26.5

\* CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.

## Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

### NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Site Visit Report June 2011](#)

[Annual Site Visit Report April 2012](#)

[Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-2013](#)