



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

**PENINSULA PREPARATORY ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
MAY 2014**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Summary of Renewal Recommendation | 2 |
| I. Charter School Overview | 2 |
| II. Overview of School-Specific Data | 2 |
| III. Rationale for Recommendation | 4 |
| | |
| School Overview and History | 7 |
| | |
| Renewal Process Overview | 8 |
| | |
| Findings | 10 |
| Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success | 14 |
| Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization..... | 16 |
| Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? | 17 |
| Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term? | 18 |
| | |
| Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview | 19 |
| | |
| Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework | 20 |
| | |
| Appendix A: School Performance Data..... | 29 |
| | |
| Appendix B: NYC DOE Progress Reports..... | 31 |

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of Charter School | Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School (PPA) |
| Current Board Chair(s) | Betty Leon, Esq. |
| School Leader | Ruth Peets-Butcher |
| Management Company (if applicable) | N/A |
| Other Partner(s) | N/A |
| District(s) of Location | NYC Community School District 27 |
| Physical Address | 611 Beach 19 th Street, Queens, NY 11691 |
| Facility | Private |
| School Opened For Instruction | 2004-2005 School Year |
| Current Charter Term Expiry Date | 6/30/2014 |
| Maximum Grade Levels/Enrollment at Expiry Date | K-5 / 314 |
| Proposed Charter Term | Five Years |
| Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at New Expiry Date | K-5 / 320 |

II. Overview of School-Specific Data¹:

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report

| Progress Report Grade | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Overall Grade | C | C | B | A |
| Student Progress | B | C | C | A |
| Student Performance | D | C | B | B |
| School Environment | B | B | A | A |
| Closing the Achievement Gap Points | - | - | 1.5 | 2.6 |

¹ Although the charter term is comprised of the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years, the NYC DOE Progress Report and Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State Averages tables include four years of data. This is meant to give the reader historical understanding.

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages²

| % Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 42.1% | 46.2% | 52.2% | 21.3% |
| CSD 27 | 50.1% | 54.7% | 56.0% | 28.7% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -8.0 | -8.5 | -3.8 | -7.4 |
| NYC | 46.1% | 49.4% | 51.2% | 28.0% |
| Difference from NYC | -4.0 | -3.2 | 1.0 | -6.7 |
| New York State | 52.5% | 54.8% | 55.2% | 31.2% |
| Difference from New York State | -10.4 | -8.6 | -3.0 | -9.9 |

| % Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 46.1% | 60.2% | 63.3% | 37.6% |
| CSD 27 | 61.7% | 64.4% | 66.0% | 32.5% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -15.6 | -4.2 | -2.7 | 5.1 |
| NYC | 57.4% | 60.0% | 62.6% | 32.7% |
| Difference from NYC | -11.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 4.9 |
| New York State | 64.6% | 64.6% | 65.7% | 28.9% |
| Difference from New York State | -18.5 | -4.4 | -2.4 | 8.7 |

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

| Academic Goal Analysis (based on School's submission) | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| | 1st year 2011-2012 | 2nd Year 2012-2013 | Cumulative 2 Year Total |
| Total Achievable Academic Goals | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| # Met | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| # Partially Met | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Not Met | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| % Met | 100% | 100% | 100% |
| % Partially Met | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % Not Met | 0% | 0% | 0% |

² Although the charter term is comprised of the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years, the NYC DOE Progress Report and Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State Averages tables include four years of data. This is meant to give the reader historical understanding. The Academic Goal Analysis table is limited to the goals of the charter term evaluated in this report.

III. Rationale for Recommendation

Background On PPA

In 2004, the NYC DOE originally authorized a five-year charter (to expire in 2009) for Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School (PPA), to serve grades K through 8. The DOE subsequently authorized a short term, three-year renewal charter (to expire in July 2012) with conditions for PPA and limiting their grade span to K-5.

On January 9, 2012, after completing the renewal process, the DOE recommended a non-renewal of PPA's charter. In March 2012, PPA commenced a CPLR Article 78 proceeding and declaratory judgment to annul the NYC DOE's non-renewal decision. PPA also sought and obtained a stay of the DOE's non-renewal determination and a temporary restraining order prohibiting the DOE from taking any action on the determination.

During the pendency of the stay, PPA demonstrated improved performance on the annual New York State exams in Math and ELA as compared to the community school district (CSD) in which PPA is located, New York City and New York State. For example, based on data from the 2011-2012 school year (which became available in August 2012), 52.2% of PPA's students were proficient in English Language Arts, an increase of six percentage points. This put PPA on par with NYC averages, and closed the gap in performance between both its CSD and New York State, by approximately five percentage points. In Math, 63.3% of PPA students were proficient in Math, just two percentage points shy of the relevant CSD and New York State averages, and virtually on par with NYC.

Also during this period, the DOE reviewed the educational opportunities available for the students that attended PPA. These students are located on a geographically isolated peninsula, which limits their opportunities to attend better performing schools located elsewhere in the same CSD. When assessing the student performance, culture, climate, and family engagement of the other schools located on the peninsula, PPA becomes one of the best options for families in this isolated area.

Based on the foregoing, on July 12, 2013, the parties entered into a Stipulation of Settlement. Pursuant to that stipulation, the DOE agreed to recommend the approval of a charter for PPA for the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years, terminating on June 30, 2014. The renewal agreement for that term is currently pending approval before the Board of Regents.

The Stipulation of Settlement between PPA and DOE also provided that if PPA met certain academic performance criteria and demonstrated satisfactory fiscal health and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, the DOE would recommend a five-year charter renewal agreement for the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2019. These criteria and conditions were taken into consideration during the DOE's renewal review.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, PPA has demonstrated academic achievement and progress. Over the previous charter term (2011-2012 to 2012-2013), the school showed strong gains improving its Overall Grade on the NYC DOE Progress Report from a B in 2011-2012 to an A in 2012-2013. The school also outperformed the city, state, and district of location on the recent assessments based on the Common Core Learning Standards.

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include, "(a) Improve student learning and achievement;" and "(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure." State assessment data shows that PPA has demonstrated success through its fourth charter term in fulfilling its primary objectives.

PPA believes that by creating a rigorous, academic environment with high expectations and a focused and challenging curriculum, the school will engage its scholars, parents, and the community as crucial partners to create a nurturing school culture where every child achieves personal academic excellence and a demonstrated intrinsic motivation for learning while demonstrating strength of character. The school currently serves students in kindergarten through fifth grade.

The NYC DOE has two years of NYC DOE Elementary School Progress Report data to evaluate the academic performance of the school during this term. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and are based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores are based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to all schools citywide.

As noted above, PPA received a B as its Overall grade on the NYC DOE Progress Report for the 2011-2012 academic year and an A for the 2012-2013 academic year. During the same period the school earned a B Student Performance for both academic years. The primary growth metrics for student progress are Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles (MAGP)³ for ELA and math measuring how much students grow relative to all students in the city who received the same proficiency score the year before. Over the same period, the school increased in Student Progress; the school received a C and an A on the Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, respectively.

The settlement agreement between PPA and DOE includes two indicators of academic success: "PPA will score a B or higher on the NYC DOE Progress Report" for the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. The school met this goal by earning a B for the 2011-2012 school year and an A for the 2012-2013 school year, as noted above. In addition to meeting the first stated academic goal, the school also met its second goal of having students, who have been continuously enrolled at PPA for at least two consecutive calendar years, have a proficiency rate that is equal to or higher than the average of PPA's peer schools as identified in the NYC DOE's Progress Report.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

PPA is a fiscally sound and viable organization.

Over the course of the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years, the Board of Trustees has demonstrated a developed governance structure and organizational design. The Board currently has seven members, which is aligned to the Board's bylaws. The Board has demonstrated effective oversight over the school as evidenced by regular updates to the Board on academic progress, well-established lines of accountability, and active committees.

The school's instructional leadership team has remained stable over the course of the charter term. Both the principal and assistant principal, Ruth Peets Butcher and Jamie Yoo have been with the school since the start of the charter term.

Over the course of the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 school years, the school has developed a stable school culture. On all NYC DOE School Surveys, the school has shown consistency with its scores, never falling below Well Above Average and Above Average on all four sections of the survey (Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety & Respect.)

³ This measure calculates the median (middle) adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. 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. A student's growth percentile is a number between 0 and 100, which represents the percentage of students with the same score on last year's test who scored the same or lower than the student on this year's test. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the Progress Report uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect averages differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The Progress Report 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.

Financially, the school is in a weak position to meet near-term financial obligations but is financially sustainable based on current practices. There were no material weaknesses noted in the independent annual financial audits for both years of the settlement, meeting the requirements of Indicator #3 of the settlement agreement between PPA and the NYC DOE.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, PPA has been compliant with applicable laws and regulations. The Board has also been compliant with applicable laws and regulations.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

The school does not have plans to replicate or grow. The Board indicates that the focus over the next charter term will be to continue to focus on the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), revise the ELA curriculum to close any gaps between the current curriculum and CCLS.

As discussed above, based on the academic success demonstrated by PPA during the 2011-2012 school year, the DOE entered into a stipulation of settlement whereby it agreed to recommend a charter renewal agreement for the period July 1, 2012 through June 30, 2014. That short term renewal agreement is currently pending approval before the Board of Regents.

Furthermore, because PPA has satisfied the requirements for demonstrating success in academics, fiscal health, and compliance with applicable laws set forth in the settlement stipulation, we recommend that the Board of Regents approve a full-term renewal for the period July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2019.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School (PPA) is an elementary school serving approximately 314 students⁴ from kindergarten through fifth grade during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in the 2004-2005 school year, with kindergarten through second grades and is under the terms of its third charter. The school's authorized full grade span is kindergarten through fifth grade, which it reached during its first charter term, which expired April 19, 2009. The school is located in a private facility in District 27, in the Far Rockaways at 611 Beach 19th Street.

The school's mission is to create a rigorous, academic environment with high expectations and a focused and challenging curriculum, PPA engages its scholars, parents, and the community as crucial partners to create a nurturing school culture where every child achieves personal academic excellence and a demonstrated intrinsic motivation for learning while demonstrating strength of character.

The school's intake grade is kindergarten but it backfills open seats in first through fifth grades as well. There were 336 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.⁵

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students:

Special Populations⁶

| | Free Reduced Lunch | | | | Students with Disabilities | | | | English Language Learners | | | |
|--------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| School | 79% | 82% | 82% | 84% | 8% | 12% | 13% | 13% | 0% | 3% | 3% | 2% |
| CSD 27 | 56.4% | 67.6% | 71.2% | 74.0% | 13.7% | 13.9% | 14.2% | 14.5% | 9.6% | 9.7% | 9.3% | 8.9% |
| NYC | 62% | 64% | 65% | 69% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 15% | 14% | 14% |

The PPA Board of Trustees is led by Board Chair Betty Leon. She has served on the Board for five years. Ruth Peets-Butcher took over as school leader in the fall of 2012, after a transition period alongside her predecessor, Ericka Wala.

⁴ ATS data 10/10/13

⁵ Self-reported on Data Collection Sheet submitted with Renewal Application in November 2013.

⁶ Comparisons to both the CSD and City are made against students in Grades K-8. This is determined by the grades the school served in the 2012-2013 school year. Special population figures are as of October 31st for each given school year with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26th, 2012.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

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 first 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.

As the school is approaching the end of its charter term, the NYC DOE performs a comprehensive review of the school's performance over the course of the charter. This renewal process is conducted through analyzing student performance data and collecting and evaluating school-submitted documents during the charter term. Evidence of a school's success is organized around the four essential questions that comprise the NYC DOE's Accountability Framework:

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

A school will answer these overarching questions by demonstrating that its students have made significant academic progress and that the school has met the goals and objectives pledged in its initial 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.

Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding a school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during its 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 identify areas of weakness and to help the school to address them. 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 staff from the Charter Schools Accountability and Support (CSAS) team and other staff from the NYC DOE.

Upon review of all the relevant materials, a recommendation is made to the Chancellor. The Chancellor's determination, and the findings on which that decision is based, is 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:

- Overall NYC DOE Progress Report score,
- New York State ELA and math results and/or New York State Regents exams,
- ELA and math proficiency compared to the district for elementary and middle schools, and graduation rates compared to the city for high 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 sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally sound, viable organization, CSAS 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 NACSA (National Association of Charter School Authorizers) Financial Framework.⁷

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 schools to 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 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 all applicable laws and regulations.

Staff Representatives

The following NYC DOE staff representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on February 11 and 14, 2014:

- Daree Lewis, Senior Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Ola Duru, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Maria Campo, Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support

⁷ http://www.qualitycharters.org/assets/files/images/stories/pdfs/publications/Performance_Framework_Fall_2012_Draft.pdf, page 38-59

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal, Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School (PPA) has demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

Academic Attainment and Improvement

During the current charter term, PPA received two NYC DOE Progress Reports and has two years of New York State (NYS) assessment data. (For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A.)⁸

| Progress Report Grade | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
|------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Overall Grade | C | C | B | A |
| Student Progress | B | C | C | A |
| Student Performance | D | C | B | B |
| School Environment | B | B | A | A |
| Closing the Achievement Gap Points | - | - | 1.5 | 2.6 |

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

| % Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 42.1% | 46.2% | 62.5% | 23.2% |
| CSD 27 | 50.1% | 54.7% | 27.6% | 9.6% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -8.0 | -8.5 | 34.9 | 13.6 |
| NYC | 46.1% | 49.4% | 49.0% | 27.7% |
| Difference from NYC | -4.0 | -3.2 | 13.5 | -4.5 |
| New York State | 52.5% | 54.8% | 55.2% | 31.2% |
| Difference from New York State | -10.4 | -8.6 | 7.3 | -8.0 |

| % Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 46.1% | 60.2% | 70.8% | 48.9% |
| CSD 27 | 61.7% | 64.4% | 36.4% | 12.0% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -15.6 | -4.2 | 34.4 | 36.9 |
| NYC | 57.4% | 60.0% | 57.0% | 34.2% |
| Difference from NYC | -11.3 | 0.2 | 13.8 | 14.7 |
| New York State | 64.6% | 64.6% | 65.7% | 28.9% |
| Difference from New York State | -18.5 | -4.4 | 5.1 | 20.0 |

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

⁸ Although the charter term is comprised of the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 academic years, the NYC DOE Progress Report and Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State Averages tables include four years of data. This is meant to give the reader historical understanding.

Mission and Academic Goals

Over its charter term, PPA has met 100% of its total applicable academic charter goals.

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals⁹

| | Met in 2011-12? | Met in 2012-13? |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School will score an overall B or higher on the NYC DOE Progress Report. | Yes | Yes |

Responsive Education Program

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited the school on February 11 and 14, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
 - Over the course of the term, the school reports that its Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) has made a variety of adjustments to align with Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), including:
 - an increased focus on informational texts and math fluency.
 - hiring a staff developer to lead the math teachers in revising the math curriculum and creating new curriculum and unit maps aligned with the CCLS. The staff developer continues to provide ongoing observation and feedback to the math teachers. The school also utilizes Math Boxes and Mad Math to drive mastery of math fundamentals.
 - supplementing the Teachers College ELA curriculum with leveled reading materials from Mondo Bookshop to increase differentiation and the classroom supply of informational texts. The school has also added an oral language component and assessment to the ELA curriculum, in order to focus on foundational literacy skills. The school continues to refine its ELA curriculum, and currently has an internal staff committee reviewing it for further changes.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
 - PPA's special education program provides support in two settings: Special Education Teacher Support Service (SETSS) and Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT). An outside agency provides occupational and speech therapies.
 - To meet the needs of at-risk learners, over the course of its charter, the school employs two full-time special education teachers. One special education teacher serves kindergarten through second grade. The other special education teacher serves third through fifth grade, and also acts as the Special Education Coordinator for the school. The first, fourth, and fifth grades have ICT classrooms. The remaining grades use SETSS for their special education students.
 - The school also employs two Academic Intervention Specialists (AIS), one who works with kindergarten through second grade and one who works with third through fifth grade. They primarily work with the students who are struggling with reading and math, through small group instruction.
 - The school utilizes the Response to Intervention (RTI) model to support students at risk of academic failure. Once a student is formally in the RTI program, a Pupil Personnel Committee (PPC), which consists of the Title I Coordinator, School Counselor, Special Education Coordinator, Teacher, and Principal or Assistant Principal will meet to

⁹ The Academic Goal Analysis table is limited to the goals of the charter term evaluated in this report.

- determine if implemented strategies are not working and will recommend a course of action or if AIS is required.
 - In order to attend to the social-emotional needs of the students, the school employs a full-time school counselor, who works with parents and students on positive behaviors, as well as a behavior interventionist, who conducts interventions with students in need of extra behavior-based supports.
 - The school staff members providing support services for Students with Disabilities (SwD) have the appropriate certifications and keep student records in secure files. The school reports a good relationship with its local CSE.
 - To serve the needs of its English Language Learners (ELL) population, the school is currently conducting a search for an English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher. ELL services are currently performed by the AIS teachers, and will be assumed by the new ESL teacher once hired.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
 - On the days of the visit, sixteen classrooms in grades kindergarten through five were observed with the school's instructional leaders (Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy and Math Coaches) and the following was noted:
 - In half of the sixteen classrooms, two adults were observed providing instruction; in the remaining observed classes one adult was observed providing instruction. In classrooms with two adults, some classes used a parallel teaching model, while others used a lead and assist or lead and monitor model. In the classrooms with one adult, the method of instruction was primarily lecture, with independent practice.
 - Observed classes varied in size from nineteen to twenty-six students.
 - In most classes all students were fully on task during the observed lessons and were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
 - Observed teachers used direct instruction, modeling, independent practice, partner and table discussion, and question and answer.
 - A variety of checks for understanding were observed: questioning, class work, polling, exit tickets, and some peer discussion review of work.
 - Forms of questioning during the classroom observations mostly challenged students to demonstrate understanding, but also included basic fact recall and challenging students to analyze and apply.
 - In most classrooms, differentiation was not observed. However in two classes, differentiation was observed through grouping with students working with different materials (leveled reading materials, for example).
 - Based on debriefs with instructional leaders after classroom visits, a majority of the classrooms had instruction that was aligned with PPA's instructional model and current academic priorities.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with twelve teachers, a literacy coach, and a math coach. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received school-based professional development both in the summer and monthly during the school year, with the administration providing resources. Teachers mentioned that offsite professional development is also made available to the staff. The information is then turn-keyed to the rest of the staff. However, teachers were unclear how teachers were chosen to attend, and noted that the information was not always clearly disseminated to the remainder of the staff.
- All interviewed teachers were clear about the supervision and evaluation process and talked about receiving both bi-annual formal and multiple informal observations with feedback that was helpful. The formal observations follow the Danielson model, including pre- and post-observation meetings, and are conducted by the principal.

- Interviewed teachers reported that they create their own interim assessments in collaboration with the other teachers on their grade level. The teachers mentioned that they norm results by using the same rubrics. Some of the interviewed teachers reported that they also used iReady, Math Box Quizzes, and Engage NY for interim assessments.
- All interviewed teachers reported that teachers split up the creation of lesson plans among the grade level team. The lesson plans are reviewed by the principal and assistant principal, and feedback is given if any changes need to be made.

Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

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

On March 17, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE observed the school's Board of Trustees meeting. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has seven active members. The Board has experienced minimal turnover throughout its charter term. The Board has kept membership within the minimum number of 5 members and maximum of 9 members, as established in the Board's bylaws. The Board has also had the president of the Parent Teacher Organization as a voting member for the entirety of the charter term, as outlined in the bylaws.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum throughout this charter term, with the exception of a Board meeting in January 2013, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The school's Principal and Director of Finance and Operations consistently update the Board on the academic progress and operations at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes and observed by the NYC DOE.
- There are clear lines of accountability between Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organization chart and school leadership's monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.
- The Board has one active and functioning committee, the Academic Committee, as required by its bylaws and recorded in its meeting minutes. Although not reflected in board minutes, the Board reports that it has active Grievance, Budget and Finance, Development, and Executive Committees, as required by its bylaws. The Board reports that the Budget and Finance, and Development Committees meet on the second Monday of each month. The remaining Grievance and Executive Committees meet on an as-needed basis.

School Climate & Community Engagement

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has developed a stable school culture.

- To date, the school has had an annual average student attendance rate of 94% during each year of its charter term.¹⁰

| Average Daily Attendance | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | 94% | 94% |

- The school has had an enrollment retention rate (for all students enrolled during the course of the year returning the following September) of 81% for the 2011-2012 school year, 97% for the 2012-2013 school year, and 96% for the 2013-2014 school year.¹¹
- The school has experienced some turnover among instructional staff. The turnover rates for the instructional staff throughout the charter term are: 30% in 2011-2012, 42% in 2012-2013; and 0% in 2013-2014.¹² Most of the staff turnover in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years can be attributed to the uncertainty of the future of the school after the DOE's initial nonrenewal decision issued in 2011.
- Over the course of the charter term, PPA's NYC School Survey results were:

¹⁰ Self-reported on Data Collection Sheet submitted with Renewal Application in November 2013.

¹¹ Self-reported on Data Collection Sheet submitted with Renewal Application in November 2013.

¹² Self-reported on Data Collection Sheet submitted with Renewal Application in November 2013.

Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School NYC DOE School Survey Results

| | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| Academic Expectations | Well Above Average | Above Average |
| Communication | Well Above Average | Above Average |
| Engagement | Well Above Average | Above Average |
| Safety & Respect | Above Average | Above Average |

- Over the course of the charter term, PPA's NYC School Survey response rates were:

Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School NYC DOE School Survey Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

| | Parents | Citywide | Teachers | Citywide | Students ¹³ | Citywide |
|------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|----------|------------------------|----------|
| 2011-2012 | 100% | 53% | 96% | 82% | – | – |
| 2012-2013 | 100% | 92% | 100% | 83% | – | – |

As part of the renewal process, representatives of 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:

- The school has an active Parent Organization that holds monthly meetings, which the principal, assistant principal, parent coordinator, school counselor, and teachers also attend, providing an opportunity for parents to discuss concerns in a welcoming environment. Monthly round-table discussions are held with the teachers to update parents on the academic foci for the month.
- The school's average parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences was 98% in the 2011-2012 school year and 100% in the 2012-2013 school year. In 2012-2013, the school made accommodations to see each parent on their schedule.¹⁴
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. About 85 participants attended the hearing, nineteen speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made phone calls to parents chosen at random from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made until there were twenty complete phone calls. Of these calls, 95% of the provided positive feedback and 5% provided negative feedback regarding the school.

Based on student interviews of approximately ten students in grades four and five, conducted on the February 11th and 14th visit to the school, the following was noted:

- Students interviewed reported that all teachers had high expectations and set high goals for the students.
- Students interviewed reported that parent communication from teachers could be for either positive or negative reasons, such as having a really good day in class, needing help with a lesson, or falling too low on the behavior chart.

Financial Health

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

¹³ Student Response Rates on the NYC School Survey have not been applicable for this school over the course of the current charter term.

¹⁴ Self-reported information from the school's renewal application, submitted in November 2013.

- Based on the FY13 financial audit and follow up, the school's current ratio indicated a risk that the school may be unable to meet its current liabilities. However, this is the result of a number of factors, including the school's move to and renovation of a new space in FY13.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit and follow up, the school's unrestricted cash availability indicated a risk that the school may be unable to cover one month of its operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-14 budget to the actual enrollment as of February 10, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

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

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

There was no material weakness noted in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 independent financial audits.

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

Over the charter term, PPA has been compliant with all applicable laws and regulations. The Board of Trustees has been compliant with all applicable laws and regulations.

The Board has been in compliance with:

- Required number of Board meetings. The school's bylaws indicate that the Board hold at least ten meetings a year. The Board held the required number of meetings throughout its charter term, as evidenced by the Board Yearly Meeting Schedule.
- Membership size. The Board has been in compliance with required minimal membership size as outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, throughout this charter term.
- Submission of required Board documents. All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms and do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.¹⁵
- Submission of required accountability documents. The Board has provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the DOE.

The school has been in compliance with:

- Submission of required documents. The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Fingerprint clearance. Over the charter term, all staff have the required fingerprint clearance.
- Certification of instructional staff: Staff is either certified or highly qualified, and those that are not, fall under the requirements outlined in the NY State Charter Schools Act. A school can have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower.
- Insurance requirements. The school has submitted all appropriate insurance documents.

¹⁵ Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

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

As reported by school leadership and the school's Board, the following was noted:

- The school has no plans to expand or replicate in the next charter term.
- In order to continue to improve student academic achievement, the school plans to further systematize the collection and analysis of student interim performance data, revise their ELA curriculum, and add classroom support staff by creating a new teacher assistant role.
- In response to the 2010 amendments to NY State Charter Schools Act requiring schools to attract and retain percentages of students who are designated as Free and Reduced Lunch learners, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners, the school is making demonstrated efforts to attract and retain these students.
 - The school has conducted targeted outreach to Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, including holding open house sessions that explain the special services the school offers and translating all advertisement materials into Spanish.

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.

The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Statutory Basis for Renewal

The Charter Schools Act of 1998 (“the Act”) authorizes the creation 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:

- Improve student learning and achievement;
- Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system;
- Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.¹⁶

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.¹⁷

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.¹⁸ 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;
- 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.

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.¹⁹

¹⁶ See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.

¹⁷ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

¹⁸ See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

¹⁹ § 2852(5)

Part 6: Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework

The New York State Charter Schools Act (“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. 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.

(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.

The NYC DOE may recommend four potential outcomes for charter schools applying for renewal: full-term renewal, renewal with conditions, short-term renewal, or non-renewal.

Full-Term Renewal

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 yielded strong student performance and progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

Renewal with Conditions

In cases where a school has demonstrated mixed academic results or concerns about organizational viability, renewal is contingent upon changes to the prospective application or new charter, new performance measures, or both. These may include changes to curriculum, leadership, or board governance structure that are intended to yield improved academic outcomes during the next chartering period.

Short-Term Renewal

In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has fewer than two years of state-assessment results, a renewal of three-years or fewer may be considered. In limited circumstances, a school not in its initial charter or in its initial charter with more than three years of state assessment data, may be considered for a short-term renewal.

Non-Renewal

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.

The CSAS Accountability Framework

To help NYC DOE authorized charter schools better understand what we mean by success for charter schools, the NYC DOE's Charter Schools Accountability & Support (CSAS) has developed an Accountability Framework build around four essential questions for charter school renewal:

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

| 1. Is the School an Academic Success? |
|---|
| 1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement |
| Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meet absolute performance goals• Meet student progress goals• Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students• Are surpassing performance of DOE identified peer-schools• Are surpassing performance district and city proficiency or better averages• Are meeting other rigorous academic and non-academic goals as stated in school's charter |
| Evidence for success might include, but not be limited to, the following depending on school configurations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations)• Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations)• Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations)• Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results• When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results• HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates (absolute and progress, overall, for at-risk student populations)• 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• Results on state accountability measures• Charter School Academic and Non-Academic Goals• NYC Progress Reports |
| 1b. Mission and Academic Goals |
| Schools with successful missions and goals have many of the characteristics below: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have an animating mission statement that staff, students and community embrace• Set ambitious academic and non-academic goals that entire school community knows and embraces• Have processes for regular monitoring and reporting on progress toward school goals• Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data |

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

- Mission statement, charter, external documents (parent and 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

1c. 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 standards and the new Common Core Curriculum.
- Use instructional models and resources consistent with school mission and that are 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
- Implement 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 curricular tasks, programs and resources for effectiveness and fit with school mission and goals

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

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

1d. Learning Environment

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

- Have a strong culture that connects high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to give their best effort academically and socially
- 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
- Provide for safe, respectful, efficient transitions, hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.
- Have classrooms where academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Provide opportunities for students to actively engage in their own learning and in the life of the

school

- Have a formal or informal character education, social development, or citizenship program that provides opportunities to develop as individuals and citizens

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

- 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
- DOE School Survey student results
- DOE School Survey parent and teacher safety and respect results
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, student interviews
- Classroom observations
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)

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

2a. Governance Structure and Organizational Design

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

- Operate with a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate 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 laws and conflict of interest regulations
- 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 and despite circumstance
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals; it also has clear lines of accountability for leadership roles, accountability to Board, and, if applicable, relationship with a charter management organization
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Implemented a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's organization and leadership structure
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provide regular feedback on instruction to teachers

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

- School charter
- Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, meeting agenda and minutes
- Annual conflict of interest forms
- Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook, operations manual
- School calendar, professional development plan

2b. 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
- An effective process for recruiting, hiring, supporting, and evaluating leadership and staff
- A flexible, data-driven approach to professional development for all staff
- An effective way of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including the DOE School Survey
- Effective home-school communication practices to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children
- Strong community-based partnerships and advocacy for the school

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

- 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

2c. Financial and Operational Health

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

- Consistently meet its student enrollment and retention targets
- Annual budgets that meets all short- and long-term financial responsibilities with available revenues
- School leadership and Board that oversee financial and operational responsibilities in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to decision-making
- Boards and school leadership that maintain effective internal controls of finances to ensure integrity of financial management and a proactive approach to mitigating risk
- Consistently clean financial audits
- If applicable, strong, accountable partnerships with management organizations and other partners and significant vendors to support delivery of chartered school design and academic program
- A safe, clean and appropriately resourced educational facility with all appropriate services specified in charter and mandated by appropriate law and regulations

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
- Appropriate insurance documents
- Required facility documents (lease, certificate of occupancy, fire and safety inspections, etc.)
- Financial audits
- Financial leader(s) resume and accountability documents
- Operational policies and procedures
- Operational org chart
- Secure storage areas for student and staff records
- Policies/protocols for maintaining secure records
- School safety plan

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

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with their charter and agreement have:

- Implemented the key features of their charter as described in the original charter and 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 update-to-date charter is publicly available to staff, parents, and school community
- Implemented 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
- Site visits
- Board meetings, agendas and minutes
- Leadership/board interviews

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have:

- Met all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Comparable enrollment of FRL, ELL and Special Education students to those of their district of location or are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages
- Implemented 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
- Conducted independently verified fair and open lottery and manage with integrity enrollment process and annual waiting lists
- Employed instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and certification requirements

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

- School reporting documents
- School's Annual Report
- Student recruitment plan and resources
- Student management policies and promotion and retention policies
- Student discipline records
- Lottery policy, resources, and records; enrollment procedures and records
- Staff roster, fingerprint clearance for all staff, certification status of all instructional staff

3c. Applicable Regulations

| |
|--|
| <p>Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns with applicable regulations • Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and have completed 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 complying with NYC DOE CSAS’s requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members. • Informed NYCDOE CSAS, and where required, received CSAS approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization • Effectively engaged parent associations |
| <p>Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Interviews |

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

| |
|--|
| <p>In anticipation of a new charter term schools may be considering various growth options: replication, expansion to new grades or increased enrollment or altering their model in some significant way. Successful schools generally have processes for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 address the 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) |
| <p>Evidence for likely success in planning for school growth in a new charter term may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term • Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term • Leadership and Board interviews |

4b. Organizational Sustainability

| |
|---|
| <p>Successful schools consistently perform despite change. While there is no single path for ensuring sustainability, successful schools often have the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School anticipates organizational opportunities/needs and plans for resource development (human resource policies for growing your own talent, for example, 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) |
|---|

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

- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organization 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 if they don't make major changes through expansion or replication, they 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:

- Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and board interviews
- MOUs or contracts with partners

Appendix A: School Performance Data

| % Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 42.1% | 46.2% | 52.2% | 21.3% |
| CSD 27 | 50.1% | 54.7% | 56.0% | 28.7% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -8.0 | -8.5 | -3.8 | -7.4 |
| NYC | 46.1% | 49.4% | 51.2% | 28.0% |
| Difference from NYC | -4.0 | -3.2 | 1.0 | -6.7 |
| New York State | 52.5% | 54.8% | 55.2% | 31.2% |
| Difference from New York State | -10.4 | -8.6 | -3.0 | -9.9 |

| % Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 46.1% | 60.2% | 63.3% | 37.6% |
| CSD 27 | 61.7% | 64.4% | 66.0% | 32.5% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -15.6 | -4.2 | -2.7 | 5.1 |
| NYC | 57.4% | 60.0% | 62.6% | 32.7% |
| Difference from NYC | -11.3 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 4.9 |
| New York State | 64.6% | 64.6% | 65.7% | 28.9% |
| Difference from New York State | -18.5 | -4.4 | -2.4 | 8.7 |

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

| % of Third Graders Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 36.0% | 44.8% | 36.5% | 22.2% |
| CSD 27 | 51.2% | 53.2% | 54.4% | 29.2% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -15.2 | -8.4 | -17.9 | -7.0 |
| NYC | 46.5% | 48.1% | 49.0% | 28.1% |
| Difference from NYC | -10.5 | -3.3 | -12.5 | -5.9 |

| % of Third Graders Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 32.0% | 52.5% | 50.0% | 37.0% |
| CSD 27 | 58.3% | 56.2% | 60.4% | 31.8% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -26.3 | -3.7 | -10.4 | 5.2 |
| NYC | 54.3% | 54.8% | 57.0% | 33.1% |
| Difference from NYC | -22.3 | -2.3 | -7.0 | 3.9 |

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

| % of Fourth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 52.9% | 52.5% | 56.3% | 21.2% |
| CSD 27 | 49.1% | 55.4% | 55.0% | 27.3% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | 3.8 | -2.9 | 1.3 | -6.1 |
| NYC | 45.6% | 51.0% | 52.4% | 27.2% |
| Difference from NYC | 7.3 | 1.5 | 3.9 | -6.0 |

| % of Fourth Graders Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 60.8% | 71.7% | 68.8% | 46.2% |
| CSD 27 | 62.7% | 68.5% | 67.0% | 36.6% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -1.9 | 3.2 | 1.8 | 9.6 |
| NYC | 58.4% | 62.3% | 65.7% | 35.2% |
| Difference from NYC | 2.4 | 9.4 | 3.1 | 11.0 |

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

| % of Fifth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 37.3% | 41.1% | 61.3% | 20.7% |
| CSD 27 | 49.9% | 55.6% | 58.6% | 29.6% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -12.6 | -14.5 | 2.7 | -8.9 |
| NYC | 46.2% | 49.0% | 52.2% | 28.7% |
| Difference from NYC | -8.9 | -7.9 | 9.1 | -8.0 |

| % of Fifth Graders Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Peninsula Preparatory Academy Charter School | 45.1% | 56.1% | 68.9% | 30.5% |
| CSD 27 | 64.3% | 68.6% | 70.6% | 28.9% |
| Difference from CSD 27 | -19.2 | -12.5 | -1.7 | 1.6 |
| NYC | 59.7% | 62.9% | 65.2% | 29.6% |
| Difference from NYC | -14.6 | -6.8 | 3.7 | 0.9 |

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

Appendix B: NYC DOE Progress Reports

NYC DOE Progress Reports

[2010-2011 Academic Year](#)

[2011-2012 Academic Year](#)

[2012-2013 Academic Year](#)