



**Department of  
Education**

*Carmen Fariña, Chancellor*

**MANHATTAN CHARTER SCHOOL  
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR  
APRIL 2015**

# 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>14</b>
<b>PART 4: FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<i>Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success? .....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization? .....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? ...</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?.....</i>	<i>31</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

Manhattan Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Manuel Romero
School Leader(s)	Genie DePolo (Chief Academic Officer/ Principal); Sonia Park (Executive Director)
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 1
Physical Address(es)	100 Attorney Street, Manhattan
Facility Owner(s)	DOE
School Opened For Instruction	2005-2006
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	6/30/2015
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-5
Current Authorized Enrollment	274
Proposed New Charter Term	4 years [July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2019]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-5
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	274
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	Grades K-5: 2 sections per grade

## 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	22	22	22	22	88
# Met	13	10	5	5	33
# Partially Met	1	0	3	2	6
# Not Met	7	11	9	11	38
# Not Applicable *	1	1	5	4	11
% Met	59%	45%	23%	23%	38%
% Partially Met	5%	0%	14%	9%	7%
% Not Met	32%	50%	41%	50%	43%
% Not Applicable *	5%	5%	23%	18%	13%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	62%	48%	29%	28%	43%

\* 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.

### 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>Manhattan Charter School</b>	67.2%	67.5%	28.4%	25.6%
CSD 1	53.7%	53.7%	33.2%	36.4%
Difference from CSD 1 *	13.5	13.8	-4.8	-10.8
NYC	49.4%	51.2%	28.0%	29.8%
Difference from NYC *	17.8	16.3	0.4	-4.2
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	14.4	12.4	-2.7	-5.0

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Manhattan Charter School</b>	78.2%	79.4%	35.9%	57.5%
CSD 1	63.8%	65.0%	38.7%	45.8%
Difference from CSD 1 *	14.4	14.4	-2.8	11.7
NYC	60.0%	62.6%	32.7%	39.1%
Difference from NYC *	18.2	16.8	3.2	18.4
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	14.9	14.6	4.8	21.3

\* 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

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Manhattan Charter School - All Students</b>	<b>66.5%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>53.5%</b>	<b>54.5%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	57.9%	25.9%	32.3%	26.1%
City Percent of Range- All Students	43.2%	19.7%	18.5%	21.4%
<b>Manhattan Charter School – School's Lowest Third</b>	<b>71.0%</b>	<b>58.0%</b>	<b>54.0%</b>	<b>71.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	57.2%	20.8%	8.5%	41.6%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	41.7%	16.9%	0.0%	40.9%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Manhattan Charter School - All Students</b>	<b>71.0%</b>	<b>46.0%</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	<b>80.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	67.8%	19.1%	25.1%	93.2%
City Percent of Range- All Students	58.4%	19.4%	22.4%	90.8%
<b>Manhattan Charter School – School's Lowest Third</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>40.0%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>80.5%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	55.0%	0.0%	0.0%	70.0%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	45.7%	0.0%	0.0%	72.7%

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 *	-	57.1%	25.0%	54.5%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	-
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	40.0%	23.1%	42.1%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	28.6%	25.0%	81.8%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	-
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	28.6%	28.6%	73.7%

\* 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 4 year short term renewal.

### A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Manhattan Charter School (MCS) has partially 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.

Data available for MCS indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting most of these objectives.

#### **Mission and Vision**

Manhattan Charter School's mission is "to teach our students how to learn and love doing it, how to cultivate their curious minds for the rest of their lives, and how to develop a solid foundation on which to base wise choices and build meaningful futures." The school executes against this mission by offering a dual focus of a rigorous, standards-based core subject education, and an education in the arts, including daily music. The foreign language, music, and arts instruction helps students to build communication and collaboration skills, as well as self-discipline and develop the ability to take risks.

#### **School Specific Academic Performance**

The school entered its tenth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data and four years of other academic indicator(s) to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at Manhattan Charter School over the retrospective charter term.

Annual aggregate English Language Arts (ELA) and math proficiency rates for Manhattan Charter School exceeded those of Community School District (CSD) 1, New York City, and New York State (NYS) during the first two years of the current charter term. However, in the last two years of the retrospective charter term, the school's proficiency rates were mixed compared with the rates for CSD 1, New York City, and New York State - most notably, the school underperformed the CSD and NYS in ELA in both 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.<sup>1</sup> While the school's math proficiency rate was below that of CSD 1 in 2012-2013, the school achieved a high level of growth in math following the 2012-2013 test examination and achieved a higher proficiency rate in math than the comparable CSD 1 rate the following year, in 2013-2014. The school's aggregate math

---

<sup>1</sup> Manhattan Charter School's ELA proficiency rate fell below the New York City proficiency rate for the same grade span in 2013-2014 and fell below the New York State ELA proficiency rate in both school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. However, the school's math proficiency rate exceeded that of both New York City and New York State in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

proficiency rate in 2013-2014 also exceeded the comparable citywide proficiency rate and the NYS proficiency rate in math.

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 2012-2013 are not directly comparable.

In 2012-2013, 35.9% of Manhattan Charter School's students were proficient in math on the NYS assessments. Manhattan Charter School's math proficiency was greater than or equal to that of 63% of all elementary schools citywide. When compared to elementary schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools), Manhattan Charter School outperformed 82% of similar schools in math proficiency in the same year. In addition, the school outperformed 85% of all elementary schools in CSD 1. In 2012-2013, 28.4% of Manhattan Charter School's students demonstrated proficiency in NYS assessments in ELA. With this level of ELA proficiency, Manhattan Charter School outperformed 61% of all elementary schools citywide, 87% of its peer schools, and 69% of other elementary schools in CSD 1 in 2012-2013.

The following year, in 2013-2014, the percent of students at Manhattan Charter School who were proficient in math on the NYS assessments rose to 57.5%. For 2013-2014, Manhattan Charter School's math proficiency was higher than 78% of all elementary schools citywide. When compared to its peer schools, Manhattan Charter School outperformed 98% of similar schools in math proficiency; additionally, the school outperformed 85% of CSD 1 elementary schools. In 2013-2014, the percent of students at Manhattan Charter School who demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA fell, to 25.6%. With this level of ELA proficiency, Manhattan Charter School outperformed 53% of all elementary schools citywide, 60% of its peer schools, and 62% of CSD 1 elementary schools in 2013-2014.

Over the four years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, Manhattan Charter School has met 43% of its applicable academic charter goals.<sup>2,3</sup> Manhattan Charter School met five of 18 applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year. Because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's academic performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math assessments for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, due to a change in state regulation the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two; further, due to the elimination of the accountability instrument, the DOE will not evaluate goals related to NYC DOE Progress Report grades beginning with the 2013-2014 school year. The school has demonstrated a declining trend of achievement of its stated charter goals during the retrospective charter term, with a reduction in its academic goal achievement rate from 62% in the first year of its current charter term to only 28% in the most recent year.

In 2012-2013, Manhattan Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 53.5% with a City Percent of Range of only 18.5%, placing the school in only the 9<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide.<sup>4</sup> The school's peer and CSD percentiles were 12% and 8%, respectively.

---

<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 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 Learning 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 evaluate 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 lower than the school under consideration. A City Percent of Range of 18.5% indicates that the school's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was more than one standard deviation below the citywide elementary school average (that only 18.5% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of Manhattan Charter School),

In 2012-2013, Manhattan Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile was 51.0% with a City Percent of Range of 22.4%, which placed it in only the 13<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer and CSD percentiles were 3% and 0%, respectively.

The following year, in 2013-2014, Manhattan Charter School's median adjusted growth percentile increased in both ELA and math. In 2013-2014, Manhattan Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 54.5% with a City Percent of Range of 21.4%, placing the school in the 12<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide. The school's peer and CSD percentiles also rose slightly to 13% and 23%, respectively. These percentile rankings indicate that more than 75% of other elementary schools in Manhattan Charter School's peer group, in CSD 1, and across New York City had ELA median adjusted growth percentiles greater than Manhattan Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

Alternatively, in 2013-2014, Manhattan Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile was 80.0% with a City Percent of Range of 90.8%, placing the school in the top 95% of all elementary schools citywide.<sup>5</sup> The school's peer and CSD percentiles also rose to 98% and 85%, respectively. This means that 5% or fewer of other elementary schools across the city and in Manhattan Charter School's peer group had math median adjusted growth percentiles greater than Manhattan Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

The school's Annual Comprehensive Review (ACR) for 2012-2013 noted that the school had demonstrated a responsive education program by identifying the students in the lowest third of their cohort in both ELA and math (as identified in the NYC DOE Progress Report) and having these students partake in small group and individual tutoring by coaches and literacy specialists.<sup>6</sup> In 2013-2014, continuing its focus on providing targeted instruction to individual students who were struggling with certain skills, the school reported its development of Academic Intervention Services.<sup>7</sup> Further, both the 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 ACR Reports for Manhattan Charter School document the school's efforts to extend learning time. The school implemented an extended year program for kindergarten students such that these students get an additional six weeks in the summer prior to the first day of school; the school also implemented a longer school day for third through fifth grade students to support differentiated small group work and provide more time for math instruction.<sup>8,9</sup> In the 2013-2014 school year Manhattan Charter School also demonstrated a shift to a stronger data-driven culture by developing a Student Dashboard that reported "each student's interim and summative ELA and math assessment results for all available years [during the time] the student was enrolled at MCS," along with implementing Achievement Network (ANet) ELA and math assessments and BMAS reading level assessments.<sup>10</sup>

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, Manhattan Charter School received an overall grade of C with a grade of F for Student Progress, a grade of A for Student Performance, and a grade of B for School Environment. This ranked Manhattan Charter School in the 13<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide and represented a deterioration in performance from the prior year. For the 2011-2012 NYC DOE Progress Report, the school earned an overall grade of B, as well as a B grade for School Environment, an A grade for Student Performance, and a C grade for Student Progress, placing the school in the 51<sup>st</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide. In school year 2010-2011 the school earned an overall grade of A.

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

---

while a citywide percentile of 9% indicates that Manhattan Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 9% of all elementary schools citywide.

<sup>5</sup> A City Percent of Range of 90.8% indicates that the school's math median adjusted growth percentile was greater than one standard deviation above the average. A citywide percentile of 95% indicates that Manhattan Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile was higher than 95% of all elementary schools citywide.

<sup>6</sup> Manhattan Charter School Annual Comprehensive Review Report 2012-2013

<sup>7</sup> Manhattan Charter School Annual Comprehensive Review Report 2013-2014

<sup>8</sup> Manhattan Charter School Annual Comprehensive Review Report 2012-2013

<sup>9</sup> Manhattan Charter School Annual Comprehensive Review Report 2013-2014

<sup>10</sup> Manhattan Charter School Annual Comprehensive Review Report 2013-2014

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>11</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 (ELLs), and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, charter schools are 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, 73.7% of Manhattan 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 Manhattan Charter School in the 97<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide. In the same year, only 42.1% of Manhattan Charter School's 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 level places Manhattan Charter School in only the 21<sup>st</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 81.8% of Manhattan Charter School's students with disabilities experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places Manhattan Charter School in the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide. In the same year, 54.5% of the school's students with disabilities experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this level places Manhattan Charter School in the 63<sup>rd</sup> percentile of all elementary schools citywide.

In 2013-2014, Manhattan Charter School did not serve the minimum number<sup>12</sup> 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 English Language Learner students citywide with the same starting scores.

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

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

- Manhattan Charter School's Board of Trustee bylaws;
- Manhattan Charter School's Board of Trustee meeting minutes;

---

<sup>11</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.

<sup>12</sup> The minimum number of students for each metric in the Closing the Achievement Gap section is five. Metrics are excluded for a school when student-sample-size criteria are not met because of confidentiality considerations and the unreliability of measurements based on small numbers.

- Manhattan Charter School's self-reported staffing data;
- Manhattan Charter School's financial disclosure forms;
- Manhattan Charter School's FY11, FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- Manhattan Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- Manhattan Charter School's 2014-2015 student and family handbook; and
- Manhattan Charter School's FY15 budget.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. The school's current Board Chair, Manuel Romero, took over in November 2014. Benjamin Breen, the current Vice Chair, served as Interim Acting Chair from July 1, 2014 to November 2014. The previous Chair, Paul O'Neill, who remains an active member, has served on the Board since 2006. One other Board member has remained on the Board since the prior charter term. All other current members joined over the course of the current charter term, with three joining in 2014. The current level of membership with 10 Board members is consistent with the minimum of five and maximum of 13 members, established in the Board's bylaws. There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational chart and school leadership team's monthly reports to the Board, as recorded in Board meeting minutes. The bylaws indicate that the Board shall have a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and such other Officers as elected. Current positions that are filled include a Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Treasurer. According to the Board's roster, active committees include Executive, Education, and Finance. Additionally, the roster indicates that there is a Facilities Committee and a Nominating Committee.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has developed a stable school culture. Genie DePolo has served as the Principal of the school since July 2007 and also took on the role of Chief Academic Officer when MCS replicated to have a second school, Manhattan Charter School 2 (MCS 2), which opened in August 2012. Over the course of the current charter term, operational leadership shifted with the departure of the Chief Operations Officer in October 2013. The operations work was then divided between the Director of Finance and Human Resources and an Operations Manager. The operations personnel changed again prior to the start of the 2014-2015 school year, with the lead operations role becoming a Director of Operations, staffed by Kashani Stokley. In addition, in 2013, the Board of Trustees voted to return to an organizational structure that included an Executive Director to oversee both the operations and academics of Manhattan Charter School and MCS II. Sonia Park joined as the Executive Director in February 2014. Staff turnover has been moderate during the current charter term, ranging between a high of 25% in 2011-2012 to a low of 8% in 2013-2014.<sup>13</sup>

The school offers an enriched arts curriculum which includes music, art, health and physical education, as well as French. The enrichment teachers incorporate academic vocabulary into their lessons along with opportunities for students to think and speak critically about the enrichment content in relation to and parallel with the CCLS.

Average daily attendance for students during the retrospective charter term (2010-2011 through 2013-2014) was 93.1%;<sup>14</sup> the school did not meet its attendance goal of 95% in any year of the current charter term. Across the charter term, the school has achieved average results on the NYC school survey compared to citywide averages, with higher rates of teacher and parent satisfaction noted in the most recent year.

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has at least \$1,899,553 of unrestricted cash on hand to meet current liabilities totaling \$645,773. Cash on hand represents 183 days of operating expenses. Overall, however, there are some concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices.

There was no material weakness noted in the four independent financial audits from FY11 to FY14.

---

<sup>13</sup> Based on school self-reported school clarifications to its original renewal application; the clarifications were received in March 2015.

<sup>14</sup> Reflects attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system

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

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

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 13 members.

For the entirety of the current charter term, the Board's bylaws indicated that the Board should be subject to requirements of the New York State Open Meetings Law, as applicable and as amended from time to time. In school year 2010-2011, the Board held six meetings, four of which met quorum. In school year 2011-2012, the Board held six meetings, all of which met quorum. In school year 2012-2013, the Board held seven meetings, six of which met quorum. In school year 2013-2014, the Board held nine meetings, all of which met quorum. The current Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months, per year. The Board bylaws comply with this law.

All nine Board members who served on the Board in 2013-2014 submitted the requisite conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms as part of the 2013-2014 New York State Education Department (NYSED) Annual Report.

The Board consistently submitted the Annual Report to the NYSED by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term. However, the NYS Charter Schools Act requires schools to post to the website the annual audit for each year of the charter term; as of the March 2015 review, Manhattan Charter School had only posted its annual audit for three years, FY12, FY13 and FY14, as of the March 2015 review.

The Board has inconsistently made Board minutes and agendas available to the public. Agendas are available at meetings for review; however, minutes are not publically available following a meeting. As of the March 2015 review, the only minutes available for review were those submitted directly to the NYC DOE by the school, which are not readily available to the public.

The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.

The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy that is in use for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be compliant with federal law.

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

The school does not plan to increase its maximum authorized enrollment, and has decided to delay its plan to expand into middle school grades. The school plans on merging with its replicated school, Manhattan Charter School 2.

The school recognizes that it is falling below its enrollment target for English Language Learner students and has made concerted efforts to attract these students. These efforts include targeted outreach in media outlets such as El Diario and World Journal, recruitment at community Head Start programs, and an increased lottery preference set-aside for applicants who indicate that they primarily speak a language other than English at home.

## Part 2: School Overview and History

Manhattan Charter School is an elementary school serving 265 students<sup>15</sup> in kindergarten through fifth grade during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2005-2006 school year with kindergarten and first grades and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's authorized full grade span is for grades kindergarten through five, which it reached during its previous charter term, in 2009-2010. The school's current charter term expires on June 30, 2015.<sup>16</sup> The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in an NYC Department of Education (DOE) operated facility in Community School District 1 in Manhattan.<sup>17</sup> The school is co-located with P.S. 142 Amalia Castro.<sup>18</sup>

Manhattan Charter School's mission is "to teach our students how to learn and love doing it, how to cultivate their curious minds for the rest of their lives, and how to develop a solid foundation on which to base wise choices and build meaningful futures." The school offers a rigorous, standards-based core subject education. Alongside of the core content, the school also ensures that every student receives an enrichment education that includes music, French, health, and art.

Manhattan Charter School's Board of Trustees is led by chair Manuel Romero, who joined the Board in May 2014. The previous Board Chair, Paul O'Neill, has been on the Board since the school's inception and continues to serve on the Board's Nominating, Fundraising, and Facilities Committees. The school is led by Executive Director Sonia Park, who has overseen both Manhattan Charter School and Manhattan Charter School 2 since February 2014, and Chief Academic Officer and Manhattan Charter School Principal Genie DePolo, who has been at the school since July 2007. The school also has an Assistant Principal, Meredith Mallouk, who joined the school in July 2014, and a Director of Operations, Kashani Stokley, who joined the school in August 2014.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades kindergarten through two only; kindergarten is considered the primary entry grade. The school has indicated that it does backfill empty seats from the waitlist during the school year for grades kindergarten through two. There were 599 students (401 kindergarten students, 115 first grade students, and 83 second grade students) on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery.<sup>19</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.

### Enrollment

Grade-Level Annual Enrollment *	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Kindergarten	48	48	48	49
Grade 1	48	48	47	50
Grade 2	48	47	48	50
Grade 3	45	43	42	49
Grade 4	43	45	37	39
Grade 5	32	39	38	37
Total Enrollment	264	270	260	274

\* 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.

<sup>15</sup> ATS data as of October 31, 2014

<sup>16</sup> NYC DOE internal data

<sup>17</sup> NYC DOE internal data

<sup>18</sup> NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System

<sup>19</sup> Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

### Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information*	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	2	25
Grade 1	2	25
Grade 2	2	25
Grade 3	2	25
Grade 4	2	20
Grade 5	2	19
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	52	

\* Lottery information is based on self-reported data from the 2013-2014 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. Section counts are based on self-reported information collected as part of the school's Renewal Application. 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 Manhattan 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 targets recently finalized by the NYSED.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, Board of Regents authorized charter schools, including those authorized by NYC DOE, will be held accountable to enrollment targets established by NYSED for students with disabilities, English Language Learner students, and students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch. Please note that the recently finalized targets are currently based on enrollment in the 2010-2011 school year and may be updated in the future.

## 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 the relevant materials, a recommendation is made to the NYC DOE 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 (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>21</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 schools to New York State Education Department;
- 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.

---

<sup>21</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)

**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 on January 13 – 14, 2015:

- DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Maria Campo, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kaitlin Padgett, Director of Evaluation and Policy, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Ola Duru, Director of Operations, 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
- Lottie Almonte, Assigned Principal, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Arthur Sadoff, Independent Consultant

## Part 4: Findings

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

At the time of this school's renewal, Manhattan Charter School has demonstrated academic achievement, but partially demonstrated academic progress.

#### High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has four years of academic performance data and four years of NYS assessment data at the time of this report for the retrospective charter term. 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.

#### 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>Manhattan Charter School</b>	67.2%	67.5%	28.4%	25.6%
CSD 1	53.7%	53.7%	33.2%	36.4%
Difference from CSD 1 *	13.5	13.8	-4.8	-10.8
NYC	49.4%	51.2%	28.0%	29.8%
Difference from NYC *	17.8	16.3	0.4	-4.2
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	14.4	12.4	-2.7	-5.0

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Manhattan Charter School</b>	78.2%	79.4%	35.9%	57.5%
CSD 1	63.8%	65.0%	38.7%	45.8%
Difference from CSD 1 *	14.4	14.4	-2.8	11.7
NYC	60.0%	62.6%	32.7%	39.1%
Difference from NYC *	18.2	16.8	3.2	18.4
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	14.9	14.6	4.8	21.3

\* 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	A	B	C	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	B	C	F	
Student Performance	A	A	A	
School Environment	B	B	B	

## Mission and Academic Goals

According to the Renewal Application submitted to the NYC DOE by Manhattan Charter School, as well as annual reports submitted to the NYSED, over each year of the retrospective charter term, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- 13 of 21 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 10 of 21 in the second year,
- 5 of 17 in the third year,<sup>22</sup> and
- 5 of 18 in the fourth year.

## Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals \*

Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1. Each year, 75% of third through eighth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA exam.	Not Met	Not Met	N/A	Not Met
2. Each year, 75% of third through eighth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Math exam.	Met	Met	N/A	Not Met
3. Each year, 75% of fourth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science exam.	Met	Met	Met	Met
4. Each year, 75% of fifth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies exam.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. Each year, if fewer than 75% of a grade level cohort (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) scores at or above Level 3 on the previous year's ELA exam, the school will reduce by one-half the gap between 75% and the school's percent at or above Level 3. If the number of students scoring at or above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75% on the previous year's ELA exam, the school is expected to demonstrate growth (above 75%) in the current year.	Partially Met	Not Met	N/A	Not Met

<sup>22</sup> It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core Learning 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 evaluate 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
6.	Each year, if fewer than 75% of a grade level cohort (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) scores at or above Level 3 on the previous year's Math exam, the school will reduce by one-half the gap between 75% and the school's percent at or above Level 3. If the number of students scoring at or above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75% on the previous year's Math exam, the school is expected to demonstrate growth (above 75%) in the current year.	Met	Met	N/A	Met
7.	Each year, students who are continuously enrolled and scoring proficient or advanced proficient on the New York State ELA exam will maintain grade level by maintaining the same proficiency level from year to year.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
8.	Each year, students who are continuously enrolled and scoring proficient or advanced proficient on the New York State Math exam will maintain grade level by maintaining the same proficiency level from year to year.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
9.	Each year, 75% of kindergarten through second grade students will perform at or above the level of their peers as evidenced by attaining an NCE score of 50 or higher in reading on the Stanford 10.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
10.	Each year, 75% of kindergarten through second grade students will perform at or above the level of their peers as evidenced by attaining an NCE score of 50 or higher in math on the Stanford 10.	Met	Met	Not Met	Met
11.	Each year, in grades one and two, if fewer than 75% of a grade level cohort (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) attain an NCE score of 50 or higher in reading on the previous year's Stanford 10, the school will reduce by one-half the gap between 75% and the school's percent at or above an NCE score of 50. If the number of students scoring at or above 50 in a grade level cohort exceeded 75% on the previous year's Reading Stanford 10, the school is expected to maintain that percentage in the current year.	Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
12.	Each year, in grades one and two, if fewer than 75% of a grade level cohort (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) attain an NCE score of 50 or higher in math on the previous year's Stanford 10, the school will reduce by one-half the gap between 75% and the school's percent at or above an NCE score of 50. If the number of students scoring at or above 50 in a grade level cohort exceeded 75% on the previous year's Math Stanford 10, the school is expected to maintain that percentage in the current year.	Met	Not Met	Partially Met	Met
13.	Each year, 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 of all similar schools, as defined by the annual New York City DOE Progress Report.	Met	Met	Met	N/A
14.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools, as defined by the annual New York City DOE Progress Report.	Met	Met	Met	N/A

Academic Goals		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
15.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will meet or exceed the percentage of students at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in the school's Community School District.	Met	Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
16.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will meet or exceed the percentage of students at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in the school's Community School District.	Met	Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
17.	Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing." <sup>23</sup>	Met	Met	Met	N/A
18.	Each year, in grades two through five, continuously enrolled students will show one year of growth as evidenced by achieving within six NCE points or higher than the previous year in reading on a value-added, nationally normed assessment (Stanford 10).	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
19.	Each year, in grades two through five, continuously enrolled students will show one year of growth as evidenced by achieving within six NCE points or higher than the previous year in math on a value-added, nationally normed assessment (Stanford 10).	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
20.	Each year, 75% of students will demonstrate annual development toward an advanced set of music skills as evidenced by meeting or exceeding the school's music standards and performance standards.	Met	Met	Met	Met
21.	Each year, the school will set rigorous and reasonable individualized student growth targets. Each year, 75% of students will achieve their individualized student growth targets.	Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
22.	Each year, the school will maintain an average daily student attendance rate of 95%.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

\* 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

The school administered Achievement Network (ANet) ELA and math assessments, BMAS reading level assessment (Fountas and Pinnell), and Achieve3000 reading quizzes for the last two years of the charter term. The school administered the Stanford 10 assessments in reading and math for all of the charter term. The following was found:

- According to the results of the ANet ELA and math interim assessments for the 2014-2015 school year, students in grades two through five made little progress moving from Interim 1 to Interim 2. However, average Lexile growth was greater than expected for students in grades three through five.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on January 13 – 14, 2015. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

<sup>23</sup> Goals that reference a school's status on the 2013-2014 NYSED Report Cards are not reported on because the 2013-2014 NYS Report Cards have not yet been released.

- **Alignment with Common Core:**

- School leadership reported that beginning in the 2011-2012 school year the school made adjustments to its curriculum to reflect the rigorous standards of the CCLS and that the curriculum was fully aligned by the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year.
- In ELA, literacy specialists and selected teachers created Literacy Frameworks, which are thematic CCLS aligned ELA units and unit assessments.
- The school utilizes the Achieve 3000 reading program in grades three through five, which increases the frequency and fluency of reading, and monitors the students' growth in terms of Lexile levels. The school has also increased its focus on writing by having all students develop writing portfolios that take them through all steps of the writing process, along with guiding rubrics and opportunities to edit their writing daily.
- In math, the school began implementing the EngageNY math curriculum for all grade levels. In the 2013-2014 school year, the school piloted the JUMP math program in fourth grade as part of a Johns Hopkins University study to supplement the EngageNY math curriculum. School leadership found the pilot to be successful and, beginning in the 2014-2015 school year, started implementing the JUMP math program in grades two through five as a supplement to EngageNY math.
- School leadership reported that the school began administering Achievement Network interim ELA and math assessments four times per year, beginning in the 2013-2014 school year, because the assessments are aligned to the CCLS and the students' results on the assessments provide data on how the students are progressing towards the school's goals in absolute and comparative proficiency on the New York State assessments.

- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**

- The school supports at-risk learners through a 3-Tier Response to Intervention (RtI) model. The program allows teachers to identify and quickly respond to students who are struggling to make academic progress.
- The school provides a special education program that includes Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS), as well as related services such as Speech Therapy and Occupational Therapy. The school has two certified special education teachers on staff, both of whom are also Academic Intervention Specialists. One of the certified special education teachers is full-time; the other works with the school on a part-time basis. The school also has a Special Education Director, who is also an Academic Interventionist teacher. The related services, such as Speech, Occupational Therapy and Physical Therapy, are provided through a DOE related service agency.
- The school's special education teachers work closely with the general education teachers, and in grades three through five SETSS lessons are developed in conjunction with the lesson being taught in the general education classes. Articulation sheets are used between general education and special education teachers to share strategies and assess student's progress.
- The school provides immersion strategies in the classroom and additional instruction in English language development for students who are identified as English Language Learners (ELLs).
- Full-time Instructional Assistants on staff that allow for differentiated small group instruction and targeted instruction with specific at-risk students. The school also utilizes the Children's Institute's Primary Project program, which uses excessive play to reduce socio-emotional difficulties and enhance learning skills for the youngest students in need (kindergarten and first grade students).

- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**

- School leadership reported that the formal evaluation of teachers and the cycle of feedback are provided through the use of the Kim Marshall teacher evaluation rubric, with teacher evaluations conducted by the Principal and Assistant Principal. Additionally, data analysis and instructional planning are incorporated into feedback sessions in an effort to improve student achievement.

- The school administers three types of interim assessments – ANet ELA and math assessments, Fountas and Pinnell benchmark reading level assessments, and Achieve3000 reading quizzes – multiple times throughout the year. In addition, the school administers Stanford 10 assessments at the end of each school year. Beginning in the 2013-2014 school year, the school also developed a Student Dashboard, which reports each student’s interim and summative assessment results for all available years during the time the student was enrolled at Manhattan Charter School.
- School leadership reported that the professional development provided for all staff is focused on delivering CCLS-aligned instruction. Other professional development opportunities include a two week-long training during the summer for all teachers, bi-weekly Wednesday sessions, which include collaborative cross-grade planning, as well as workshops on various topics including data and report card analysis, developing responsive classrooms, and understanding curriculum changes.
- During the renewal visit the NYC DOE observed 33 classrooms across grades kindergarten through five with the school’s Principal, Assistant Principal, and Writing Coach. Additionally, one pull-out academic intervention was observed.
- In a majority of the observed classes teachers employed a direct instruction model, mostly consisting of one teacher and, in some cases, one instructional assistant. In a few of the observed classes, special education services were provided to a pull-out group.
- Class-sizes observed ranged from 14 to 24 students, with one or two teacher(s) in all classrooms. When two teachers were in the classroom, they followed mostly a lead and monitor model.
- The form of questioning most frequently observed during the classroom observations was a combination of basic fact recall questions and challenging students to demonstrate understanding through explain or restate methods. In a few of the classrooms questioning included challenges for students to analyze and apply.
- In most classrooms, the checks for understanding that were observed included questioning, observing, polling, classwork, and exit tickets.
- Though the NYC DOE observed students working in pairs or small groups across classrooms, no evidence of differentiation was observed.
- In all observed classes, all students demonstrated awareness of classroom rules or procedures.
- In all observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task.
- 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.

## **Learning Environment**

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 18 teachers, the Director of Special Education, a Writing Coach, and the Assistant Principal. The following was noted:

- Many interviewed teachers reported having opportunities to receive professional development. The professional development opportunities discussed by the interviewed teachers included a two-week whole-staff summer training, external trainings that are “turn-keyed” to staff by school leadership, and coaching provided by external consultants. A majority of the interviewed teachers who discussed professional development said they found it to be relevant and very useful.
- Most interviewed teachers mentioned a formal evaluation process, though only a few identified it as the Kim Marshall method. Teachers interviewed mentioned that the evaluation process includes observations, as well as a verbal and written debrief process with feedback. A few teachers mentioned that the feedback provided as part of that process is actionable and concrete.
- Some of the interviewed teachers mentioned that the school made several changes to become better aligned to the CCLS. Some of the changes discussed included the articulation of a student learning objective at the beginning of lessons and the use of the EngageNY curriculum.
- Some of the interviewed teachers discussed the use of data to tailor instruction and group students by both abilities and needs. Data is derived from formal assessments, including Fountas and Pinnell Achieve3000 and ANet, as well as informal assessments including end of unit exams and exit slips. However, there was little evidence during the observations of how these assessments informed instruction.

One group of nine fourth and fifth grade students was interviewed. Based on student interviews conducted on the January 13, 2015 visit to the school, the following was noted:

- Interviewed students reported that the school work was sometimes challenging, and that some subjects were more difficult than others. Further, they reported that homework served as a way for students to practice what they learned in class at home.
- Interviewed students reported that teachers would call their parents for both positive and negative reasons, such as doing well in class or getting a low score on a test.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 98% of parents agree “that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child” and 98% of parents who responded to the survey agree “that the school has high expectations for [their] child.”<sup>24</sup>

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 100% of teachers agree that “order and discipline are maintained at the school” and only 4% agree with the statement that “at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school.”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 65% of parent respondents strongly agree that Manhattan Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 33% agree with the statement. Similarly, 65% of parent respondents strongly agree that Manhattan Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 33% agree with the statement.

<sup>25</sup> According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 61% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at Manhattan Charter School; another 39% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 83% strongly disagree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 13% of teacher respondents disagree with the statement; 0% agree with the statement; and 4% strongly 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 developed its governance structure and organizational design.

On January 29, 2015, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE attended a meeting of the school's Board of Trustees and 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 10 active members. This level of membership is consistent with the minimum of five and maximum of 13 members stated in the Board's bylaws.
- The bylaws indicate that the Board shall have a President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer and such other Officers as elected. Current positions that are filled include a Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer.
- According to its bylaws, the Board is to hold at minimum six meetings each year. In the 2010-2011 school year, four of the six meetings held achieved quorum. In the 2011-2012 school year, all six meetings held achieved quorum; in the 2012-2013 school year, six of the seven meetings held achieved quorum; and in the 2013-2014 school year, all nine held achieved quorum. All six meetings held as of March 2015 for the 2014-2015 school year have met quorum.
- The Board is updated by the Executive Director, the Chief Academic Officer, and the Director of Operations as recorded in all available meeting minutes.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational chart.
- The Board's bylaws require a standing Executive Committee, a Finance Committee, and an Education and Accountability Committee. According to the Board's roster, active committees include Executive, Education, and Finance. Additionally, the roster indicates that there is a Facilities Committee and a Nominating Committee.
- The school's current Board Chair, Manuel Romero, assumed the Chair position in November 2014. Benjamin Breen, the current Vice Chair, served as Interim Acting Chair from July 1, 2014 to November 2014. The previous Chair, Paul O'Neill, remains an active member and has served on the Board since 2006. Genie DePolo has served as the Principal of the school since July 2007 and also took on the role of Chief Academic Officer when Manhattan Charter School replicated to have a second school, Manhattan Charter School 2, which opened in August 2012. Over the course of the charter term, operational leadership has shifted, with the departure of the Chief Operations Officer in October 2013. The operations work was then divided between the Director of Finance and Human Resources and an Operations Manager. The operations personnel changed again prior to the start of the 2014-2015 school year, with the lead operations role becoming a Director of Operations, staffed by Kashani Stokley. In addition, in 2013 the Board of Trustees voted to return to an organizational structure that includes an Executive Director who oversees both the operations and academics of Manhattan Charter School and Manhattan Charter School 2. Sonia Park joined as the Executive Director in February 2014.

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

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

- The school did not meet its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% in any of the four school years in the retrospective charter term. Average daily attendance for students over the period was 93.1% according to the data in the table below.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> The table reflects average daily attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014. Please note that the school self-reported different attendance rates in its Renewal Application than those recorded in ATS for all school years, though the differences are not significant. The school self-reported attendance rates of 92.0%, 93.0%, 93.0% and 93.0% for school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, respectively.

## Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Manhattan Charter School*</b>	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>93.2%</b>	<b>93.2%</b>	<b>92.9%</b>
NYC**	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	-0.2	-0.7	-0.4	-0.3

\* Attendance figures reflect average attendance as reflected in ATS.

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

- The school has experienced moderate instructional staff turnover during the course of the charter term, with average turnover of 18%.<sup>27</sup> For the most recent period, 2013-2014, the turnover rate for instructional staff was 8%.<sup>28</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 yet finalized by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term at the time of the creation of this report. Based on the NYC DOE's evaluation and not in comparison to any other school, the CSD, or NYC averages, the school has not had challenges with retaining students.

## Mobility

Student Mobility out of Manhattan Charter School *				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Number of Students who Left the School	20	26	8	30
Percent of Students who Left the School	8.6%	11.3%	3.6%	12.7%

\* 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 will not be 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. In the most recent year of survey results, 2013-2014, the percentage of teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for all of the four selected questions; in addition, the percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for all of the three selected questions.
- 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. The response rates for Manhattan Charter School parents and teachers were above NYC averages in all years.

<sup>27</sup> The highest rate of instructional staff turnover was reported for the 2011-2012 school year; the rate was reported as 25.0%, or five of 20 instructional staff that did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year. The lowest rate of instructional staff turnover was reported for the 2013-2014 school year at 8%; this rate reflected two of 26 instructional staff who did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year.

<sup>28</sup> Based on school self-reported school clarifications to its original renewal application; the clarifications were received in March 2015.

## NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree						
Survey Question		Manhattan 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.	97%	96%	99%	98%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	95%	92%	97%	99%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	97%	96%	99%	100%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	90%	92%	74%	100%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	90%	89%	87%	96%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	86%	82%	91%	100%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	-	90%	74%	91%	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*	Manhattan Charter School	-	-	-	-
	NYC	-	-	-	-
Parents	Manhattan Charter School	89%	89%	96%	89%
	NYC	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	Manhattan Charter School	97%	97%	100%	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 will only have met this goal if 75% or more of parents respond to the survey." The school met this goal in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. This goal was 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:

- Manhattan Charter School has reported that it maintains a parent group, the MCS Family Association, which engages families in supporting the school by organizing activities and fundraisers, as well as conducting outreach to the community.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing on January 13, 2015 at Manhattan Charter School located at 100 Attorney Street, New York, NY 10002 for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 165 participants attended the hearing with 31 people speaking in support of the school's renewal, eight speaking in opposition, and one speaker who was neutral to the proposal.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents/guardians from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made in January 2015 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 95% of parent/guardian respondents provided positive feedback and 5% provided negative 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 and follow up, the school's current ratio of 5.73 indicated that the school is in a strong position to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit and follow up, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash of \$1,899,553, representing operating expenses for 183 days, to cover its operating expenses for at least two months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of January 30, 2015 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, there are some concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices.**

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus of 7% over these audited fiscal years, and in FY14, the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit and follow up, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.16 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY14, the school generated overall negative cash flow from FY11 to FY14, though the school generated positive cash flow from FY12 to FY13.

There was no material weakness noted in the four independent annual financial audits for FY11 to FY14.

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

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

As of the review in March 2015, the Board of Trustees for Manhattan 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 13 members. The Board currently has 10 members.
- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** One Board member, Tom Alwood, left the Board in March 2014. Additionally, Barbara Cuspari joined the board in December 2014 as a parent representative. The NYC DOE was notified about each of these changes.
- **Required number of Board meetings.** For the entirety of the current charter term, the Board's bylaws indicated that the Board should be subject to requirements of the New York State Open Meetings Law, as applicable and as amended from time to time. In year one (2010-2011), the Board held six meetings, four of which met quorum. In year two (2011-2012), the Board held six meetings, all of which met quorum. In year three (2012-2013), the Board held seven meetings, six of which met quorum. In year four (2013-2014), the Board held nine meetings, all of which met quorum. The current Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months, per year. The Board's bylaws comply with this law.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All of the nine Board members who served on the Board in 2013-2014 submitted the requisite conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms as part of the 2013-2014 NYSED Annual Report. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.<sup>29</sup>

As of the review in March 2015, the Board of Trustees for Manhattan Charter School is out of compliance with:

- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has inconsistently made Board minutes and agendas available to the public. Agendas are available at meetings for review; however, minutes are not publically available following a meeting. As of the March 2015 review, the only minutes available for review were those submitted directly to the NYC DOE by the school.
- **Timely submission of documents.** The Board consistently submitted the Annual Report to the NYSED by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term. However, the NYS Charter Schools Act requires schools to post to their website the annual audit for each year of the charter term; Manhattan Charter School has only posted its annual audit for three years, FY12, FY13, and FY14.

As of the review in March 2015, 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.
- **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 2014-2015 enrollment, the school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 3, 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.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Fire Emergency.** One of the school leaders was trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.

---

<sup>29</sup> Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

- **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.
- **Student Discipline Plan.** The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy that is in use for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be compliant with federal law.

As of the review in March 2015, the charter school is out of compliance with:

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members do not have appropriate fingerprint clearance. One staff member has pending clearance.

### **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 the creation of this report, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act were still in a proposed status; these targets have since been finalized. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, as well as the recently finalized current enrollment targets developed by NYSED. It should be noted that these targets were developed using a different methodology than that used to develop the school-specific enrollment rates for each special population as presented below.<sup>30</sup>
- In all years of operation, including the most recently completed school year 2013-2014, Manhattan Charter School:
  - served a higher percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to the CSD 1 rate but a lower percentage compared to the citywide rate, with the exception of 2012-2013, when the school served a higher percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch than the citywide rate;
  - served a lower percentage of students with disabilities compared to both the CSD 1 and citywide percentages; and
  - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to both the CSD 1 and citywide percentages.

---

<sup>30</sup> Please see the following website for more information: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/enrollment-retention-targets.html>

## Enrollment of Special Populations<sup>31</sup>

Special Population		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Current)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	<b>Manhattan Charter School</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>84.2%</b>	<b>81.8%</b>	<b>72.2%</b>
	CSD 1	76.0%	74.8%	70.2%	70.0%	
	NYC	81.8%	84.1%	83.0%	82.5%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	<b>Manhattan Charter School</b>	<b>14.4%</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>17.0%</b>
	CSD 1	19.8%	20.2%	22.2%	25.2%	
	NYC	17.4%	17.3%	17.9%	19.7%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	<b>Manhattan Charter School</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>1.2%</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>10.0%</b>
	CSD 1	10.8%	10.6%	10.2%	9.2%	
	NYC	17.6%	17.0%	16.6%	16.0%	

Additional Enrollment Information				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	K-5	K-5	K-5	K-5
CSD(s)	1	1	1	1

<sup>31</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 NYSED. 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 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?**

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

- The school has decided to delay its plan for grade expansion, and is not requesting to increase its maximum authorized enrollment at this time.
- The school seeks to merge with its replicated school, Manhattan Charter School 2, as the schools share leadership, operations, academic intervention, and special education staff.
- In its next charter term the school will change its intake grades from grades kindergarten through two to grades kindergarten through three.
- The 2010 amendments to the NYS Charter Schools Act require charter schools to attract and retain at-risk students, specifically students who are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, students with disabilities, and English Language Learner students, at rates proportional to schools in their districts of location. In response to this regulation, Manhattan Charter School has demonstrated efforts to attract and retain these students.
  - During the 2012-2013 school year, Manhattan Charter School amended its lottery procedures to include a set-aside preference of 18% of kindergarten seats for applicants who indicate on their application that they primarily speak a language other than English at home. During the 2014-2015 school year, Manhattan Charter School again amended its lottery procedures to increase its set-aside preference for those applicants to 20%.
  - The school reported that 33% of applicants in the April 2014 lottery indicated that they spoke a language other than English at home.<sup>32</sup>
  - During the current 2014-2015 school year:<sup>33</sup>
    - The percentage of English Language Learner (ELL) students at Manhattan Charter School is 3.8%, which is more than double the school's 2013-2014 enrollment rate of ELL students. This increase is largely attributable to an increase in ELL enrollment in kindergarten, the primary entry grade for the school. In 2014-2015 the school's kindergarten ELL enrollment rate is 14.6%. This high level of ELL enrollment in the entry grade provides some evidence that the school's recruitment efforts were effective in increasing the number of ELL applicants to the school.
    - The percentage of students with disabilities at Manhattan Charter School is 21.1%, which is a 2.9 percentage point increase over the school's 2013-2014 enrollment rate of students with disabilities.
    - The percentage of students eligible for free or reduced price lunch at Manhattan Charter School is 78.1%, which is a 3.7 percentage point decrease over the school's 2013-2014 enrollment rate.
  - Manhattan Charter School is a member of the NYC Charter School Center's Recruiting and Educating English Language Learners (REELL) Program to learn best practices for recruitment and retention. The school has also had conversations with the school leadership of its peer schools, both district and charter, who have been successful in their ELL recruitment strategies.
  - School leadership has met with organizations within CSD 1 to raise awareness within the community. These organizations include University Settlement, Henry Street Settlement and Apex for Youth. School leadership has also met with representatives from Councilmember Margaret Chin's Office and the Community Education Council for CSD 1.
  - The school increased the number of media outlets it partners with for recruitment advertising and also increased the frequency with which it advertised in these outlets. The school advertised in El Diario (a Spanish language print and online newspaper), World Journal (a Chinese language news outlet), and East Villager (a print and online newspaper with a focus on East Village news).
  - Additional recruitment efforts included: visiting Head Start programs in the community, including Virginia Day Nursery and Grand Street Settlement; attending the District 1

---

<sup>32</sup> School-reported information as part of the Renewal Application. Please note that speaking a language other than English at home does not necessarily lead to a classification of English Language Learner.

<sup>33</sup> The 2014-2015 enrollment rates of English Language Learner students, students with disabilities, and students eligible for free or reduced price lunch reflect ATS enrollment as of October 31, 2014 and student demographics as of February 2, 2015.

Choice Fair; hosting school tours twice weekly; outreach and visits to the District 1 Family Welcome Center; and direct mailings via Vanguard.

## 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 its 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>34</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>35</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;
- 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

---

<sup>34</sup> See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

<sup>35</sup> See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

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>36</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>37</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.

<sup>37</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 the NYC DOE 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 2014-2015.

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>38</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>38</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>39</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

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

<sup>39</sup> School-specific targets for enrollment and retention were developed by the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

### 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>Manhattan Charter School</b>				
Grade 3	68.9%	69.8%	21.4%	22.9%
Grade 4	64.3%	65.9%	35.1%	20.6%
Grade 5	68.8%	66.7%	29.7%	34.3%
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 1 *</b>				
Grade 3	14.2	18.5	-12.9	-12.5
Grade 4	10.5	11.5	0.7	-19.2
Grade 5	16.2	11.4	-0.8	0.5
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM NYC</b>				
Grade 3	20.8	20.8	-6.7	-7.0
Grade 4	13.3	13.5	7.9	-10.5
Grade 5	19.8	14.5	1.1	5.9

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Manhattan Charter School</b>				
Grade 3	75.6%	79.1%	33.3%	45.8%
Grade 4	78.6%	77.3%	35.1%	68.6%
Grade 5	81.3%	82.1%	39.5%	62.2%
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 1 *</b>				
Grade 3	14.9	18.6	-8.6	-1.1
Grade 4	12.4	7.6	-6.1	19.8
Grade 5	16.8	17.1	7.2	20.7
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM NYC</b>				
Grade 3	20.8	22.1	0.2	7.2
Grade 4	16.3	11.6	-0.1	28.6
Grade 5	18.4	16.9	9.9	23.4

\* 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 Comprehensive Report 2013-2014](#)

[Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-2013](#)