



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

BRONX LIGHTHOUSE CHARTER SCHOOL RENEWAL REPORT

**2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
MARCH 2014**

Table of Contents

Summary of Renewal Recommendation	2
I. Charter School Overview	2
II. Overview of School-Specific Data	2
III. Rationale for Recommendation	4
School Overview and History	8
Renewal Process Overview	10
Findings	12
Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success	12
Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization.....	18
Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?	22
Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?	23
Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview	24
Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework	25
Appendix A: School Performance Data.....	34
Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data	37

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Name of Charter School	Bronx Lighthouse Charter School
Current Board Chair(s)	Rebecca Wollensack
School Leader	Dianne Hardcastle
Management Company (if applicable)	Lighthouse Academies, Inc.
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 12
Physical Address	1001 and 1005 Intervale Ave., Bronx, NY 10459
Facility	Public
School Opened For Instruction	2004
Current Charter Term Expiry Date	5/17/2014
Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at Expiry Date	K-11/ 621
Proposed Charter Term	Two Years
Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at New Expiry Date	K-12 / 638

II. Overview of School-Specific Data:

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	B	D	D	B
Student Progress	B	F	F	A
Student Performance	C	C	C	D
School Environment	A	A	B	B
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	2.3	1.0	1.5	3.7

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	37.2%	34.1%	34.9%	14.6%
CSD 12	28.1%	26.7%	28.9%	10.4%
Difference from CSD 12	9.1	7.4	6.0	4.2
NYC	43.4%	43.9%	46.9%	26.4%
Difference from NYC	-6.2	-9.8	-12.0	-11.8
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-15.3	-20.7	-20.3	-16.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	59.4%	62.1%	58.5%	22.2%
CSD 12	38.4%	40.4%	42.6%	11.3%
Difference from CSD 12	21.0	21.7	15.9	10.9
NYC	55.6%	57.3%	60.0%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	3.8	4.8	-1.5	-7.4
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-5.2	-2.5	-7.2	-6.7

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

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	-	-	68.9%	91.7%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	31.6%	76.8%
City Percent of Range	-	-	37.7%	81.7%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	-	-	-	92.0%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	88.4%
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	84.6%
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	-	-	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	-

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 or city.

Academic Goal Analysis (Based on School's Submission)					
	1st Year 2009-2010	2nd Year 2010-2011	3rd year 2011-2012	4th Year 2012-2013	Cumulative 4 Year Total
Total Achievable Academic Goals	7	10	11	10	38
# Met	5	2	1	4	12
# Partially Met	0	2	3	3	8
# Not Met	2	6	7	3	18
% Met	71%	20%	9%	40%	32%
% Partially Met	0%	20%	27%	30%	21%
% Not Met	29%	60%	64%	30%	47%

III. Rationale for Recommendation

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Bronx Lighthouse Charter School (BLCS) has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress. After a successful first charter term, BLCS continued its success in the first year of the current charter term but then struggled over the next two years. In 2012-2013, the school again showed strong promise, earning a B on the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Progress Report, including an A on the Student Progress subsection. BLCS has consistently surpassed its Community School District (CSD) proficiency levels in ELA and math throughout every year of the current charter term.

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

The BLCS mission is to prepare students for college through a rigorous arts-infused academic program. To accomplish this mission, BLCS has partnered with Lighthouse Academies (LHA), a charter management organization operating one other charter school in NYC and approximately twenty charter schools in other parts of the United States, particularly in the Midwest. The school currently serves students in grades K-7 in its Lower and Upper Elementary Academy and grades 8-11 in its College Prep Academy.

BLCS entered the fifth year of its second charter term with the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. For the current charter term, the NYC DOE has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data to evaluate the academic performance of the school. In addition, BLCS has received four graded NYC DOE Elementary-Middle School Progress Reports during this term. It has also received two ungraded High School Progress Reports, beginning in 2011-2012. BLCS will not receive a graded High School Progress Report until it promotes its first graduating class in 2014-2015. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an overall grade of A, B, C, D, or F and are based on the school's performance in each of these categories: Student Progress, Student Performance, and School Environment, with additional points for closing the achievement gap contributing to the overall grade. High School Progress Reports also include a College and Career Readiness section. Grades are based on comparing school results in each category to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to school results citywide.

Over the course of its second charter term, BLCS earned a B grade on the NYC DOE Progress Report in 2009-2010 and 2012-2013. BLCS earned a D grade on the NYC DOE Progress Report in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012. In the two years in which the school earned a B grade on the Progress Report, BLCS's Progress Report scores placed it near the top half of all NYC elementary-middle schools (above 59% of schools in 2009-2010 and 49% in 2012-2013), but in the years it received Ds, it was in bottom tenth. The two years of poor performance coincide with leadership instability.

Despite this inconsistent performance on its Progress Reports, it should be noted that in all four years of its second charter term, BLCS has outperformed its district of location, CSD 12, in both ELA and math overall proficiency (percent of students scoring Level 3 or 4). Several parents raised this point at the school's renewal hearing, stating that BLCS was their best school option in their community.

The pattern in the overall Progress Report grades also repeats itself in the school's Student Progress subsection: BLCS earned a B in Student Progress in 2009-2010, an F in 2010-2011 and

2011-2012, and then significantly improved in 2012-2013, earning an A in Student Progress on its most recent Progress Report. The primary growth metrics for student progress are Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles (MAGP)¹ for ELA and math. In 2012-2013, BLCS increased significantly in both metrics. Its ELA MAGP increased by 9.5 percentage points for all learners, putting it in the top quarter of its peer group and the top third in its district. In math its MAGP increased 13.5 percentage points for all learners, putting it in the top third of its peer group and its district.

The pattern in the school's Elementary-Middle School Progress Report was different for the Student Performance subsection; grades for the second term have been mediocre to poor with BLCS earning Cs in the first three years of the term and a D in Student Performance on its most recent Progress Report. The Student Performance grade on the Progress Report evaluates a school's performance compared to a demographically similar peer group of schools, regardless of geographic location. The school's performance compared to CSD 12 is a geographic comparison and that comparison has been favorable all the years of the charter term in both ELA and math, as noted above.

While it has not yet earned a graded HS Progress Report, the school has had two years of results in one important Student Progress measure, credit accumulation². In 2011-2012, 68.9% of BLCS's first year high school students earned 10 or more credits, with 46.7% of the school's lowest third of academic performers earning 10 or more credits. In 2012-2013, this improved significantly: 91.7% of its first year students and 92% of its second year students earned 10 or more credits. In addition, when looking at the school's lowest third of academic performers, the percent of students earning 10 or more credits increased as well with 86.7% of first year lowest third students and 100% of second year lowest third students earning 10 or more credits. Their citywide percentile rank for these four metrics ranges for 79th percentile to the 96th percentile, with peer group and borough percentile rankings being even higher.

Based on an analysis of applicable academic charter goals, over the course of its first term BLCS has cumulatively met 32% of its applicable goals, partially met an additional 21% of its goals, and not met 47% over the course of the term. The pattern of goal performance matches the pattern observed in the school's overall and student progress grades over the course of its second term. In 2009-2010, the school met 71% of its academic goals, but then met only 20% and 9% respectively in the middle two years of the term, before rebounding in 2012-2013 and meeting 40% of its academic goals³.

Over the course of the charter term, the NYC DOE has conducted three site visits: a one-day Annual Visit in the Spring of 2012, a two-day Annual Visit in the Spring of 2013, and, as part of the renewal process, a two-day visit in the Fall of 2013, with a follow-up visit on February 11, 2014. As evidenced by site visit reports, BLCS has partially developed a responsive educational program and supportive learning environment.

¹ This measure calculates the median (middle) adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. A student's growth percentile is a number between 0 and 100, which represents the percentage of students with the same score on last year's test who scored the same or lower than the student on this year's test. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the Progress Report uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect averages differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The Progress Report evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

² Credit accumulation is an important measure of progress toward graduation. The metric considers the percentage of students who earn ten or more credits between fall and summer of an academic year, with at least six of these credits needing to be earned in one of the main subjects (English, math, science or social studies)

³ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

After the departure of the principal who successfully took the school through its initial charter term, BLCS has struggled with turnover at both the leadership level and with its regional support team from LHA, impacting the school's academic performance and educational program implementation. In the report for the May 2012 visit, it was noted that school leadership was "actively engaged in addressing the challenges facing the school." Adjustments were made to the school's discipline policy, to aspects of its instructional model (including its assessment program), and to support for its teachers. The report also noted that the school needed to continue to "improve classroom instruction, improving consistency across classrooms, alignment across academies, and overall instructional rigor, differentiation, and the school's arts infusion program."

Improvements were noted in the report for the 2013 visit, with more consistent instruction and students consistently on-task. The improvements made in 2012-2013 coincide with improved Progress Report and DOE School Survey results. However, there has been continued change: the principal of BLCS for the K-7 academy left early in the 2012-2013 school year for health reasons and the school's lead principal, Richard Burke, who also served as the K-7 academy principal for the bulk of the school year, left when the position of lead principal was eliminated by the Board of Trustees at the end of June 2013.

In January of 2014 the K-7 principal, Elizabeth Runco, resigned, with Dianne Hardcastle, the CPA principal, named as the interim principal to replace Ms. Runco. After Ms. Runco's resignation her five-member leadership team was terminated. While the NYC DOE found that allegations of financial misconduct and potential violations of Open Meetings Law were not substantiated, the report did note that the school needs to take steps to address continued turnover and to improve communication, school culture, and execution of its accountability system.

In addition, BLCS continues to adjust its instructional program and interim assessments.

BLCS offers a structured English language immersion program for English Language Learner (ELL) students that includes push-in and pullout support during the instructional day as well as in after school programming. All teachers receive professional development training on strategies for teaching ELL students. The school utilizes a Response to Intervention (RTI) approach to support academic intervention and progress monitoring for all students at risk academic failure. The school's Student Support Team manages the RTI program, the student referral process, and provides direct support. The school works with the NYC DOE to provide additional related services such as long-term physical and/or occupational therapy.

Although BLCS continues to work to develop a supportive learning environment for all students, the school serves a smaller percentage of ELL students compared to CSD 12 and citywide averages. BLCS also serves fewer Students with Disabilities (SwD) than both CSD 12 and the citywide average. As it pertains to increasing the percentage of ELL students, the school is taking action (as described in Essential Question 4 on page 23) to increase enrollment of both ELL students and SWD.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has developed its governance structure and organizational design. The Board currently has seven members, which is more than the minimum number of five members and fewer than the maximum number of eleven established in its bylaws. Current Board Chair Rebecca Wollensack has been serving in this position since January 2013, replacing the Board Chair of the previous two years, Chris Torres. The Board receives regular updates from school leadership related to the school's academic and financial health, as evidenced by meeting minutes

Over the course of the school's current charter term, in part because of turnover, BLCS has struggled to establish a stable school culture. The school's NYC DOE School Survey results have consistently been Average to Below Average across all four categories (Academic Expectations,

Communication, Engagement, and Safety & Respect). School Survey participation rates among BLCS parents were below city averages for the first three years of the term; however, participation among teachers and students has been consistently higher than the city average for all four years and in the most recent year parent participation far exceeded city averages at 90%.

As noted above, the school has experienced significant leadership turnover during the course of its charter term. Its current K-7 academy has had six school leaders during that time (Jeffrey Tsang, Meghan Kimpton, Terri Foster, Richard Burke, Elizabeth Runco, and current interim principal Dianne Hardcastle), and its College Prep Academy has had four (Jeffrey Tsang, Mathias Guishard, Richard Burke, and current principal Dianne Hardcastle). Ms. Hardcastle is the interim principal for the K-7 academy but the permanent principal for the CPA. However, the school has consistently met its goals related to student attendance, student retention, and parent attendance at school conferences.

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations and is financially sustainable based on its current practices. There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits for FY2013, FY2012, and FY2011.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the course of the charter term, the school has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations but not with others. On August 8, 2013, CSAS issued a Notice of Concern to the BLCS Board for having implemented an organizational structure change without having first received submitted the change for approval from the NYC DOE as its chartering authority. During the renewal visit it was noted that the school failed to always complete fingerprint clearance and background checks prior to the start dates of some staff.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

BLCS will complete its growth into a full K-12 school when its current 11th grade students matriculate up to 12th grade in the first year of its next charter term. The school has no plans for replication.

For the aforementioned reasons, the NYC DOE recommends a short-term renewal of two years and 4 months (through June 30, 2016). In the first year of the new term, BLCS will reach its full grade span of K-12. As part of its oversight of BLCS in its next term, the NYC DOE asks the school to submit a draft corrective action plan to address the school culture, communication, and other issues described above and in the body of this report. A draft of the plan should be submitted to the NYC DOE by April 1, 2014, two weeks prior to its submission to BLCS's Board for approval at its April 17 meeting.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Bronx Lighthouse Charter School (BLCS) is an elementary school, middle school, and high school serving approximately 621⁴ students from kindergarten to eleventh grades during the 2013-2014 school year. BLCS opened in the 2004-2005 school year, serving grades kindergarten through second grade, and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's currently authorized full grade span is kindergarten through eleventh grade and, if approved for renewal, would complete its expansion to twelfth grade in its next charter term, reaching its desired grade span, K-12 in the first year of the new term. The school is split-sited in a New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) facility and a private facility in District 12, in the Bronx.

The BLCS mission is to prepare students for college through a rigorous arts-infused academic program. To accomplish this mission, BLCS has partnered with Lighthouse Academies (LHA), a charter management organization operating one other charter school in NYC and approximately twenty charter schools in other parts of the United States, particularly in the Midwest. BLCS is one of two Lighthouse Academy charter schools in New York City, both located in the Bronx.

Lighthouse Academies provides business and academic services to Bronx Lighthouse Charter School, one of two charter schools in New York City. The CMO also manages Metropolitan Lighthouse Charter School, also in the Bronx. Services from the CMO are coordinated and/or provided by a Regional Vice President and Regional Operations Manager dedicated to the two schools the CMO manages in the Bronx. Lighthouse Academies provides school leadership support and evaluation, back office support, payroll and human resources, vendor management, and financial and accounting support. It also supports implementation of the Lighthouse education model, providing curriculum guides, supplemental resources to support Common Core instruction, and professional development. The annual budget of the school is created in conjunction with Lighthouse Academies, the BLCS Board's Finance Committee and the school principals and approved by the Board of Trustees of the school. The school paid a flat fee in 2012-2013 of \$230,000 to Lighthouse for its support, resources, and services, with a bonus potential of \$35,000.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades kindergarten but accepts applications at all grade levels with some backfilling of empty seats. The school received 2087 applications for its Spring 2013 lottery—819 for kindergarten.⁵

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students⁶:

Special Populations

	Free Reduced Lunch				Students with Disabilities				English Language Learners			
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
School	85%	81%	87%	83%	9%	10%	11%	11%	9%	5%	6%	5%
CSD 12	85%	85%	85%	85%	19%	19%	18%	19%	19%	20%	19%	18%
NYC	62%	64%	65%	69%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	14%	14%

The table above indicates that BLCS serves a comparable percentage of FRL students to its district of location and higher percentages than city percentages. BLCS serves a smaller percentage of SWD and

⁴ ATS 2/21/14

⁵ Self-reported on Data Sheet Submitted by school November 8, 2013

⁶ Special Populations data is based on ATS snapshots as of October 31st of the given school year, with the exception of data for 2012-2013, which is based on an ATS snapshot as of October 26, 2012.

ELLs than both the district and citywide average. Most notably, BLCS serves only 5 % of ELL students, which is just under one-third of the district average.

BLCS was renewed for a full five year term in 2007-2008 academic year with no conditions.

The BLCS Board of Trustees is led by Board Chair Rebecca Wollensack. The school's principal is Dianne Hardcastle, who has served at the school for four years and is in her second full year as College Prep Academy principal, becoming interim principal of K-7 academy in January 2014.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

Renewal Process

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

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

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

A school will answer these overarching questions by demonstrating that its students have made significant academic progress and that the school has met the goals and objectives pledged in its initial charter. In addition, the school will describe challenges it has faced during its charter term, the strategies that were used to address those challenges and the lessons learned.

Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding a school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during its charter term, including but not limited to oversight visits, annual reports, and formal correspondence between the school and its authorizer, the NYC DOE, all of which are conducted in order to identify areas of weakness and to help the school to address them. Additionally, the NYC DOE incorporates into this report its findings from the renewal application process, which includes a written application, a report on student achievement data and a school visit by staff from the Charter Schools Accountability and Support (CSAS) team and other staff from the NYC DOE.

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

Is the school an academic success?

To assess whether a school is an academic success, the NYC DOE considers performance measures, including, but not limited to the following:

- Overall NYC DOE Progress Report score,
- New York State ELA and math results and/or New York State Regents exams,
- ELA and math proficiency compared to the district for elementary and middle schools, and graduation rates compared to the city for high schools,
- New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) or other approved alternate assessments, and
- Performance data pertaining to college and career readiness.

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

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally sound, viable organization, CSAS focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and

Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the NACSA (National Association of Charter School Authorizers) Financial Framework.⁷

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

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

A school's Governance Structure & Organizational Design and Climate & Community Engagement are rated as **Developed, Partially Developed, or Not Yet Developed**. A school's Financial Health is rated to indicate whether there are concerns about the near-term financial obligations and the financial sustainability of the school.

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

As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Staff Representatives

The following NYC DOE staff representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on October 16 and 17, 2013:

- Richard Larios, Senior Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Gabrielle Mosquera, Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Sonia Park, Executive Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Elaine Gorman, Senior Superintendent, NYC DOE Division of Portfolio Planning
- Amanda Cahn, Deputy Chief Portfolio Officer, NYC DOE, Office of Portfolio Management
- Keely Faulkner, Associate Director of Planning, NYC DOE, Office of Portfolio Management
- Adrien Siegfried, Associate Director of Planning, NYC DOE, Office of Portfolio Management

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

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal BLCS has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

Academic Attainment and Improvement

During this charter term, the school has received four NYC DOE Progress Reports and has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data at the time of this report. (For detailed information on the grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A.)

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	B	D	D	B
Student Progress	B	F	F	A
Student Performance	C	C	C	D
School Environment	A	A	B	B
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	2.3	1.0	1.5	3.7

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	37.2%	34.1%	34.9%	14.6%
CSD 12	28.1%	26.7%	28.9%	10.4%
Difference from CSD 12	9.1	7.4	6.0	4.2
NYC	43.4%	43.9%	46.9%	26.4%
Difference from NYC	-6.2	-9.8	-12.0	-11.8
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-15.3	-20.7	-20.3	-16.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	59.4%	62.1%	58.5%	22.2%
CSD 12	38.4%	40.4%	42.6%	11.3%
Difference from CSD 12	21.0	21.7	15.9	10.9
NYC	55.6%	57.3%	60.0%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	3.8	4.8	-1.5	-7.4
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-5.2	-2.5	-7.2	-6.7

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

Mission and Academic Goals

Over its second charter term, BLCS achieved: 5 of 7 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter term, 2 of 10 in the second year (with 2 others partially met), 1 of 11 in the third year (with 3 others partially met), 5 of 9 in the fourth year (with 1 other partially met)⁸.

- It is worth noting among the partially met goals were goals related to BLCS surpassing the district in ELA and math proficiency. BLCS did that in overall proficiency for both subjects in all four years of the current term but the goals were only partially met because the goals are written so that the school has to surpass at every grade level for it to be regarded as met. In each instance where it was partially met the school surpassed the district in all but one grade.
- However, it should also be noted that the gap between school and district in overall proficiency levels has narrowed each year during the current term, though the school remains higher than the district.

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

	Met in 2009-2010?	Met in 2010-2011?	Met in 2011-2012?	Met in 2012-2013?
Each year, 75% of 3 rd -8 th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA exam.	No	No	No	N/A
Each year, 75% of 3 rd -8 th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math exam.	No	No	No	N/A
Each year, 75% of 4 th and 8 th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science exam.	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial
Each grade level cohort of the same students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS ELA exams (baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA exams.	N/A	No	No	N/A
Each grade level cohort of the same students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS Math exams (baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's Math exams	N/A	No	No	N/A
Each year, 75% of students enrolled in grades 9-12 will accumulate 10 or more credits towards graduation.	N/A	N/A	No	Yes
By the end of year 4 in the second term of the charter, 75% of the first cohort will have scored at least 75% on the NYS Regents examinations in Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
By the end of year 4 in the second term of the charter, 75% of the initial cohort will have scored at least 65 on the NYS Regents examinations in Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
By the end of year 4 in the second term of the charter, 75% of the initial cohort will have scored at least 65 on the NYS Regents examinations in History	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exams in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students in Community School District 12	Yes	Partial	Partial	Partial

⁸ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exams in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students in Community School District 12	Yes	Yes	Partial	Partial
The school will receive a “B” or higher on the Student Progress section of the NYCDOE Progress Report.	Yes	No	No	Yes
Each year, for a grade level cohort that has been at the school for three full years (through 8th grade), the percent at or beyond the national median in reading and math as measured by the NWEA MAP assessments will increase by 10% of the cohort.	N/A	No	No	No
Each year, the school will be deemed “In Good Standing” on the NYS Report Card.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Responsive Education Program

The school administers the Northwest Evaluation Association (NWEA) assessments twice yearly to all students in grades kindergarten through eighth grade and once to new students in grade nine through eleven. One of the school’s charter goals is related to NWEA results, annual cohort increases of 10% in the percent of students performing above the national median in reading and math. BLCS did not meet that goal during the current charter term. However, the school reports that over the course of the charter term it has consistently seen grade level changes in Meant RIT⁹ score fall-to-spring growth that exceed the percent of typical growth achieved based on NWEA’s Growth Index. This suggests that while the school has not met its primary WNEA goal, students have demonstrated growth each year.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited BLCS on October 16 and 17, 2013, with a follow-up operational visit on February 11, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
 - BLCS uses LHA’s education program, which has been aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and is supported by curriculum maps, professional development and unit and lesson plan resources.
 - In 2013-2014, BLCS changed its interim assessment system from Acuity to Achievement Network for grades two through seven to improve rigor, consistency, and alignment of assessments and instruction.
 - College Prep Academy (grades eight through eleven) uses Learning Station as its interim assessment support with teacher created content that, leadership reported, is two-thirds aligned with NYS Regents expectations and one-third with Advanced Placement and SAT expectations.
 - The school leadership and board use a dashboard built from its Culture of Achievement Plan (CAP) to monitor school progress. The academic portion of the CAP is aligned with CCLS expectations, according to school leadership.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
 - The instructional leadership team includes multiple coaches for teachers: the Special Education Coordinators, the CPA Director of College Transition, the Director of Teacher Leadership, the Teacher Leader fellow, and both principals all serve as coaches to teaching staff.
 - In addition to the coaching model, professional development support includes twenty days prior to school opening set aside for getting ready for the coming year—including a five-day LHA wide summit and 15 days on site at the school. During the year, additional professional development opportunities occur during weekly grade level and team meetings.

⁹ A RIT (or Rausch Unit) score measure is an equal interval of instructional growth; it compares growth of students at the same instructional level. Typical growth is an average increase in RIT score for a class or group of students, in this case, grade levels.

- Over the two days of the visit, NYC DOE representatives observed twenty-eight classrooms, grades kindergarten through eleven, with members of the school's instructional leadership team.
 - While class sizes ranged from eleven to twenty-three students per class, most classes in the lower and upper elementary had between twenty-one and twenty-three students. Class sizes were smaller in the College Prep Academy (CPA), where six of ten observed classes had between eleven and nineteen students. In all but four of the observed classes there was one teacher in each class; four of the observed classes has push-in support during part of the visit.
 - All observed classes were safe, orderly and conducive to learning. Students were consistently on-task and responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
 - Instructional delivery varied but included direct instruction, modeling, guided and independent practice, peer discussion, and station learning. 'Do Nows' and mini-lesson were common elements of observed lessons.
 - Multiple checks for understanding, formal and informal, were employed with varying degrees of effectiveness—questioning, polling, exit tickets, observation, activity and work sheets, homework, and some performance-based projects, generally writing.
 - Questioning in most observed classrooms focused on basic recall questions with some questions asking students to explain their answers or cite evidence for a response but very little higher level critical thinking or application questions.
 - Pacing was consistently more efficient and instructional time more effectively used in the College Prep Academy.
 - In the lower and upper elementary academy, pacing varied with some very efficient and effective lessons. In other lessons, unnecessary waiting was built into the student activity or portions of lessons took much more time than planned and in some instances, independent practice or lesson wrap-ups were either cut short or skipped altogether.
 - Classrooms were print and resource rich. Student work along with instructional and behavioral supports was displayed; curriculum materials and technology were also available.
 - Feedback on student work, both oral and displayed written feedback, was frequently positive but often generic. In many classes, teachers were observed providing students with correct answers rather than guiding them to think through or explain their responses.
 - Examples of differentiated instruction were limited, leveled readers in literacy classes, station rotations in a few classes, and in limited tracking of students in ability groups in lower and upper elementary academy.
 - Examples of arts infusion were observed in some classrooms and impressive displays of student artwork were visible around the school in both academies. The lower and upper elementary academy relies on teachers creating connections with informal support from the academy's art teacher. The CPA has an arts infusion specialist teacher who collaborates with subject-area teachers to plan meaningful arts infusion.
- Based on debriefs with the school's instructional leaders after classroom visits, all classrooms were deemed to be aligned with the school's mission and instructional priorities, although execution varied across classes, particularly in lower and upper elementary where there is a significant number of first and second year teachers.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
 - BLCS has two special education coordinators, one for lower and upper elementary academy and one for the College Prep Academy.
 - Staffs of both teams are appropriately certified.
 - Special Education services are provided in a Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) setting at BLCS with push-in and pull-out support provided.
 - While the school implemented a Response to Intervention (RTI) program in 2010-2011, based on interviews, staff felt that the program was not effectively implemented until

2012-2013, when implementation was more formally and systematically supported by administration, staff, and professional development. The school has RTI specialists providing Tier II and III support, one specialist per two grade clusters in the lower and upper elementary academy, with an additional RTI specialist assigned to kindergarten. The special education coordinators at BLCS each maintain a tracking spreadsheet for students receiving RTI support, which for academic and behavior support is on six-week cycles.

- BLCS offers a structured English language immersion program for ELL students that includes push-in and pullout support during the instructional day as well as in after school programming.
- The school employs eight full time staff with special education certification to provide services to SwD and student support teachers participate in parent-teacher conferences.
- **Assessment System**
 - BLCS uses a variety of assessments to monitor progress, support instruction and accountability, including:
 - NWEA is administered twice yearly for grades kindergarten through eight for all students; once for students in grades nine through eleven for students new to the school.
 - Interim assessments are administered four times a year using Achievement Network in second through seventh grades and five times a year using teacher created assessment on Learning Station in grades eight through eleven for math, ELA, science, history and Spanish.
 - Fountas and Pinnell is administered four times a year in grades kindergarten through three and at the start of the year in grade four.
 - LHA's Writing Assessment is administered three times a year in grades kindergarten through seven, and the College Prep Academy administers a five times a year thematic essay using the Regents rubric.
 - The College Prep Academy also uses ReadStep, a College Board resource, and the PSAT to prepare students for success on the SAT and is piloting SAT subject tests in history and Spanish in 2013-2014.

Learning Environment

- During the days of the visit, all observed transitions and student-teacher interactions were safe, orderly and respectful. Classrooms had LHA's core values and behavioral reminders on display and student management included a positive incentive system in the CPA and upper elementary academy. In the lower elementary individual teachers had classroom-based reward systems.
- CSAS representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with fifteen BLCS teachers.
 - All interviewed teachers reported that the school environment was warm, supportive and collaborative. They appreciated the degree of flexibility and creativity they were allowed in planning instruction.
 - Interviewed teachers had mixed responses about the use of data to inform instruction, with some teachers unable to identify what data might be used to inform or adjust instruction and others specifying classroom assessments, exit tickets, and informal observational data.
 - All interviewed teachers were aware of who was responsible for their supervision and evaluation, how the evaluation would be conducted, and that the Danielson Framework was the basis of both their evaluation and their coaching support.
 - All interviewed teachers spoke positively of their informal observations and feedback they had received from their coaches.
 - All interviewed teachers were positive about the arts infusion emphasis of the LHA program with the College Prep Academy speaking more positively about their implementation, praising their arts infusion specialist, and the lower and upper elementary teachers being less confident about their implementation and support.
 - All interviewed teachers spoke positively about improvements that the new leadership team has implemented, including improved communication and greater consistency in

student management, grading, and collaboration. However, all teachers also spoke about the two academies as very separate schools and suggested that continued improvement in communication and collaboration across the two BLCS academies would be beneficial to overall school culture. Additionally, several teachers stated that they were hoping for less teacher turnover in the coming school years and one expressed a wish for less leadership turnover.

- The school employs a fulltime bilingual main office staff to support communication with families and provides Spanish-language translation of all documents sent home for families and provides translation at school programming events, including report card conferences and family events.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

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

On October 15, 2013, as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE conducted an interview with the school's Board of Trustees, had further conversations with the Board in January and February and meetings with LHA and school leaders during the February 11, 2014 visit following the leadership change. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has seven active members, which is more than the minimum number of five members and fewer than the maximum number of eleven members established by its bylaws. Although the Board has had turnover of its roster between the first and second, third and fourth, and fourth and fifth years of the current term, it managed the attrition by adding new members and has kept membership within the parameters of its bylaws throughout the charter term. The current board has one member from the first year of the term, two from the second year, one from the third, two from the fourth, and one from the current year.
- The role of Board Secretary is currently vacant.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- BLCS's school leader(s) and LHA representatives update the Board on academic progress and operations at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organization chart and school leadership's monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board as recorded in Board meeting minutes. Resources and formal structures for leadership and staff evaluation are in place. An informal evaluation process based on the school's Closing the Achievement Gap plan is used to evaluate LHA and the Board's performance, but no structured rubrics or evaluative tools are in place at this point.
 - However, despite clearly articulated lines of accountability and identified structures for supervision and evaluation, in 2014 there were several instances of breakdowns in communication and accountability that contributed to turnover and to failures to ensure that some evaluations occurred as intended.
- The Board has active and functioning committees, as required by its bylaws, including an Executive Committee, an Education and Accountability Committee, and a Finance and Audit, as recorded in meeting minutes and confirmed during the Board interview.

School Climate & Community Engagement

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has struggled to develop a stable school culture.

- As noted in the Executive Summary, the school has experienced significant leadership turnover during the course of its charter term. Its current Lower School (lower and upper elementary grades) has had five school leaders during that time (Jeffrey Tsang, Meghan Kimpton, Terri Foster, Richard Burke, Elizabeth Runco, and current interim principal Dianne Hardcastle), and its College Prep Academy has had four (Jeffrey Tsang, Mathias Guishard, Richard Burke, and current principal Dianne Hardcastle).
- The school's non-instructional staff turnover rate has ranged from 19% to 32% throughout the course of its charter term.
- The school has experienced significant instructional staff turnover throughout its charter term. BLCS's instructional staff turnover rates over the course of its charter are as follows: 18% in 2009-2010; 33% in 2010-2011; 46% in 2011-2012; and 38% in 2012-2013.¹⁰ According to the school principals, approximately 40% of BLCS's 2013-2014 instructional staff were new to the

¹⁰ Self-reported from Data Collection Form submitted with Renewal Application in November 2013.

school. At the College Prep Academy the percent of new teachers was 24% with some new teachers being the result of grade expansion. The percent of new teachers in the lower and upper elementary academy is higher, 52% (15 of 29 teachers). It should be further noted, that additional attrition occurred in the winter of 2014, when six instructional staff in the lower school (K-7), two in support roles, resigned after Principal Runco resigned.

- To date, the school has met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95%.

Average Daily Attendance¹¹	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
	95%	95%	95%	95%

- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey results and response rates for BLCS were:

Bronx Lighthouse Charter School NYC School Survey Results

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Academic Expectations	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Average
Communication	Above Average	Average	Average	Average
Engagement	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Average
Safety & Respect	Above Average	Average	Average	Average

Bronx Lighthouse Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

	Parents	Citywide	Teachers	Citywide	Students	Citywide
2009-2010	44%	49%	71%	76%	95%	82%
2010-2011	47%	52%	100%	82%	93%	83%
2011-2012	45%	53%	86%	82%	94%	82%
2012-2013	90%	54%	100%	83%	93%	83%

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

- The school has met its goal for at least 80% parent conference attendance during each year of its charter term.¹²
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments on BLCS's renewal. Approximately 108 community members attended the hearing with 17 offering public comment. All speakers spoke in favor of the school's renewal; no speakers spoke against.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to parents/guardians were made until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.
- After Lead Principal Richard Burke's departure at the end of June 2013 there was an electronic petition urging the Board to re-instate his position. The Board communicated its intention to stand by the decision to eliminate the Lead Principal role at a fall Board meeting. Following Principal Runco's resignation in January 2014 and her leadership team's termination, the Board, the NYC

¹¹ NYC DOE Progress Reports, 2009-2013

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

DOE (and others) received communication from some parents and staff upset at these changes. A follow-up investigation resulted in a determination that allegations of inappropriate financial management or decision-making that violated applicable law, regulations or policies were based on inaccurate facts (the CMO owns BLCS's private facility), or represented strong differences with decisions that were the appropriate responsibility of individual staff, school leaders, or the Board to make in their respective roles.

- While the NYC DOE did not find that there was financial misconduct as alleged or that allegations regarding significant violations of charter law were substantiated, there are concerns about the:
 - perceptions of some staff and parents that there are two schools, not one, that are in competition with each other for resources and how that perception has contributed to a divided school culture;
 - failure to effectively respond to this division with adequate communication, accountability, and support to resolve the situation in a timely manner;
 - and questions raised by the continued high turnover and its implications for the school's hiring processes, staff and leadership expectations, and supervision and evaluation.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the Fiscal Year (FY) 13 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover its operating expenses for more than two months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-2014 budget to the actual enrollment as of October 31, 2013 show that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

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

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus and in FY13 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY13 the school had overall negative cash flow, with declining cash in each fiscal year.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits for FY 2013, FY 2012 and FY 2011.

Based on document review and an interview during the visit to the school, the following was noted:

- Bronx Lighthouse Charter School is the sole owner of BLCS Property, a Delaware not-for-profit corporation, which was incorporated on March 16, 2011 for the purpose of holding real estate to be used by the school's College Preparatory Academy.

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

Over the course of the charter term, the Board has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations with one exception. On August 8, 2013, CSAS issued a Notice of Concern to the BLCS Board for having implemented an organizational structure change without having first submitted the change for approval to the NYC DOE as its chartering authority.

Over the course of the charter term, the school has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations, but not others.

The Board is in compliance with:

- Membership size. The board has consistently been within the range of five to eleven members outlined in the Board's bylaws.
- Required number of Board meetings. The Board has held the number of board meetings outlined in its charter and required by its bylaws.
- Availability of minutes and agendas. The Board has made all board minutes and agendas available to the public via the school's website.
- Required number of monthly meetings. The Board has provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the NYC DOE.

The Board has been out of compliance with:

- Timely submission of documents. Over the bulk of the charter term, the Board has submitted all required documents in a timely fashion with the exception noted above of charter revision documentation that was not submitted until after the proposed change had been implemented.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of all required documents. The school has submitted the required private facility safety plan. The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Insurance requirements. The school has all appropriate insurance documents.

The school is out of compliance with:

- Certification of staff. The school is out of compliance with NY State Charter Schools Act which relates to teacher certification. A school can have no more than five teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower. The school has seven uncertified teachers, however two teachers are in Teach For America and are in the process of receiving their Transitional certification.
- Fingerprint clearance. Over the course of the charter term, all staff have not had the required fingerprint clearance conducted in a timely manner. During the renewal visits, it was discovered that some staff were officially cleared after their *start* dates and that three staff did not have fingerprint clearance on file. The three staff members have since received their fingerprint clearance. The school will receive additional oversight visits to monitor compliance with this requirement in 2014. Failure to maintain compliance could result in additional action by the NYC DOE.

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 intends to complete its expansion to a full scale K-12 school in the next charter term when its first graduation class moves up to twelfth grade in 2014-2015.
- The school has implemented changes to its leadership structure and LHA's regional support team to provide greater stability and support in the next charter term.

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

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

In response to these amendments, the school is planning the following efforts to attract and retain these students, including to:

- participate in local Bronx Charter School Student Recruitment Fair at Success Academy on 3/15;
- staff at recruitment events will be led by the BLCS's Director of Student Services to demonstrate its commitment to special populations and share the school's program for meeting the needs of SwD and ELLs;
- participate in Head Start led open houses and information sessions in the local Bronx community;
- provide Spanish speakers, with Spanish-language marketing and recruitment materials available, at recruitment events to target ELL families;
- make electronic applications available in Spanish and other primary languages spoken in the community.
- Participate in additional recruitment events at cultural centers in the community including:
 - Urban Health Plan hosted information session (low income health care provided to many Spanish-speaking families);
 - student recruitment in collaboration with the POINT, a community non-profit student center;
 - cultivate lasting relationships with community organizations serving special populations, such as Dreamyard and CollegeNOW NY;
 - Community Board Meetings, including hosting of the November Community Board meeting in the BLCPA gym.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Statutory Basis for Renewal

The Charter Schools Act of 1998 (“the Act”) authorizes the creation of charter schools to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently of existing schools and school districts in order to accomplish the following objectives:

- Improve student learning and achievement;
- Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system;
- Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.¹³

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.¹⁴

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.¹⁵ As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education (“NYC DOE”) institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act’s renewal standards:

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;
- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction.

Where the NYC DOE approves a renewal application, it is required under the Act to submit the application and a proposed charter to the Board of Regents for its review and approval.¹⁶

¹³ See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.

¹⁴ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

¹⁵ See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

¹⁶ § 2852(5)

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

The New York State Charter Schools Act (“the Act”) states the following regarding the renewal of a school’s charter:

§2851.4: Charters may be renewed, upon application, for a term of up to five years in accordance with the provisions of this article for the issuance of such charters pursuant to section twenty-eight hundred fifty-two of this article; provided, however, that a renewal application shall [also] include:

- (a) A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in the charter.
- (b) A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private. Such statement shall be in a form prescribed by the Board of Regents.
- (c) Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school required by subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty-seven of this article, including the charter school report cards and the certified financial statements.
- (d) Indications of parent and student satisfaction. Such renewal application shall be submitted to the charter entity no later than six months prior to the expiration of the charter; provided, however, that the charter entity may waive such deadline for good cause shown.
- (e) The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents or the board of trustees of the state university of New York, as applicable, of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal. When developing such targets, the board of regents and the board of trustees of the state university of New York shall ensure (1) that such enrollment targets are comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the charter school is located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.

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

Full-Term Renewal

In cases where a school has demonstrated exceptional results with its students, a five-year renewal will be granted. A school must show that its program has yielded strong student performance and progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

Renewal with Conditions

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

Short-Term Renewal

In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has fewer than two years of state-assessment results, a renewal of three-years or fewer may be considered. In limited circumstances, a

school not in its initial charter or in its initial charter with more than three years of state assessment data, may be considered for a short-term renewal.

Non-Renewal

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

The CSAS Accountability Framework

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

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

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

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

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

1c. Responsive Education Program

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

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

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

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

1d. Learning Environment

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

- Have a strong culture that connects high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to give their best effort academically and socially
- Use a comprehensive approach to student management, including positive behavioral expectations and a clear discipline policy to build and sustain a safe, orderly, and supportive classroom environment
- Provide for safe, respectful, efficient transitions, hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.
- Have classrooms where academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Provide opportunities for students to actively engage in their own learning and in the life of the school

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

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

- School mission and articulated values
- Student management plan (code of conduct, school values, discipline policy, positive incentive system, etc.)
- Student attendance and retention rates
- Student discipline data
- DOE School Survey student results
- DOE School Survey parent and teacher safety and respect results
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, student interviews
- Classroom observations
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)

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

2a. Governance Structure and Organizational Design

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

- Operate with a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter
- Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly but not limited to open-meeting laws and conflict of interest regulations
- Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time and despite circumstance
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals; it also has clear lines of accountability for leadership roles, accountability to Board, and, if applicable, relationship with a charter management organization
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Implemented a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's organization and leadership structure
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provide regular feedback on instruction to teachers

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

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

2b. School Climate and Community Engagement

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

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

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

- DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results
- Student retention and wait list data
- Staff retention data
- Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews
- Student and staff attendance rates
- Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences
- Parent association meeting calendar and minutes
- Community partnerships and sponsored programs

2c. Financial and Operational Health

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

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

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

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

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

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with their charter and agreement have:

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

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

- Authorized charter and signed agreement
- Charter revision request approval and documentation
- School mission
- School policies and procedures
- Site visits
- Board meetings, agendas and minutes
- Leadership/board interviews

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have:

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

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

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

3c. Applicable Regulations

<p>Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns with applicable regulations • Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and have completed all other financial reporting as required • Boards that meet requirements for size, meeting frequency, public notice, applicable open-meeting and conflict of interest regulations, as well as complying with NYC DOE CSAS’s requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members. • Informed NYCDOE CSAS, and where required, received CSAS approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization • Effectively engaged parent associations
<p>Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School or building safety plan; appropriate inspection documents • Annual audits, escrow accounts, other financial reporting documents • Board roster, calendar, agenda and minutes, conflict of interest documents, notification of changes/approval of new member request documents • Charter revision requests, revised or new contracts • Parent association calendar of meetings, identified officers, parent association agenda and minutes, parent satisfaction survey results • Interviews

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

<p>In anticipation of a new charter term schools may be considering various growth options: replication, expansion to new grades or increased enrollment or altering their model in some significant way. Successful schools generally have processes for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting needs/opportunity assessments • Forming Board and leadership committees or subcommittees to investigate options, develop action plans, ensure capacity and resources are aligned, etc. • Engaging school community in articulating charter revisions (or a new charter in cases of replication) to address the proposed growth plans • Ensuring that the final proposal is ambitious but realistic in its plans • Creating a well-reasoned and documented prospective for the school’s new charter term and, if applicable, a new charter proposal (for replication)
<p>Evidence for likely success in planning for school growth in a new charter term may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term • Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term • Leadership and Board interviews

4b. Organizational Sustainability

<p>Successful schools consistently perform despite change. While there is no single path for ensuring sustainability, successful schools often have the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School anticipates organizational opportunities/needs and plans for resource development (human resource policies for growing your own talent, for example, or fundraising or budget management to take care of anticipated capital needs and to mitigate risks for the unexpected, or board development to bring new talent or specific needs-based expertise to the school)

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

- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organization chart
- Staff rosters
- Staff handbook
- Leadership and staff interviews
- Budget

4c. School or Model Improvements

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

- Review performance carefully and even if they don't make major changes through expansion or replication, they are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success.
- Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission.

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

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

Appendix A: School Performance Data

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	37.2%	34.1%	34.9%	14.6%
CSD 12	28.1%	26.7%	28.9%	10.4%
Difference from CSD 12	9.1	7.4	6.0	4.2
NYC	43.4%	43.9%	46.9%	26.4%
Difference from NYC	-6.2	-9.8	-12.0	-11.8

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	59.4%	62.1%	58.5%	22.2%
CSD 12	38.4%	40.4%	42.6%	11.3%
Difference from CSD 12	21.0	21.7	15.9	10.9
NYC	55.6%	57.3%	60.0%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	3.8	4.8	-1.5	-7.4

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

% of Third Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	40.9%	34.8%	27.3%	19.6%
CSD 12	34.7%	30.3%	30.8%	12.7%
Difference from CSD 12	6.2	4.5	-3.5	6.9
NYC	46.5%	48.1%	49.0%	28.1%
Difference from NYC	-5.6	-13.3	-21.7	-8.5

% of Third Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	56.3%	65.2%	34.1%	37.0%
CSD 12	40.3%	36.1%	37.8%	14.4%
Difference from CSD 12	16.0	29.1	-3.7	22.6
NYC	54.3%	54.8%	57.0%	33.1%
Difference from NYC	2.0	10.4	-22.9	3.9

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

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	30.3%	38.0%	37.8%	8.9%
CSD 12	27.1%	35.3%	32.5%	11.1%
Difference from CSD 12	3.2	2.7	5.3	-2.2
NYC	45.6%	51.0%	52.4%	27.2%
Difference from NYC	-15.3	-13.0	-14.6	-18.3

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	74.2%	65.2%	51.1%	20.0%
CSD 12	40.7%	45.6%	45.5%	13.4%
Difference from CSD 12	33.5	19.6	5.6	6.6
NYC	58.4%	62.3%	65.7%	35.2%
Difference from NYC	15.8	2.9	-14.6	-15.2

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

% of Fifth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	48.8%	35.3%	38.6%	8.7%
CSD 12	30.7%	30.2%	33.0%	11.7%
Difference from CSD 12	18.1	5.1	5.6	-3.0
NYC	46.2%	49.0%	52.2%	28.7%
Difference from NYC	2.6	-13.7	-13.6	-20.0

% of Fifth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	48.8%	60.3%	78.4%	15.2%
CSD 12	38.4%	44.4%	44.7%	8.5%
Difference from. CSD 12	10.4	15.9	33.7	6.7
NYC	59.7%	62.9%	65.2%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	-10.9	-2.6	13.2	-14.4

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

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	30.2%	48.9%	33.3%	11.0%
CSD 12	27.8%	27.0%	29.1%	8.1%
Difference from CSD 12	2.4	21.9	4.2	2.9
NYC	40.1%	43.6%	45.3%	23.3%
Difference from NYC	-9.9	5.3	-12.0	-12.3

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	53.5%	84.4%	53.6%	31.9%
CSD 12	37.4%	40.8%	42.4%	10.7%
Difference from CSD 12	16.1	43.6	11.2	21.2
NYC	53.0%	56.0%	59.3%	53.0%
Difference from NYC	0.5	28.4	-5.7	0.5

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

% of Seventh Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	35.7%	27.3%	40.9%	12.9%

CSD 12	20.5%	20.1%	26.6%	8.6%
Difference from CSD 12	15.2	7.2	14.3	4.3
NYC	38.2%	36.5%	43.3%	25.5%
Difference from NYC	-2.5	-9.2	-2.4	-12.6

% of Seventh Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	59.5%	50.0%	70.5%	6.5%
CSD 12	35.1%	38.1%	43.2%	8.3%
Difference from CSD 12	24.4	11.9	27.3	-1.8
NYC	52.6%	55.5%	57.3%	25.0%
Difference from NYC	6.9	-5.5	13.2	-18.5

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

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	-	15.6%	28.9%	28.8%
CSD 12	-	17.1%	21.5%	9.9%
Difference from CSD 12	-	-1.5	7.4	18.9
NYC	-	35.0%	39.0%	25.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-19.4	-10.1	3.4

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Bronx Lighthouse Charter School	-	44.4%	46.7%	19.2%
CSD 12	-	37.8%	42.4%	12.5%
Difference from CSD 12	-	6.6	4.3	6.7
NYC	-	52.5%	55.2%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-8.1	-8.5	-6.5

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

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Progress Reports

2012 – 2013 Academic Year: [Elementary/Middle School](#); [High School](#)

2011 – 2012 Academic Year: [Elementary/Middle School](#); [High School](#)

[2010 – 2011 Academic Year](#)

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Comprehensive Review Report 2012 – 2013](#)

[Annual Site Visit Report 2011 – 2012](#)

Annual Site Visit Report 2010 – 2011: Not Applicable