



**CONEY ISLAND PREPARATORY PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL  
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR  
NOVEMBER 2013**

# Table of Contents

<b>Summary of Renewal Recommendation .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>I. Charter School Overview .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>II. Overview of School-Specific Data .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. Rationale for Recommendation .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Overview and History .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Renewal Process Overview .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Findings .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success? .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization? .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law     and Regulations? .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term? .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview .....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Appendix A: School Performance Data.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data .....</b>	<b>34</b>

## Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

### I. Charter School Overview:

Name of Charter School	Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School
Current Board Chair(s)	Josh Wolfe
School Leader	Jacob Mnookin, Executive Director
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 21
Physical Address, public	501 West Avenue, Room 300, Brooklyn 11224
Physical Address, private	294 Avenue T Brooklyn, 11223
Facility	Public and Private
School Opened For Instruction	2009
Current Charter Term Expiry Date	12/15/2013
Maximum Grade Levels / Authorized Enrollment at Expiry Date	5-9/450
Proposed Charter Term	5 years
Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at New Expiry Date	K-12/948

### 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	-	A	A	B
Student Progress	-	A	A	C
Student Performance	-	A	A	A
School Environment	-	A	A	A
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	8.0	4.3	5.3

#### 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
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	<b>41.9%</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
CSD 21	54.4%	56.8%	58.7%	37.9%
Difference from CSD 21	-12.5	-7.1	-7.8	-11.6
NYC	46.2%	46.3%	46.9%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-4.3	3.4	4.0	0.6
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-10.6	-5.1	-4.3	-4.9

<b>% Proficient in Math</b>				
	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	<b>75.6%</b>	<b>79.1%</b>	<b>81.5%</b>	<b>39.6%</b>
CSD 21	68.8%	72.7%	75.6%	43.5%
Difference from CSD 21	6.8	6.4	5.9	-3.9
NYC	59.7%	59.5%	60.6%	27.3%
Difference from NYC	15.9	19.6	20.9	12.3
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	11.0	14.5	15.8	10.7

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

<b>Academic Goal Analysis (based on School's submission)</b>					
	<b>1st Year 2009-2010</b>	<b>2nd Year 2010-2011</b>	<b>3rd year 2011-2012</b>	<b>4th Year 2012-2013</b>	<b>Cumulative 4 Year Total</b>
Total Achievable Academic Goals	3	7	9	3	<b>22</b>
# Met	2	4	5	1	<b>12</b>
# Partially Met	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
# Not Met	1	3	4	2	<b>10</b>
% Met	67%	57%	56%	33%	<b>55%</b>
% Partially Met	0%	0%	0%	0%	<b>0%</b>
% Not Met	33%	43%	44%	67%	<b>45%</b>

### **III. Rationale for Recommendation**

#### **A. Academic Performance**

At the time of this school's renewal, Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School (CIPPCS) has demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

The school's mission is rooted in the belief that all students will master the skills and content necessary for success in college and the career of their choice. The school provides each student the opportunity to participate in advisory group, enrichment classes, college trips and nonfiction exhibition.

CIPPCS entered its fifth year of operation with the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. Therefore, the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has three years of New York State (NYS) assessment data to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at CIPPCS. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and assess student progress student progress, student performance, and school environment. Progress Report scores are based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to all schools citywide.

The primary objective of charter schools, in accordance with the NY State Charter Schools Act of 1998, is to improve student learning and achievement. CIPPCS has made notable progress in fulfilling its primary obligation.

The school has shown remarkable success in the first years of its charter term. In its first two years of operation, CIPPCS maintained a stellar academic record. CIPPCS received A grades for every rated section of the Progress Report, ranking CIPPCS in the top 7% of all middle schools citywide both years. In 2012-2013, CIPPCS maintained this high performance trend, and received an A on both student performance and school environment sub-sections.

For all three years of the school's graded progress reports, and indeed for all four years that CIPPCS has testing results, the school ranked in the top 30% of all middle schools in the city in ELA proficiency and in the top 20% of all middle schools in the city for math proficiency..

On the most recent progress report, CIPPCS earned a C grade on the progress sub-section and saw a decrease in the overall progress report grade. Median adjusted growth percentiles<sup>1</sup> in both ELA and math are the main metrics in the Progress section, and the school did not perform as well relative to its peer schools and in the city in 2012-2013 as compared to 2011-2012.

While CIPPCS saw a decrease in overall proficiency in this most recent year, CIPPCS has consistently demonstrated strong performance since its inception, which is evidenced by the school's consecutive A's in student performance. The school's math proficiency rate this year ranked them in the top 17% of all middle schools citywide. Similarly, its ELA proficiency ranked the school among the top 25% of all middle schools citywide. Despite the fact that its ELA proficiency decreased from the prior year, the school's citywide rank increased respective to ELA proficiency, from the top 30% of all middle schools citywide to the top 25% in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Though the school's proficiency levels did not increase from 2011-12 to 2012-13, over the last four years CIPPCS's has been in the top 26% of middle schools citywide in terms of ELA proficiency

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 average 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.

and in the top 17% of all middle schools citywide in terms of math proficiency. Compared to its Community School District (CSD), CIPPCS outperformed CSD 21 in math in every year but the last year. Over the last four years, CIPPCS' math proficiency was above the district average in two years and below the district average in the other two years. .

It is important to note that CIPPCS serves a higher population of students who receive Free and Reduced Lunch as well as higher number of Students with Disabilities as compared to its CSD. Therefore, it is important to compare its performance relative to their peer schools, in addition to their district. To that end, CIPPCS is peered with the 40 other middle schools across the city that have student populations that are most similar across every student characteristic. When compared to their peer schools, CIPPCS is in the top 8% of schools in terms of ELA proficiency and in the top 3% of schools in terms of math proficiency for the last four years.

Although CIPPCS showed less progress on the most recent progress report, the absolute performance of CIPPCS, when compared to the city, the district and its peer schools, shows that students at the school are performing well, and the school is getting these results while serving higher proportions of challenging populations than the CSD overall.

Schools receive additional credit on the NYC DOE Progress Report for showing exceptional progress and performance of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. In 2012-2013, the school earned additional points based on the 16% of students in Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) placements that met proficiency in math, placing the school in the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile relative to middle schools citywide. The school also earned additional points for the 23% of students receiving Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETTS) that met proficiency in math, placing the school in the 92<sup>nd</sup> percentile relative to middle schools citywide.

Further, CIPPCS is successfully preparing its students for high school. In 2012-2013, the school had 86% of eighth graders earning high school credit, which was the highest percentage in the district and places the school in the top 5% of schools in the city for its percentage of 8<sup>th</sup> graders earning high school credit.

During the CIPPCS charter term, the NYC DOE conducted annual site visits in the spring of 2010 and 2011. The reviewers cited CIPPCS' consistent approach to instruction and planning and use of rigorous assessment systems to monitor student progress which incorporates professional Data Days and provides multiple opportunities for struggling students to receive academic assistance. The reviewers also noted that the school established a strong culture that promotes student progress and reinforces a positive learning environment for students.<sup>2</sup>

The NYC DOE also notes that CIPPCS has a developed responsive education program and supportive learning environment. The school provides a responsive education model that primarily uses a co-teaching instructional approach that has two-three teachers providing instruction in a class including Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) in the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> grade in the Special Education program.

CIPPCS identifies itself as a "Direct Instruction-Group Practice-Individual Practice Model" in reading, math, science, and social studies. The school incorporates the Writers Workshop model in development of strong writing skills of students. The school is committed to implementing varied instructional methods and techniques as appropriate and to best fit the needs of its students. To facilitate learning for students with disabilities and at-risk students, CIPPCS has incorporated a daily intervention block for additional academic assistance.

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

CIPPCS is a fiscally sound and viable organization.

---

<sup>2</sup> Coney Island Prep Public Charter School Annual Site Visit Reports, 2010, 2011.

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

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has developed a stable school culture. In 2010, the school received the highest level of satisfaction on all four sections of their first NYC DOE School Survey: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety & Respect. On all subsequent NYC DOE School Surveys, the school has shown consistency with its scores, always scoring at least Well Above Average and Above Average" on all sections.

As it pertains to charter goals, the school partially met its goals for attendance and enrollment, with the school meeting its goals in all years except for 2011-12.

Financially, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations and is financially sustainable based on current practices. There were no material weaknesses noted in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 or 2012-13 independent annual financial audits.

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

Over the charter term, CIPPCS has been compliant with applicable laws and regulations, with the exception of teacher certification. Currently, the school is out of compliance with New York State Charter Schools Act Section §2854. A school can have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower. As of October 2013, twenty-two of thirty-nine teachers are certified.

The Board has been compliant with applicable laws and regulations.

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

CIPPCS was planned as a five through twelve school, serving both middle and high school grades. Upon receiving their first charter, the school was approved to serve grades five through nine.

CIPPCS intends to grow to serve the remaining high school grades, while simultaneously expanding downward, beginning with Kindergarten and first grade. The school will eventually serve students in grades Kindergarten through twelve during its next charter period. At the end of the school's charter term, projected student enrollment will be 948 students.

**For the aforementioned reasons, the NYCDOE recommends a full-term five term charter renewal and approves a grade and enrollment expansion, with the following conditions:**

- **CIPPCS must comply with NY State Charter Schools Act Section §2854**
  - **The school must be incomplete compliance with regard to teacher certification by the end of the first year of the next charter term.**
- **The school's elementary expansion is contingent on the NYC DOE receiving a succinct elementary grade expansion plan which should include, but not be limited to, descriptions on curriculum, staff, assessment and specific academic goals by January 31, 2014.**
- **The school must comply with IDEA and NY State guidelines and mandates regarding students with special needs in the first year of the next charter term.**
  - **The school must develop a pre-referral/referral process that includes parent notification. The school must report on progress toward IEP goals for all students with IEPs in a timely manner. The school must develop a tracking system for Related Services of students with IEPs. Additionally, each year, the school must conduct timely annual reviews of all IEPs.**

## Part 2: School Overview and History

Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School (CIPPCS) is a middle and high school serving approximately 445 students<sup>3</sup> from fifth to ninth grade during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in the 2009-2010 school year, with fifth grade and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's intended full grade span is Kindergarten through twelve which the school is expected to reach during its next charter term, pending renewal.<sup>4</sup> The school's charter will expire on December 15, 2013.<sup>5</sup> The middle school is located in a NYC DOE facility in District 21, in Brooklyn and is co-located with I.S. 303, the Rachel Carson High School for Coastal Studies, and P.S. K771. The high school is located in private space located at 294 Avenue T in Brooklyn.<sup>6</sup>

The school's mission is rooted in the belief that all students will master the skills and content necessary for success in college and the career of their choice. Each cohort of students is named after a college or university in the City University of New York (CUNY) or State University of New York (SUNY) systems. The school is also committed to providing a well-rounded program that includes character development and enrichment opportunities. CIPPCS provides each student with the opportunity to participate in advisory group, enrichment classes, college trips and nonfiction exhibition.

The school enrolls new students in grades five and nine and enrolls students to fill seats in other grades as needed. There were 216 students on the fifth grade waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.<sup>7</sup>

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students<sup>8</sup>:

### Special Populations

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL)	75.6%	76.0%	79.3%	85.6%
Students with Disabilities (SwD)	27.8%	24.0%	22.5%	25.1%
English Language Learners (ELL)	4.4%	7.3%	4.8%	4.5%

CIPPCS is approaching the end of its first charter term.

The CIPPCS Board of Trustees is led by Josh Wolfe. The school's founder and Executive Director, Jacob Mnookin is an *ex officio* member of the school's Board. As of November 1, 2013, the middle school will be led by Ryan Gassaway, who has been at the school since its inception. The high school is led by Alexis Johnson, who has also been with the school since it opened.

<sup>3</sup> ATS data from 10/10/13

<sup>4</sup> NYC DOE internal data.

<sup>5</sup> NYC DOE internal data

<sup>6</sup> NYC DOE Location Code Generating System database

<sup>7</sup> Self-reported on Data Sheet Submitted with Renewal Application 9/2013

<sup>8</sup> Special population figures are pulled from ATS as of June 1st each year. These figures are compared against the total population which is pulled from ATS as of October 31st each year.

## 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.<sup>9</sup>

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

- Board of Trustee bylaws,
- Board of Trustee meeting minutes,
- Annual Reports submitted by schools to New York State Education Department (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 representatives participated in the review of this school, including visits to the school on June 5, 2013 and September 24, 2013:

- Sonya Hooks, Senior Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Keisha Womack, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Andrea McLean, Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Jose Castro, National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) Fellow
- Taniel Chan, Analyst, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Laurie Pendleton, Independent Consultant

---

<sup>9</sup> [http://www.qualitycharters.org/assets/files/images/stories/pdfs/publications/Performance\\_Framework\\_Fall\\_2012\\_Draft.pdf](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?

Over the charter term Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School has demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

#### Academic Attainment and Improvement

The school has received three NYC DOE Progress Reports and has four years of NYS assessment data at the time of this report. (For detailed information on the progress reports and 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	-	A	A	B
Student Progress	-	A	A	C
Student Performance	-	A	A	A
School Environment	-	A	A	A
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	8.0	4.3	5.3

#### 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
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	<b>41.9%</b>	<b>49.7%</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	<b>26.3%</b>
CSD 21	54.4%	56.8%	58.7%	37.9%
Difference from CSD 21	-12.5	-7.1	-7.8	-11.6
NYC	46.2%	46.3%	46.9%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-4.3	3.4	4.0	0.6
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-10.6	-5.1	-4.3	-4.9

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	<b>75.6%</b>	<b>79.1%</b>	<b>81.5%</b>	<b>39.6%</b>
CSD 21	68.8%	72.7%	75.6%	43.5%
Difference from CSD 21	6.8	6.4	5.9	-3.9
NYC	59.7%	59.5%	60.6%	27.3%
Difference from NYC	15.9	19.6	20.9	12.3
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	11.0	14.5	15.8	10.7

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

## Mission and Academic Goals

Over its charter term, the school achieved: 2 of 3 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter, 4 of 7 in the second year, 5 of 9 in the third year, and 1 of 3 in the fourth year.<sup>10</sup>

### Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

	Met in 2009-10?	Met in 2010-11?	Met in 2011-12?	Met in 2012-13?
Each year, 75 percent of 5th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 6th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	N/A	No	No	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 7th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 5th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 6th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 7th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 5th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>10</sup> It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% 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, 75 percent of 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, 75% of students enrolled in grades 9 – 12 will accumulate 10 or more credits towards graduation. The school will report this each September by submitting a report of student credit accumulation from the previous school year for purposes of the NYCDOE Progress Report.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
For years 2 through 5 of the proposed charter, grade-level cohorts of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam (baseline) and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam. If the percentage of students scoring above proficiency in a grade-level cohort exceeded 75 percent on the previous year's ELA exam, the school is expected to demonstrate growth (above 75 percent) in the current year. The difference will be calculated by subtracting the percentage of students who scored proficient on the NYS ELA test enrolled at the school on BEDS day of year 1 from the percentage of the same students who scored proficient on the NYS ELA test in year 2 and were continuously enrolled for two consecutive years on BEDS day.)	N/A	No	No	N/A
For Years 1 through 3, grade-level cohorts of the same students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Math exam (baseline) and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Math exam. If the percentage of students scoring above proficiency in a grade-level cohort exceeded 75 percent on the previous year's Math exam, the school is expected to demonstrate growth (above 75 percent) in the current year. The difference will be calculated by subtracting the percentage of students who scored proficient on the NYS Math test enrolled at the school on BEDS day of year 1 from the percentage of the same students who scored proficient on the NYS Math test in year 2 and were continuously enrolled for two consecutive years on BEDS day.)	N/A	Yes	Yes	N/A
Each year, the percent of each cohort of students passing the Math Regents examination will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of Community School District 21, or whichever Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of the performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYCDOE.	No	No	No	No
Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of Community School District 21, or whichever Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of the performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYCDOE.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No

Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing a Math Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of its fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools as determined by the NYCDOE Progress Report peer schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing."	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

## Responsive Education Program

The school reports administering Northwest Evaluation Association Measure of Annual Progress (NWEA MAP) assessment two-times a year and Achievement Network (A-Net) Interim assessments four-times a year. The following data was reported by the school:

- Over 61% of students who scored in the 75th percentile on the math NWEA MAP assessment, scored proficient or above on the NYS math assessment in fifth grade.
- 100% of eighth grade students who scored in the 89<sup>th</sup> percentile on either the math or ELA NWEA MAP assessment scored proficient on the respective NYS assessment.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited the school on June 5, 2013 and September 24, 2013. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
  - The school regularly monitors student performance data with internal assessments aligned to Common Core Learning Standards.
    - Throughout the year, the school uses assessment data from NWEA MAP, A-Net Interim assessments, running records, and baseline writing assessments as predictive state testing performance data and to inform instruction.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
  - CIPPCS has a Student Supports Coordinator who manages all Special Education services and mandated IEPs. The school also has a Social Worker and two Social Work interns who provide counseling to students.
  - School leadership reported that implemented structures and programs have led to greater academic success for all students.
    - The Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) model of 2-3 teachers in a class gives teachers the flexibility to meet their students' diverse needs.
    - Intervention periods for all students are built into the school day and provide extra support in small groups.
    - The longer school day provides more time for academic subjects, including double period math and reading blocks.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
  - School leadership reported an emphasis on the importance of professional development for new and returning teachers and provided them with essential pedagogical training.
    - All staff participate in a three-week summer professional development session which includes specially designed training for new staff members.
    - Teachers have been given training in data analysis for Data Days, held once each quarter. Data Days allow all teachers to spend an entire day analyzing the data produced from the A-Net Interim assessments, as well as the data collected from unit assessments, quizzes, and running records.
    - Teachers who have been with the school for over a year are offered a \$2,000.00 self-directed stipend that can be used towards their own professional development.
    - Teachers receive weekly observations and coaching from an Instructional Manager.

- On the days of the visit, twenty classrooms in grades five through nine were observed with the school's Principal, Principal-in-Training, and Executive Director, and the following was noted:
  - In all observed classes, teachers were following the school's CTT model in fifth, sixth, and seventh grades, including team teaching, parallel teaching, push-in and/or pull-out.
  - In all observed classes, teachers were seen using a variety of methods to check for understanding that included questioning, polling, classwork, teacher observation, and frequent use of exit slips.
  - In all observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
  - In all observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task and seemed engaged in the learning. A few students who were observed as off-task - were effectively re-directed.
  - In all observed rooms, teachers employed various instructional strategies including whole class instruction, small group work, project-based learning, and peer tutoring.
  - In most observed rooms, use of differentiated materials, tasks, and products were seen in small group instruction or independent practice. The differentiated approach was consistent with the school model.
  - In most observed classes, behavioral expectations and current student work was posted.
  - In most classes, evidence of work connected to the Common Core Learning Standards and high academic expectations was seen.
    - Students in an eighth grade science class were observed reviewing for the Earth Science Regents exam.
    - Students in an ELA class were observed preparing to read "To Kill a Mockingbird".
- Based on debriefs with the school's Principals and Executive Director after classroom visits, all classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

## Learning Environment

- NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with twenty-three teachers and two student support teachers. The following was noted:
  - All interviewed teachers report that they received school-based professional development three weeks in the summer and weekly during the school year, with the administration providing resources.
    - All teachers reported being encouraged by administration to seek external professional development opportunities such as Kagan Training and trainings at Columbia University.
  - All interviewed teachers reported being observed weekly and receiving both oral and written feedback from instructional managers during weekly check-ins.
    - During weekly check-ins, agendas are created based on individual teacher needs such as Common Core implementation, lesson plans, classroom management and analysis of student work.
  - All interviewed teachers reported incorporating "Criteria for Success" during lesson planning which assist in determining how many students mastered the objective of the day.
  - All interviewed teachers reported the use of data driven instruction, assessment and analysis, including Data Days which occur once each quarter.
    - Teachers reported using informal and formal assessments to adjust lessons plans and instruction accordingly, such as exit slips, student work, NWEA, and A-Net assessments.

- All interviewed teachers reported a school-wide improvement in internal and external communication.
  - Teachers report having open communication with parents/guardians of scholars, for both positive and negative behavior, academic performance, and overall inquiries.
- Most teachers reported receiving training on how to read and implement student IEPs.
- Some teachers reported challenges to maintaining a work/life balance.
- Though all teachers noted the three-week summer training, some interviewed teachers reported not receiving professional development in co-teaching.
  - With the exception of the grade team meetings which focused on data, teachers reported not having scheduled time to collaborate with co-teachers and other teachers.

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

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

Over the course of CIPPCS's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. On September 24, 2013, as part of the renewal process, representatives of the NYC DOE attended a Board of Trustees meeting. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has nine active members. Although the Board lost one member each year for two consecutive years, the Board managed the attrition by adding new members and has kept membership within the minimum of seven members and maximum of thirteen members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The Executive Director and Principal 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 and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.
- The Board has committees, as required by its bylaws, including a Fundraising Committee, Facilities Committee, and Governance Committee, however there is limited evidence that the committees are active based on recorded meeting minutes.
- The school's founder and Executive Director, Jacob Mnookin, is an *ex officio* member of the school's Board. As of November 1, 2013, the middle school will be led by Ryan Gassaway, who has been at the school for five years. The high school is led by Alexis Johnson, who has also been at the school for five years. Both have been with the school since the school's inception.
- CIPPCS Board of Trustees is led by Josh Wolfe.

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

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

- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Twenty participants attended the hearing, six speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by CIPPCS for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.
- To date, the school has met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% with the exception of one year.

<b>Average Daily Attendance<sup>11</sup></b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>	<b>2011-12</b>	<b>2012-13</b>
	96%	94%	96%	95%

- There was 23% turnover of instructional staff whom did not return, by choice or request, at the start of the 2012-2013 school year, 15% in the 2011-2012 school year and zero turnover in the 2010-2011 school year.<sup>12</sup>
- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey results and response rates were:

---

<sup>11</sup> Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 9/2013

<sup>12</sup> Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 9/2013

### Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School NYC School Survey Results

	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
<b>Academic Expectations</b>	Well Above Average	Well Above Average	Well Above Average	Above Average
<b>Communication</b>	Well Above Average	Above Average	Above Average	Above Average
<b>Engagement</b>	Well Above Average	Above Average	Above Average	Above Average
<b>Safety &amp; Respect</b>	Well Above Average	Well Above Average	Above Average	Above Average

### Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

	Parents	Citywide	Teachers	Citywide	Students <sup>13</sup>	Citywide
<b>2009-10</b>	<b>95%</b>	49%	<b>100%</b>	76%	-	-
<b>2010-11</b>	<b>94%</b>	52%	<b>100%</b>	82%	<b>100%</b>	83%
<b>2011-12</b>	<b>88%</b>	53%	<b>100%</b>	82%	<b>99%</b>	82%
<b>2012-13</b>	<b>85%</b>	54%	<b>100%</b>	83%	<b>95%</b>	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:
  - A "New Family Picnic" is held every June so new families can meet CIPPCS staff, complete the intake process, learn about the school uniform, and have an opportunity to tour the facility.
  - Every incoming fifth grade family receives a one-on-one home visit from a CIPPCS staff member which provides the opportunity for exchanging information and building relationships.
  - A "New Family Orientation Night" takes place annually the last week in August.
    - At the annual event new families are given the opportunity to meet teachers and advisers to establish consistent communication throughout the year.
  - The Family Council supports the school with parent engagement, including but not limited to Family workshops and quarterly "Enrichment Showcases".
- For grades five through eight, groups of five to six students were interviewed in each grade. Based on student interviews conducted on the September 24<sup>th</sup> visit to the school, the following was noted:
  - Across the grade levels, students found the rigor of their class work to be mixed, with some classes being more difficult than others.
  - All students noted that they felt they could meet with their teachers if they needed any help and also said they received help during intervention periods.
  - All students noted that they felt teachers had high expectations for student performance.

<sup>13</sup> Student Response Rates on the NYC School Survey have not been applicable over the entire course of the current charter term.

## Financial Health

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

- Based on the fiscal year 2013 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school has 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 September 25, 2013, revealed 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 FY10 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus over the four audited fiscal years.
- 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 FY10 to FY13, the school generated overall positive cash flow and the school had positive cash flow in each measurable year.

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

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

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

The Board of Trustees is in compliance with:

- Membership size: The Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter (no less than seven and no greater than thirteen) and in the Board's bylaws.
- Submission of all required documents: All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms and do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.<sup>14</sup>
- Timely submission of documents: The Board has provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the NYC DOE.
- Submission of minutes and agendas: The Board has made all board minutes and agendas available to the public prior to, at or after Board meetings by posting materials on the school's website.
- The required number of board meetings: The school's bylaws state that the Board is to hold ten meetings a year. The Board held nine out of ten of the required number of monthly meetings during the 2012-2013 school year, as evidenced by the meeting minutes submitted to NYC DOE and posted on the website. The missed meeting was due to Super Storm Sandy, and is not counted as non-compliance.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of all required documents: The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Fingerprint clearance: Over the charter term, all staff members have the required fingerprint clearance.
- Insurance requirements: The school has all appropriate insurance documents.

The school is out of compliance with:

- Certification of staff: As of the 2013-2014 school year, the school is out of compliance with NYS Charter Schools Act. A school can have no more than five teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified or not Highly Qualified, whichever number is lower. Currently, only twenty-two of thirty-nine teachers are certified.

---

<sup>14</sup> Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report 2012

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

As reported by Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School leadership and the school's Board, the following was noted:

- The school has applied to expand to serve its remaining high school grades and elementary school in the next charter term.
  - CIPPCS was originally chartered to serve grades five through nine. The school has applied to expand to its remaining high school grades (ten through twelve).
  - The school has also applied to serve elementary grades (Kindergarten through four).
  - The school would eventually serve students in grades Kindergarten through twelve during its next charter term. At the end of CIPPCS's second charter term, projected student enrollment will be 948 students.
- The school plans on implementing a new leadership structure to better align to the school's expansion needs.
  - The school has applied to revise its charter to add the roles of Chief Academic Officer, Chief Financial Officer and Elementary Principal.
- In response to the 2010 amendments to NYS Charter Schools Act requiring schools to attract and retain percentages of students who are designated as free and reduced lunch learners, students with disabilities, and English language learners, the school is making demonstrated efforts to attract and retain these students. These efforts include:
  - CIPPCS plans on working with local community-based groups to conduct outreach to families in particular communities in an effort attract and retain free and reduced lunch learners, students with disabilities, and English language learners (ELL).
  - The school plans to work alongside current ELL families to encourage outreach to peers in the community.
  - The school is currently in discussion to possibly run free English as a Second Language classes to families in the evenings and/or on weekends.

## 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.<sup>15</sup>

When granted, a charter is valid for up to five years. For a school chartered under the Act to operate beyond the initial charter term, the school must seek and obtain renewal of its charter.<sup>16</sup>

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.<sup>17</sup> As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education 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.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.

<sup>16</sup> See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

<sup>17</sup> See §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

<sup>18</sup> See § 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?

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

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

**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"> <li>• Conducting needs/opportunity assessments</li> <li>• Forming Board and leadership committees or subcommittees to investigate options, develop action plans, ensure capacity and resources are aligned, etc.</li> <li>• Engaging school community in articulating charter revisions (or a new charter in cases of replication) to address the proposed growth plans</li> <li>• Ensuring that the final proposal is ambitious but realistic in its plans</li> <li>• Creating a well-reasoned and documented prospective for the school’s new charter term and, if applicable, a new charter proposal (for replication)</li> </ul>
<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"> <li>• Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term</li> <li>• Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term</li> <li>• Leadership and Board interviews</li> </ul>

**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"> <li>• 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)</li> </ul>
---

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
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	41.9%	49.7%	50.9%	26.3%
CSD 21	54.4%	56.8%	58.7%	37.9%
Difference from CSD 21	-12.5	-7.1	-7.8	-11.6
NYC	46.2%	46.3%	46.9%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-4.3	3.4	4.0	0.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	75.6%	79.1%	81.5%	39.6%
CSD 21	68.8%	72.7%	75.6%	43.5%
Difference from CSD 21	6.8	6.4	5.9	-3.9
NYC	59.7%	59.5%	60.6%	27.3%
Difference from NYC	15.9	19.6	20.9	12.3

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
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	41.9%	47.7%	39.8%	18.2%
CSD 21	54.4%	55.1%	57.8%	35.5%
Difference from CSD 21	-12.5	-7.4	-18.0	-17.3
NYC	46.2%	49.0%	52.2%	28.7%
Difference from NYC	-4.3	-1.3	-12.4	-10.5

% of Fifth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	75.6%	72.7%	71.6%	25.0%
CSD 21	68.8%	71.0%	73.2%	41.1%
Difference from CSD 21	6.8	1.7	-1.6	-16.1
NYC	59.7%	62.9%	65.2%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	15.9	9.8	6.4	-4.6

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

<b>% of Sixth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts</b>				
	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	-	51.7%	56.2%	9.3%
CSD 21	53.2%	58.0%	59.0%	36.6%
Difference from CSD 21	-	-6.3	-2.8	-27.3
NYC	40.1%	43.6%	45.3%	23.3%
Difference from NYC	-	8.1	10.9	-14.0

<b>% of Sixth Graders Proficient in Math</b>				
	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	-	85.4%	85.4%	39.5%
CSD 21	71.5%	73.9%	76.3%	48.4%
Difference from CSD 21	-	11.5	9.1	-8.9
NYC	53.0%	56.0%	59.3%	28.8%
Difference from NYC	-	29.4	26.1	10.7

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

<b>% of Seventh Proficient in English Language Arts</b>				
	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	-	-	56.8%	34.9%
CSD 21	54.8%	52.0%	59.2%	39.3%
Difference from CSD 21	-	-	-2.4	-4.4
NYC	38.2%	36.5%	43.3%	25.5%
Difference from NYC	-	-	13.5	9.4

<b>% of Seventh Graders Proficient in Math</b>				
	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	-	-	87.5%	41.2%
CSD 21	72.4%	74.5%	76.7%	40.4%
Difference from CSD 21	-	-	10.8	0.8
NYC	52.6%	55.5%	57.3%	25.0%
Difference from NYC	-	-	30.2	16.2

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

<b>% of Eighth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts</b>				
	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	-	-	-	43.9%
CSD 21	53.0%	52.3%	53.6%	39.5%
Difference from CSD 21	-	-	-	4.4
NYC	37.5%	35.0%	39.0%	25.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	18.5

<b>% of Eighth Graders Proficient in Math</b>				
	<b>2009-2010</b>	<b>2010-2011</b>	<b>2011-2012</b>	<b>2012-2013</b>
<b>Coney Island Preparatory Public Charter School</b>	-	-	-	53.7%
CSD 21	68.1%	73.5%	73.5%	43.4%
Difference from CSD 21	-	-	-	10.3
NYC	46.3%	52.5%	55.2%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	28.0

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

[2011 – 2012 Academic Year](#)

[2010 – 2011 Academic Year](#)

### NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Site Visit Report 2009-2010](#)

[Annual Site Visit Report 2010-2011](#)