Department of Education
Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

BEDFORD STUYVESANT NEW BEGINNINGS CHARTER SCHOOL RENEWAL REPORT

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR
DECEMBER 2014

Table of Contents

PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION **2**

I. CHARTER SCHOOL OVERVIEW: 2

Background Information *2*

Overview of School-Specific Data *3*

II. RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE 6

PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY **12**

PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW **14**

PART 4: FINDINGS **16**

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success? *16*

Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization? *22*

Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? *27*

Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term? *30*

PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS **31**

PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK **34**

APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA **46**

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA **48**

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Background Information

Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Joseph Sciame
School Leader(s)	Nicholas Tishuk (Executive Director), Sabrina Del Sherpa (ES), Silbia Pagan (MS)
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 16
Physical Address(es)	82 Lewis Avenue, Brooklyn
Facility Owner(s)	Private
School Opened For Instruction	2010-2011
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	1/11/2015
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-8
Current Authorized Enrollment	489
Proposed New Charter Term	3.5 years [January 12, 2015 – June 30, 2018]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-8
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	729
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	3

Overview of School-Specific Data

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

Academic Goal Analysis					
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	Cumulative Charter Term Total
Total Achievable Goals	14	14	14	14	56
# Met	2	5	5	4	16
# Partially Met	0	0	0	0	0
# Not Met	5	6	3	7	21
# Not Applicable *	7	3	6	3	19
% Met	14%	36%	36%	29%	29%
% Partially Met	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
% Not Met	36%	43%	21%	50%	38%
% Not Applicable *	50%	21%	43%	21%	34%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	29%	45%	63%	36%	43%

* Some goals may not be applicable in all years. For example, goals related to the NYC Progress Report are not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year as Progress Reports were not issued that year.

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	**40.8%**	**48.3%**	**30.4%**	**23.5%**
CSD 16	39.2%	45.5%	16.6%	18.0%
Difference from CSD 16 *	1.6	2.8	13.8	5.5
NYC	48.1%	50.6%	28.0%	28.7%
Difference from NYC *	-7.3	-2.3	2.4	-5.2
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-12.0	-6.8	-0.7	-7.1

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	**61.2%**	**73.0%**	**26.6%**	**25.2%**
CSD 16	50.3%	53.2%	18.8%	17.5%
Difference from CSD 16 *	10.9	19.8	7.8	7.7
NYC	54.8%	61.3%	32.7%	37.8%
Difference from NYC *	6.4	11.7	-6.1	-12.6
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-2.1	8.2	-4.5	-11.0

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

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

Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School - All Students	**-**	**64.0%**	**68.0%**	**48.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	-	59.8%	72.1%	0.0%
City Percent of Range- All Students	-	53.4%	61.6%	1.2%
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School - School's Lowest Third	**-**	**65.0%**	**66.0%**	**62.0%**
Peer Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	39.2%	38.1%	12.8%
City Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	36.9%	23.4%	14.6%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School - All Students	**-**	**60.5%**	**42.0%**	**32.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	-	54.7%	0.8%	0.0%
City Percent of Range- All Students	-	50.2%	1.4%	0.0%
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School - School's Lowest Third	**-**	**65.0%**	**59.0%**	**52.5%**
Peer Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	50.0%	15.8%	7.3%
City Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-	49.8%	10.7%	1.3%

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

Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	75.0%	22.2%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	0.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	23.1%	63.2%	28.1%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	12.5%	38.9%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	22.2%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	22.2%	26.3%	37.1%

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

II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 3.5 year short term renewal with academic performance conditions.

The academic performance conditions are as follows:

1. **In each year of the charter term, in the middle school (grades six through eight), for each grade the percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 or above on the New York State ELA assessment must meet or exceed the Community School District of location percent proficient for each grade respectively.**
2. **In each year of the charter term, in the middle school (grades six through eight), for each grade the percentage of students scoring at a Level 3 or above on the New York State math assessment must meet or exceed the Community School District of location percent proficient for each grade respectively.**

As part of the renewal application, Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School submitted one material revision. The NYC DOE determination is as follows: regarding the material revision to increase the authorized maximum enrollment to 729 students during the next charter term, the NYC DOE approves this material revision. Under the school's current charter (which expires on January 11, 2015), enrollment was permitted up to 15% above the maximum authorized enrollment; in the renewal charter agreement, the 15% allowance over maximum authorized enrollment has been eliminated for all NYC DOE Chancellor-authorized schools.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School (BSNBCS) has partially demonstrated academic success.

New York Charter Schools Act

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

§ 2850 (2)

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

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

Mission and Vision

Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's mission is to create a supportive and rigorous academic environment for all students. Through the pursuit of 21st century learning, project based and service learning, and traditional coursework, students will be prepared to succeed in academically competitive schools as well as become responsible citizens of the global community. The school executes against this mission by focusing on rigorous instruction, accountability for academic achievement, and designing a learning environment that promotes academic success.

School Specific Academic Performance

The school entered its fifth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data and four years of other academic indicator(s) to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School (BSNBCS).

Total ELA and math proficiency rates for BSNBCS have consistently exceeded those of CSD 16 during the current charter term, though individual grade-level proficiency was below the CSD 16 rates for grade 5 ELA and math and grade 4 math this past school year, 2013-2014.

Beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, NYS assessments were aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). As such, proficiency rates for school years prior to the 2012-2013 are not directly comparable.

In 2012-2013, only 26.6% of BSNBCS's students were proficient in math. However, BSNBCS's math proficiency was greater than or equal to that of 50% of elementary/middle schools citywide. When compared to elementary/middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools), BSNBCS outperformed 55% of similar schools. In addition, the school outperformed 87% of CSD 16 elementary/middle schools. In 2012-2013, 30.4% of BSNBCS's students demonstrated proficiency in NYS assessments in English Language Arts (ELA). With this level of proficiency, BSNBCS outperformed 64% of elementary/middle schools citywide. Additionally, BSNBCS outperformed 83% of its peer schools, and 80% of CSD 16 schools.

The following year, in 2013-2014, the percent of students at BSNBCS who were proficient in math fell to 25.2%. For 2012-2013, BSNBCS's math proficiency was higher than only 37% of elementary/middle schools citywide. When compared to peer schools, BSNBCS outperformed only 40% of similar schools, yet the school outperformed 67% of CSD 16 elementary/middle schools. In 2013-2014, the percent of students at BSNBCS who demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA also fell, to 23.5%. With this level of proficiency, BSNBCS outperformed 48% of elementary/middle schools citywide, 43% of its peer schools and 67% of elementary/middle schools in CSD 16.

Over the four years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, BSNBCS has met only 43% of its applicable academic charter goals.[1,2] BSNBCS met four of eleven applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year. Because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's academic performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, due to a change in state regulation, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two or NYC DOE Progress Report grades. The school has demonstrated an inconsistent trend of achievement of its stated charter goals during the retrospective charter term, with a drop in its success rate over the last two years of the charter term under review.

In 2012-2013, BSNBCS's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 68.0% with a City Percent of Range of 61.6%, placing the school in the 65th percentile of elementary/middle schools

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

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

citywide.[3] Similarly, the school's peer and Community School District (CSD) percentiles were 74% and 73%, respectively. This means that over 70% other elementary/middle schools in BSNBCS's peer group and CSD had ELA median adjusted growth percentiles less than BSNBCS's median adjusted growth percentile.

In 2012-2013, BSNBCS's math median adjusted growth percentile of 42.0% with a City Percent of Range of only 1.4%, which placed it in the bottom 3rd percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer and Community School District (CSD) percentiles were 3% and 7%, respectively. This means that nearly all other elementary/middle schools in BSNBCS's peer group and CSD had math median adjusted growth percentiles greater than BSNBCS's median adjusted growth percentile.

The following year, in 2013-2014, BSNBCS's median adjusted growth percentile decreased in both ELA and math. In 2013-2014, BSNBCS's ELA median adjusted growth percentile fell to 48.0% with a City Percent of Range of just 1.2%, placing the school in the 2nd percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer and Community School District (CSD) percentiles were both 0%.

In 2013-2014, BSNBCS's math median adjusted growth percentile fell to 32.0% with a City Percent of Range of 0%, placing the school in the bottom 1% of elementary/middle schools citywide.[4] The school's peer and Community School District (CSD) percentiles were 3% and 7%, respectively.

Under the founding school leadership, the school had shown strong instructional leadership with established curriculum and enrichment programming. In a visit to the school in May 2011, reviewers noted that the school leaders "have a thorough knowledge of what happens in classrooms through regular observations and feedback,"[5] and in April 2012, that the "school has a comprehensive professional development program that is aligned to school-wide priorities and the needs of individual teachers."[6] However, when the school added middle school grades in the 2013-2014 school year, school leaders struggled to develop a similar level of stability for the middle school instruction and curriculum. During the renewal visit, the new school leadership discussed their focus on the middle school. Further, the school's new organizational structure marks a departure from a single academic leader to two academic leaders: a Director of the Lower School and a Director of the Middle School. According to the school leadership, this new structure allows for a focus to be placed on developing the middle school curriculum and instructional staff. In addition, the school had challenges with serving the at-risk student population, including special education students and English Language Learners (ELLs). For example, as noted in the April 2012 school visit report, the school met the needs of ELL students primarily "through general intervention programs for struggling students."[7]

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, BSNBCS received an overall grade of C with a grade of C for Student Progress and B grades in both the Student Performance and School Environment sections. This ranked BSNBCS in the 35th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. For the 2011-2012 NYC DOE Progress Report, the school earned an overall grade of B and ranked in the 61st percentile of all elementary schools citywide. (Schools receive an ungraded progress report in their first year serving students.)

---

[3] A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A percentile rank provides the percentage of schools that score the same or lower than the school under consideration. A City Percent of Range of 61.6% indicates that the school's median adjusted growth percentile was above the citywide elementary/middle school average but less than one standard deviation above the average (that 61.6% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of BSNBCS), while a citywide percentile of 65% indicates that BSNBCS's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than 65% of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

[4] A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A City Percent of Range of 0% indicates that the school's math median adjusted growth percentile was two standard deviations below the average. A percentile rank provides the percentage of schools that score the same or lower than the school under consideration. A citywide percentile of 1% indicates that BSNBCS's math median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 1% of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

[5] BSNBCS Annual Visit Report 2010-2011

[6] BSNBCS Annual Visit Report 2011-2012

[7] BSNBCS Annual Visit Report 2011-2012

NYC DOE Progress Reports graded each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and were based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores were based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of 40 schools with similar student populations and to all schools citywide. The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report was the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constituted 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section was primarily based on median adjusted growth percentiles,[8] which measure students' growth on state tests relative to other students with the same prior-year score. Although the NYC DOE Progress Report was discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, individual academic performance metrics from the former NYC DOE Progress Report are included in this renewal report for all years for which data was available in the current charter term.

Closing the Achievement Gap

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

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 37.1% of BSNBCS's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places BSNBCS in the 29th percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, only 28.1% of BSNBCS's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this places BSNBCS in the bottom 2nd percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 38.9% of BSNBCS's students with disabilities experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places BSNBCS in the 38th percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, only 22.2% of BSNBCS's students with disabilities experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this places BSNBCS in the bottom 3rd percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 22.2% of BSNBCS's English Language Learner students experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places BSNBCS in the 14th percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, 0% of English Language Learner students at BSNBCS experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this places BSNBCS at the bottom of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

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

- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's Board of Trustee bylaws;
- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's Board of Trustee meeting minutes;
- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's self-reported staffing data;

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

- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's financial disclosure forms;
- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's 2014-2015 student and family handbook; and
- Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School's FY15 budget.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a partially developed governance structure and organizational design, with seven of the eight current Board members having been with the school since its inception. This level of membership is consistent with the minimum of seven and maximum of 15 members established in the Board's bylaws. There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's 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's bylaws require a standing Finance Committee, as well as Executive, Grievance, Development, and Family Life Committees. References to most of these committees, including Finance, Executive, Development, and Engagement and Outreach, can be found on the Board's roster.

Currently, the Board's bylaws require that the Board hold 10 meetings per year and the Board has adhered to this in all but one year of the current charter term. Quorum was achieved at the majority of Board Meetings over the course of the charter. If quorum was not achieved the Board did not vote, as recorded in meeting minutes.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture. At the end of the 2013-2014 school year, the founding leadership team of the school, including the Executive Director, Academic Leader, and Director of Operations, left the school and were replaced by a new Executive Director and a new school leadership team, which includes a Director of Student Culture, a Lower School Director of Instruction, a Middle School Director of Instruction, an Associate Director of Special Education and Response to Intervention, an Associate Director of Family and Community Engagement, and an Associate Director of Knowledge and Development. These staff members all started with the new roles at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year. In general, staff turnover has been inconsistent, ranging between 25% and 12% over the course of the charter term. In year one, year two, and year three of the charter term (2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013), 25%, 12%, and 14% of instructional staff did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year. However, for the most recent period, 2013-2014, staff turnover was 24%, which represents a loss of eight instructional staff members.[9]

The school started the development of professional learning teams in the 2014-2015 school year, along with a positive behavioral management system (including a behavior clip chart and the use of THRIVE tickets), in an effort to develop academic and cultural identity by both staff and students.

Average daily attendance for students during the charter term (2010-2011 through 2013-2014) was 92.4%;[10] the school did not meet its attendance goal of 95% in any year of the current charter term. Across the charter term, the school has had mixed results on the NYC School Survey, with a declining trend of teacher satisfaction in recent years.

Overall, the school is in a weak position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has at least $304,257 of unrestricted cash on hand to meet current liabilities totaling $1,021,131. Cash on hand represents only 17 days of operating expenses. Overall, there are concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on practices from up through FY2014.

[9] Data on instructional staff turnover was self-reported by the school in its Renewal Application to the NYC DOE dated November 2014.

[10] Reflects attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits from FY12 to FY14.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

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

The school submitted its FY13 independent financial audit as part of its 2012-2013 Annual Report, which it submitted after the deadline to the New York State Education Department (NYSED).

During the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE determined that the school was out of compliance with its special education and discipline policies. The school was given 30 days to bring its policies into compliance; specifically, the NYC DOE required the school to modify its family handbook to include language regarding due process and student discipline as it relates to students with Individual Education Programs (IEPs). The school updated its Student-Family Culture and Discipline Handbook, effective March 3, 2014, which includes the federal guidelines for students with disabilities.

Although the Board held the required number of meetings per the Board's bylaws in year one of the charter term, the Board held only nine of 10 indicated meetings in subsequent years.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

Although the school does not plan to serve any additional grades beyond its currently authorized grades of kindergarten through eight, it is requesting to increase its maximum authorized enrollment.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School is an elementary/middle school serving 532 students[11] in kindergarten through seventh grade during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2010-2011 school year with kindergarten through third grades and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's authorized full grade span is for grades kindergarten through eight, which it is not expected to reach during its current charter term expiring on January 11, 2015.[12] The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in a privately operated facility in Community School District 16 in Brooklyn.

BSNBCS's mission is to partner with families, educators, and community members, joining together "to create a supportive and rigorous academic environment for all students. Through the pursuit of 21st century learning, project based, and service learning, and traditional coursework, students will be prepared to succeed in academically competitive schools as well as become responsible citizens of the global community." The school sets out to provide a Humanities approach in the lower grades (kindergarten through four) and a Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, Math approach in the upper grades (five through eight).

BSNBCS's Board of Trustees is led by chair Joseph Sciame, who has been on the Board since the school's inception. The school is led by Executive Director Nicholas Tishuk, who has been at the school since July 2014. The school also has a Lower School Director of Instruction, Sabrina Del Sherpa, who has been with the school since its founding in 2010, and a Middle School Director of Instruction, Silbia Pagan, who has been with the school since July 2014.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades kindergarten through seven. There were 68 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery.[13] The school does backfill students from the waitlist during the school year across all grades.

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

Enrollment

Grade-Level Annual Enrollment *	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Kindergarten	43	52	66	72
Grade 1	41	52	65	75
Grade 2	47	50	63	72
Grade 3	49	49	47	73
Grade 4	-	46	48	54
Grade 5	-	-	46	53
Grade 6	-	-	-	46
Grade 7	-	-	-	-
Grade 8	-	-	-	-
Total Enrollment	180	249	335	445

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

[11] ATS data as of October 31, 2014
[12] NYC DOE internal data
[13] Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	3	24
Grade 1	3	25
Grade 2	3	24
Grade 3	3	24
Grade 4	2	27
Grade 5	2	27
Grade 6	2	23
Grade 7	-	-
Grade 8	-	-
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	69	

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

Please see additional demographic data in Section 4 of this report for information regarding the enrollment of special populations at Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School. This information includes enrollment data for the percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners and students with disabilities as compared to the CSD and citywide averages as well as targets proposed by the NYSED.[14]

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

Part 3: Renewal Report Overview

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

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

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

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

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

Is the school a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization?
To assess whether a school is a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization, OSDCP focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the National Association of Charter School Authorizer's Core Performance Framework.[15]

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.

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

Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with relevant laws and regulations as identified in the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework.

Staff Representatives
The following experts participated in the review of this school, including the renewal visit to the school on September 23 – 24, 2014:

- DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Maria Campo, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kaitlin Padgett, Director of Evaluation and Policy, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Ola Duru, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Caitlin Robisch, Director of Analytics, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Paul Yen, Data Analyst, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Mariama Sandi, Chairperson, Division of Specialized Instruction and Student Support, Charter Committee on Special Education Citywide

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal, Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

High Academic Attainment and Improvement

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

NOTE: The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 ELA and math proficiency percentages should not be compared directly with prior-year results. Unlike prior years, proficiency on the NYS assessments for ELA and math in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 were based on the Common Core Learning Standards – a more demanding set of knowledge and skills necessary for 21st century college and career readiness.

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	40.8%	48.3%	30.4%	23.5%
CSD 16	39.2%	45.5%	16.6%	18.0%
Difference from CSD 16 *	1.6	2.8	13.8	5.5
NYC	48.1%	50.6%	28.0%	28.7%
Difference from NYC *	-7.3	-2.3	2.4	-5.2
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-12.0	-6.8	-0.7	-7.1

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	61.2%	73.0%	26.6%	25.2%
CSD 16	50.3%	53.2%	18.8%	17.5%
Difference from CSD 16 *	10.9	19.8	7.8	7.7
NYC	54.8%	61.3%	32.7%	37.8%
Difference from NYC *	6.4	11.7	-6.1	-12.6
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-2.1	8.2	-4.5	-11.0

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

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

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

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

Mission and Academic Goals

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

- 2 of 7 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 5 of 11 in the second year,
- 5 of 8 in the third year,[16] and
- 4 of 11 in the fourth year.

Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals *

	Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1.	75% of students will perform at or above Level 3 on the ELA NYS Examination.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
2.	75% of students will perform at or above Level 3 on the Math NYS Examination.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
3.	75% of students will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science Examination.	N/A	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**
4.	75% of students will perform at proficiency in Social Studies.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.	The percentage of students performing at level 3 or 4 on the NYS ELA test will be greater than the percentage for CSD 16 for applicable grade levels.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**
6.	The percentage of students performing at level 3 or 4 on the NYS Math test will be greater than the percentage for CSD 16 for applicable grade levels.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**
7.	The percentage of students performing at level 3 or 4 on the NYS Science test will be greater than the percentage for CSD 16 for applicable grade levels.	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**

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

Academic Goals		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
8.	The percentage of students performing at level 3 or 4 on the NYS Social Studies test will be greater than the percentage for CSD 16 for applicable grade levels.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9.	75% of students will perform at or beyond grade level on the Spring Assessment of the ITBS - Reading.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
10.	75% of students will perform at or beyond grade level on the Spring Assessment of the ITBS - Math.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
11.	Grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS ELA exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year.	N/A	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
12.	Grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS Math exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Math Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year.	N/A	**Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
13.	The school's average daily attendance rate will be at least 95%.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
14.	The school will remain in "Good Standing" each year on the NYS Annual Report.	N/A	**Met**	**Met**	N/A

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

Responsive Education Program

The school administered Fountas and Pinnell's Running Records (F&P) and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) for most of the charter term. The school began administering the i-Ready diagnostic assessment in 2012-2013, which is the only year of data available for that assessment. The following was found:

- According to the results of the F&P assessments, in 2010-2011, 63% of BSNBCS students were reading at or above grade level. The percent of students reading at or above grade level dropped in 2011-2012 to 45%, but increased to 64% (roughly equal to the starting level) in 2012-2013.
- According to the results of the ITBS, the percent of BSNBCS students at or above grade level, in both ELA and math decreased each year from 2010-2011 to 2012-2013. In ELA, BSNBCS students went from 62% at or above grade level in 2010-2011 to 44% at or above grade level in 2012-2013. In math, BSNBCS students went from 56% at or above grade level in 2010-2011 to 36% at or above grade level in 2012-2013.
- According to the results of the i-Ready diagnostic assessment, BSNBCS students in grades three through five showed progress from the beginning of the 2012-2013 school year to the end of the 2012-2013 school year. In ELA, the percent of third through fifth grade BSNBCS students at or above grade level went from 14% at the beginning of the year to 34% at the end of the year. In math, the percent of third through fifth grade BSNBCS students at or above grade level went from 4% at the beginning of the year to 43% at the end of the year.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on September 23 – 24, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core**:
    - School leadership reported that they made adjustments to the curriculum to reflect the rigorous standards of the CCLS. In ELA, the school added explicit vocabulary instruction embedded in the literacy units and expanded supplemental reading programs. In the middle school grades, the school is utilizing the Engage NY curriculum. In math, the school uses Singapore Math for all grade levels.
    - The school expanded the interim assessment program in all grades to include online programs such as i-Ready and Achieve 3000 to better align the school's interim assessments to the New York State Common Core Assessments.
    - School leadership reported that the move to using professional learning communities (PLCs) at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year was a direct result of the school's results on the 2013-2014 state assessments. School leadership plans on using the PLCs to target professional development to support the teachers' adoption of effective practices, pedagogical strategies, and a consistent curriculum aligned with the CCLS.

- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**
    - The school supports at-risk learners through a Response to Intervention (RTI) program, following a six-week cycle. During the interviews in the renewal visit, Tier 1 was described as a way of providing supports to students within the classroom setting, by the RTI coordinator. Tier 2 was described as a formal pull-out program, where students are given specific instruction in ELA or math or both. However at the time of the renewal visit, it appeared that the school had just begun establishing the program, and evidence of a consistent RTI practice was lacking.
    - The school provides an Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) and Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) program. Related services, including Speech Therapy, counseling, Occupational Therapy and paraprofessional supports, have been established within the school building. At the time of the renewal visit, 11 IEPs were not in compliance with the special education program the school offers. The staff indicated that plans exist to address the out of compliance program recommendations.
    - The school has an Associate Director of Special Education and Response to Intervention on staff. The Associate Director supervises five Special Education instructors, the Response to Intervention Coordinator, and a Guidance Counselor.
    - The school began collecting data on English Language Learners (ELLs) within the school at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year. In prior years of the current charter term, there was limited documentation of Home Language Survey records, and evaluation of students using the New York State Identification Test of English Language Learners (NYSITELL) and New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT). School leadership asserted that, as they continue to collect more robust data, they will begin forming the English as a Second Language instructional methodology for ELL students at different levels of proficiency.

- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**
    - School leadership reported that the formal evaluation of and feedback to teachers is through the Individualized Professional Growth Plan (IPGP) framework, with quarterly reviews for all instructors. It includes a self-evaluation using Kim Marshall's pedagogical rubric and an evaluation by their respective Director. They also reported the use of informal feedback following mini-observations that are structured within the Kim Marshall framework of frequent mini-observations.
    - The school has on staff an Associate Director of Knowledge and Development who supports the school's increased use of data. The Associate Director organizes and analyzes data, providing the teachers and the instructional leaders with specific tools to use the data to inform instruction.
    - School leadership reported that professional development supports for the staff include a three-week summer staff training, individual professional growth plans, daily PLCs, New Teacher Alliance support sessions with a designated New Teachers' Mentor, and weekly classroom observations.

- During the renewal visit, 42 classrooms across grades kindergarten through seven were observed with the school's Executive Director, Lower School Director, Middle School Director, and Director of School Culture.
- In approximately half of the observed classes, teachers were following a Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) model, mostly consisting of one lead and one assist. There was only one observed class that was implementing team teaching. The other observed classes were following a single teacher, direct instruction model.
- Class-sizes observed ranged from 15 to 27 students in size, with one or two teacher(s) in all classrooms.
- Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations included mostly basic fact recall and challenging students to demonstrate understanding or to analyze and apply.
- In most classrooms, checks for understanding that included questioning, polling, classwork, and exit tickets, were observed.
- In nearly all observed classrooms there was no evidence of differentiation of materials, tasks, and products. However, there were two observed classes that did some differentiation; one differentiated tasks and one differentiated materials.
- In some observed classes, not all students demonstrated awareness of classroom rules or procedures.
- In some observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were off task for a majority of the observation.
- Based on debriefs with the school's leadership team members after classroom visits, most 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 twelve teachers, the English Language Learning Coach, and the Special Needs Learning Coach. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that the new school leadership team had implemented PLCs at the beginning of the 2014-2015 school year. The PLCs meet daily, initially facilitated by the lead learning coach, but then following a rotation by the teachers within the team. Agenda topics include how students are doing, reflections on lesson plans, how to implement the service learning component of the program, and school procedures such as dismissal. Some teachers also mentioned receiving a school-based pre-service training for three weeks in the summer, which the new school leadership used to prepare the teachers for the new structures and a revised school culture. Some teachers found it helpful, while others thought it could have been more differentiated.
- Most interviewed teachers mentioned the use of the Teacher Evaluation Rubric by Kim Marshall for formal teacher evaluations, four per year, conducted by either the school's Executive Director or one of the Directors of Instruction (Lower and Middle Schools), while a few of the interviewed teachers discussed the use of informal observations for receiving feedback from the teacher's respective Director of Instruction. However, of those teachers who mentioned the informal observations, there were discrepancies in how they received feedback after those observations (i.e. in the moment verbally or later in the day through email).
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through both formal (i.e. Common Core Learning Standards-based tests, i-Ready, Achieve 3000, etc.) and informal assessments (i.e. quizzes, exit slips, etc.) to decide groupings and to identify trends in the classroom for targeted re-teaching instruction.

One group of 10 fifth grade students and one group of 10 sixth grade students were interviewed. Based on student interviews conducted on the September 24, 2014 visit to the school, the following was noted:

- Students interviewed reported that if they need help they can go to their teachers, the Dean of Student Culture, the Academic Dean, or close friends.
- Students interviewed reported that teachers would call their parents for both positive and negative reasons, such as doing good work or being disrespectful, as well as for sharing important school information.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 94% of parents agree “that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child” and 96% of parents who responded to the survey agree “that the school has high expectations for [their] child.”[17]

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, only 24% of teachers agree that “order and discipline are maintained at the school” and 35% agree with the statement that “at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school.”[18]

[17] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 51% of parent respondents strongly agree that Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 43% agree with the statement. Similarly, 55% of parent respondents strongly agree that Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 41% agree with the statement.

[18] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 4% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School; another 20% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 27% strongly disagree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 38% of teacher respondents disagree with the statement; 31% agree with the statement; and 4% strongly agree with the statement.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

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

On October 20, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE attended a meeting of the school's board of trustees and met with a representation of the school's Board of Trustees independent of the school leadership team. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has eight active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of seven members and maximum of 15 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Treasurer and Secretary roles are currently specified positions in the Board's bylaws and are currently filled; however, the bylaws also reference President and Vice President positions, though the Board is currently employing a Chair/Co-Chair model.
- The majority of Board meetings held quorum over the course of the charter. If quorum was not achieved, the Board did not vote, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The Board is updated on academic progress, operations, and the financial standing of the school by different school staff members as recorded in all available meeting minutes.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational chart 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's bylaws require a standing Finance Committee, as well as Executive, Grievance, Development, and Family Life Committees. References to the Finance, Executive, Development, and Engagement & Outreach committees can be found on the Board's roster.
- One of the school's founders, Joseph Sciame, is still a member of the school's Board and currently serves as Board Chair. The school underwent a significant leadership change over the course of the charter term, with completely new school leadership as of the start of the 2014-2015 school year, including a new Executive Director, Nicholas Tishuk, a new Director of Student Culture, a new Lower School Director of Instruction, a new Middle School Director of Instruction, a new Associate Director of Special Education and Response to Intervention, a new Associate Director of Family and Community Engagement, and a new Associate Director of Knowledge and Development. The previous school leader had been with the school since its inception.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- To date, the school has not met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95%. Average daily attendance for students over the course of the retrospective charter term (2010-2011 through 2013-2014) is 92.4% according to the data in the table below.[19]

[19] The table reflects average daily attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014. Please note that the school self-reported different attendance rates in its Renewal Application than those recorded in ATS for the first and last years, 2010-2011 and 2013-2014, though the differences are not significant. The school self-reported attendance rates of 92.4% and 91.2% for school years 2010-2011 and 2013-2014, respectively.

Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School *	**92.5%**	**93.4%**	**92.4%**	**91.1%**
NYC **	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	-0.7	-0.5	-1.2	-2.1

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

- The school has experienced inconsistent instructional turnover during the course of the charter term. For the most recent period, 2013-2014, the turnover rate for instructional staff was 24%. This rate is similar to what the school experienced in its first year of operation (2010-2011), when the turnover rate for instructional staff was 25%. However, the average turnover rate across the two years in between was 13%.[20]
- Student mobility is presented below for the charter term without comparison to other schools, the CSD, or NYC as final student retention goals were not established by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term. Based on the NYC DOE's evaluation and not in comparison to any other school, the CSD, or NYC averages, the school has had minor challenges with retaining students.

Mobility

Student Mobility out of Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School *				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Number of Students who Left the School	26	35	51	59
Percent of Students who Left the School	14.4%	14.1%	15.2%	14.0%

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

- The NYC DOE has made changes to the NYC School Survey during the entirety of the retrospective charter term. Questions asked have been altered, added or deleted from year to year. Also, beginning with the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, survey categories will not be measured in total points out of 10 possible points. To allow for consistency during the evaluated charter term, selected questions, consistent with the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework were identified as relevant for charter schools. These are presented below for the duration of the retrospective charter term. In the most recent year of survey results, 2013-2014, the percentage of teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for two of four selected questions; the percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was not above citywide averages for any of the three selected questions.
- NYC School Survey Response Rates should be comparable over time, however, as the measurement of these has remained consistent. Response rates for parents, teachers and students (if participating) are presented below for each year of the charter term. In general, the response rates for BSNBCS parents were above NYC averages in all but the last year (2013-2014), whereas the response rates for BSNBCS teachers were above NYC averages in only the first two years. In 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, the BSNBCS teacher response rate was slightly below the citywide average.

[20] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form in November 2014

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree						
Survey Question		Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School				Citywide Average
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	-	-	-	-	-
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	-	-	-	-	-
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	-	-	-	-	-
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	95%	96%	94%	92%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	94%	93%	96%	93%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	96%	96%	96%	90%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	82%	96%	71%	24%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	59%	96%	84%	92%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	87%	96%	96%	96%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	-	88%	75%	59%	81%

* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.
** This question was phrased as "My teachers inspire me to learn" in the 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 School Surveys.
*** This question was not introduced until the 2011-2012 School Survey.

NYC School Survey Results

	Response Rates				
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	-	-	-	-
	NYC	-	-	-	-
Parents	Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	66%	82%	67%	51%
	NYC	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School	100%	96%	80%	79%
	NYC	82%	81%	83%	81%

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

- The school's charter goals include, "parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect." The school met this goal in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013 school years. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school's charter goals include, "staff will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect." The school met this goal in

the 2011-2012 school year but not in the 2010-2011 or 2012-2013 school years. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.

- The school's charter goals include, "students will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect." This goal is not applicable.

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

- Over the course of the charter, the school has increased its support of parents by adding an Associate Director of Family and Community Engagement to the staff.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing on September 30, 2014 at Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School located at 82 Lewis Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11206 for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 53 participants attended the hearing with six persons speaking in support of the school's renewal and none in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents/guardians from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made during October 2014 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 90% provided positive feedback, 5% provided neutral feedback, and 5% provided negative feedback regarding the school.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the fiscal year 2014 (FY14) financial audit and follow up, the school's current ratio of 0.65 indicated a risk that the school may be unable to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit and follow up, the school's unrestricted cash amount of $304,257 indicated a risk that the school will be able to cover at least one month of its operating expenses without an infusion of cash. The school's cash on hand represents only 17 days of operating expenses.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of September 30, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations**.**

Financial Sustainability

Overall, there are concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices.

- Based on the financial audits from FY12 to FY14, the school operated at a 2% deficit, indicating that the school may not be operating within its resources at the time of the FY14 financial audit, though the school generated a surplus for FY14.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit and follow up, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 1.29 indicated that the school still had more total liabilities than it had total assets.
- Based on the financial audits from FY12 through FY14, the school generated overall positive cash flow for FY14, though the school had negative cash flow from FY12 to FY13.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent annual financial audits for FY12 to FY14**.**

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

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

As of the review in November 2014, the Board of Trustees for BSNBCS is in compliance with:

- **Membership size.** Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, a minimum of seven and maximum of 15 members.

As of the review in November 2014, the Board of Trustees for BSNBCS is out of compliance with:

- **Required number of board meetings.** The school's bylaws indicate that the Board is to hold no fewer than 10 meetings a year. The school held 10 meetings in the first year of its charter and nine meetings in the subsequent years. All but one of those meetings had quorum. The current Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months, per year. The Board has updated its bylaws to comply with this law.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have not submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents that have been submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.[21]
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has inconsistently made board minutes and agendas available to the public prior to Board meetings via posting on the school's website. Currently, Board Meeting minutes are available on the school's website from March 27, 2014 – September 16, 2014.
- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** The Board has not consistently submitted new board member credentials within the required five days of change to OSDCP for review and if necessary, approval. During the charter term, documents were not submitted per the required timeframe for one board member. Throughout the course of the charter term the school did not submit any resignations.
- **Timely submission of documents.** The Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the NYSED by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term. However, the school did not post to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law.

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

- **Teacher certification.** The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification. The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools.
- **Immunization.** The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.
- **Insurance.** The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2013-2014 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 9, 2014, adhering to charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1. Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently adhere to this requirement.
- **Fire Emergency.** One of the school leaders was trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.
- **Timely Submission of Invoicing and Reconciliation Documents.** Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently submit complete invoicing and reconciliation documents by the associated deadlines.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Student Discipline Plan.** The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be compliant with federal law; however, during the 2013-2014 school year, the

[21] Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

NYC DOE found the school was out of compliance with its special education and discipline policies, specifically as they related to due process and discipline for students with IEPs. The school updated its Student-Family Culture & Discipline Handbook, effective March 3, 2014, which now includes the federal guidelines for students with disabilities.

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

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

Enrollment and Retention Targets

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
    - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.
    - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
    - As of November 1, 2014, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act are still in a *proposed* status. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, however, these averages should not be assumed to be similar to the final enrollment targets to be released by NYSED.[22]
- In all years of operation, including the most recent completed school year 2013-2014, Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School:
    - served a lower percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to the CSD 16 rate, but served a higher percentage than the citywide rate;
    - served a lower percentage of students with disabilities compared to both the CSD 16 and citywide percentages; and
    - served a higher percentage of English Language Learner students compared to the CSD 16 percentage (the only exception being the school's first year of operation, in which it served a smaller percentage of ELL students than the CSD 16 percentage), but BSNBCS served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to the citywide percentage.

[22] Please see the following website for more information: http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/enrollment-retention-targets.html

Enrollment of Special Populations[23]

Special Population		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Proposed)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	**Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School**	**87.8%**	**90.8%**	**86.6%**	**89.2%**	**92.0%**
	CSD 16	94.0%	93.8%	93.6%	94.3%	
	NYC	81.4%	83.8%	83.0%	82.4%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	**Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School**	**12.2%**	**15.3%**	**12.5%**	**15.7%**	**16.1%**
	CSD 16	16.8%	18.3%	20.2%	25.1%	
	NYC	16.3%	16.8%	17.9%	19.9%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	**Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School**	**1.7%**	**6.4%**	**8.4%**	**7.0%**	**2.8%**
	CSD 16	4.7%	5.2%	5.4%	5.2%	
	NYC	18.7%	17.6%	16.6%	15.6%	

Additional Enrollment Information				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Grades Served	K-3	K-4	K-5	K-6
CSD(s)	16	16	16	16

[23] Comparisons of a charter school's special populations to the CSD and City are made relative only to the grades served by the school. For example, if a charter school serves grades kindergarten through five, comparisons of that school's special populations will only be made relative to grades kindergarten through five in the CSD and citywide. CSD comparisons are particular to the grades served in each CSD each year. Enrollment rates reflect demographic characteristics as of June 1 and enrollment as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.
State enrollment targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific enrollment target. The CSD for a multi-district school is the primary CSD as determined by each school. The enrollment is determined by the total number of students enrolled as of October 31, 2013. Any school with an unusual grade configuration (i.e. K, 6-9) should use an available grade configuration provided by SED that is most aligned as determined by the DOE, otherwise a school's actual grade span is used. For more information regarding SED's methodology behind the calculation of charter school enrollment and retention targets, please refer to the memo at http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2012Meetings/July2012/712brca11.pdf.

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

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

- Although the school does not plan to serve any additional grades, it did request an increase in its maximum authorized enrollment.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Renewal Process

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

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

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

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

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

Statutory Basis for Renewal

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

§2850:

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

When granted, a charter is valid for up to five years. For a school chartered under the Act to operate beyond the initial charter term, the school must seek and obtain renewal of its charter.[24]

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

> **§2851.4**:
> Charters may be renewed, upon application, for a term of up to five years in accordance with the provisions of this article for the issuance of such charters pursuant to section twenty-eight hundred fifty-two of this article; provided, however, that a renewal application shall [also] include:
> (a) A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in the charter.
> (b) A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private. Such statement shall be in a form prescribed by the board of regents.
> (c) Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school required by subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty-seven of this article, including the charter school report cards and the certified financial statements.
> (d) Indications of parent and student satisfaction.
> (e) The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents or the board of trustees of the state university of New York, as applicable, of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal. When developing such targets, the board of regents and the board of trustees of the state university of New York shall ensure (1) that such enrollment targets are comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the charter school is located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.
>
> Such renewal application shall be submitted to the charter entity no later than six months prior to the expiration of the charter; provided, however, that the charter entity may waive such deadline for good cause shown.

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

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.[25] As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education ("NYC DOE") institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act's renewal standards:

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;
- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction; and
- The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and

[24] See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.
[25] See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

> students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal.[26]

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.[27]

[26] § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.
[27] See § 2852(5).

Part 6: NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

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

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

Full-Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions

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

Short Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions

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

Non-Renewal

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

Grade Expansions or Enrollment Changes

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

The NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

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

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

Although academic performance is primary, the NYC DOE takes into account a wide variety of factors (as indicated by the framework strands and available evidence detail) when evaluating a school. These factors include academic, fiscal, operational and environmental indicators of a charter school's performance. Additionally, some of the indicators we evaluate relate to expected performance as defined in the New York State Charter Schools Act including evidence of improved student learning and achievement, special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure, use of different and innovative teaching methods, parent and student satisfaction, and enrollment and retention of special student populations. Further detail about the application of the framework to school reflection and evaluation is provided beginning on page 17 of the NYC DOE Chancellor-Authorized Schools Accountability Handbook for 2014-2015.

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

1. Is the School an Academic Success?
1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement
Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below: • Meet absolute performance goals established in school charter • Meet student progress goals established in school charter • Meet other rigorous academic goals as stated on school charter • Demonstrate increasing student achievement/growth • Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students • Are surpassing academic performance measures of DOE identified peer-schools • Are surpassing academic performance measures compared with district/city proficiency averages

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

- Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates
- Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results
- Grades 8-12 College Readiness Credit Accumulation
- Percentage of Students Applying to and Being Admitted to College
- Percentage of Students Taking AP Courses and/or Percentage of Students Passing AP Courses
- When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results
- Results on state accountability measures
- Charter School Academic Goals
- School-reported internal assessments
- NYC DOE Progress Reports or School Quality Reports[28]

1b. Instructionally Sound and Responsive Education Program

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

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

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

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

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

1c. Learning Environment

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

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

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

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

2. Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?
2a. Mission and Goals
Schools with a successful mission and goals have many of the characteristics below: • Have an animated mission statement and clearly articulated goals (both academic and non-academic) that staff, students and community embrace • Demonstrate an active self-evaluation process that involves regular monitoring, an examination of practices based on outcomes against goals, and reporting on progress towards school goals • Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data
Evidence for a successful mission and goals might include, but not be limited to, the following: • Mission Statement • School charter and external documents (student/family handbooks, school website, etc.) • Annual Reports, school improvement plans, leadership/Board reports • Board agendas and minutes • Parent, student, and teacher satisfaction surveys • Participation at parent-teacher conferences, school advocacy events, participation in academic goal related programs • Stakeholder interviews (board, parents, staff, students, etc.)

2b. Leadership and Governance Structure
Schools with successful leadership and governance structures have many of the characteristics below: • Have a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations, with clear lines of accountability for the Board, school leadership and all staff • Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate officers, committees, and a purposeful blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter • Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly, but not limited to, Open-Meeting Law and conflict of interest laws, and is fully compliant with its Board approved by-laws (number of meetings, quorum, posting of calendar, agenda and minutes) • Have a defined process for Board reflection on effectiveness, assessing developing needs, and plan for professional growth • Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time • Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals and, if and when necessary, makes timely adjustments to that structure with proper notice to and approval by its authorizer • Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel • Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provides regular feedback on instruction to teachers, including both formal and informal observations
Evidence for school governance and organizational design may include, but are not limited to, the following: • School charter • Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, calendar of meetings, meeting agenda and minutes • Annual conflict of interest forms • Board resources for evaluating school leadership and staff, including rubric/performance metrics • Board resources for self-reflection and professional growth • Board development plan • Board interviews • Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook and core operational policies • School calendar • Professional development plans • Stakeholder interviews (board, school leadership and staff)

2c. School Climate and Community Engagement
Schools with a sustaining school climate and engaged parent and community support have many of the characteristics below: • A healthy professional school climate that is collaborative, student-centered, and open to parents and community support • Employ an effective means of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including, but not limited to, the NYC DOE School Survey • Have effective home-school communication practices and engagement strategies to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children • Strong community-based partnerships that support and advocate for the school • Engage families actively in the life of the school, including advocacy, community engagement, and feedback on school policies and initiatives • Have a clear procedure for parents and staff to express concerns to school leadership and the Board, as appropriate, including a clearly articulated escalation path to authorizer • Share instructional and operational practices with the larger NYC school community and actively seek opportunities for partnering and collaboration • Encourage professional conversations about effective performance and quality instruction among staff, through, for example, such means as regular and periodic teaming (grade level teams, data days, etc.) and peer observations • Have systems in place to evaluate professional development effectiveness and provide ongoing support for school-wide and individual initiatives
Evidence for school climate and community engagement may include, but not be limited to, the following: • NYC DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results • Student retention and wait list data • Staff retention data • Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews • Student and staff attendance rates • Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences • Parent association meeting calendar and minutes • Community partnerships and sponsored programs • Participation in NYC DOE initiatives and efforts to collaborate/partner with other NYC schools • Parent and community feedback via public hearings, renewal calls to parents, etc. • Community outreach documents (newsletters, announcements, invitations, etc.) • School Professional Development Plan and staff feedback on professional development events • Resources for evaluations and observations, scheduled opportunities for professional collaboration, staff feedback on professional development events • Student/Family and Staff Handbooks

2d. Operational Health

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

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

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

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

2e. Financial Sustainability

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

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

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

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

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

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

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

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

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

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

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

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

- Meet all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, ELL and Special Education students to those of their community school district of location[29] *or* are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages for enrollment and retention
- Implement school policies related to student discipline and promotion and retention that are fully compliant with laws and regulations related to students with disabilities and due process regulations
- Conduct an independently verified fair and open lottery and manage enrollment process and annual waiting lists with integrity
- Employ instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and meet all certification requirements

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

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

[29] School-specific targets for enrollment and retention are to come from the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

3c. Applicable Regulations
Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have the characteristics below: • Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns • Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and complete all other financial reporting as required • Boards that meet requirements for size, meeting frequency, public notice, applicable open-meeting and conflict of interest regulations, as well as comply with NYC DOE OSDCP's requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members • Inform NYC DOE OSDCP, and where required, receive OSDCP approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization • Effectively engaged parent associations
Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following: • School or building safety plan; appropriate inspection documents • Annual audits, escrow accounts, other financial reporting documents • Board roster, calendar, agenda and minutes, conflict of interest documents, notification of changes/approval of new member request documents • Charter revision requests • Revised or new contracts • Parent association calendar of meetings, identified officers, parent association agenda and minutes, parent satisfaction survey results • Stakeholder interviews

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

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

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

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

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

4b. Organizational Sustainability

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

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

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

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

4c. School or Model Improvements
Successful schools are thoughtful about the continued appropriateness of school design features and elements of their models. They: • Review performance carefully and even without major changes through expansion or replication, are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success • Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission
Evidence for successful improvements to a school's program or model may include, but not be limited to, the following: • Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term • Renewal application revised charter including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term • Leadership and Board interviews • Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) with partners or important vendors

Appendix A: School Performance Data

Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School				
Grade 3	40.8%	44.4%	31.3%	31.0%
Grade 4	-	52.3%	29.2%	23.5%
Grade 5	-	-	31.0%	13.5%
Grade 6	-	-	-	23.3%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 16 *				
Grade 3	1.6	3.2	17.5	9.0
Grade 4	-	2.6	10.2	3.4
Grade 5	-	-	13.9	-3.6
Grade 6	-	-	-	12.6
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 3	-7.3	-4.6	3.1	1.1
Grade 4	-	-0.1	2.0	-7.6
Grade 5	-	-	2.3	-14.9
Grade 6	-	-	-	-2.0

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Bedford Stuyvesant New Beginnings Charter School				
Grade 3	61.2%	66.7%	37.5%	41.7%
Grade 4	-	79.5%	18.8%	13.7%
Grade 5	-	-	23.3%	13.5%
Grade 6	-	-	-	25.6%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 16 *				
Grade 3	10.9	22.0	23.6	21.4
Grade 4	-	18.0	-6.2	-6.4
Grade 5	-	-	5.8	-2.5
Grade 6	-	-	-	13.5
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 3	6.4	9.7	4.4	3.0
Grade 4	-	13.8	-16.5	-26.2
Grade 5	-	-	-6.3	-25.3
Grade 6	-	-	-	-8.2

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

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-13
Annual Site Visit Report 2011-12
Annual Site Visit Report 2010-11