



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2013-2014

**SUMMIT ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT**

2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

School Information for the 2013-2014 School Year

Name of Charter School	Summit Academy Charter School
Board Chair(s)	Gene Moore
School Leader(s)	Thomas Gordon (Principal), Natasha Campbell (ED)
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 15
Physical Address(es)	27 Huntington Street, Brooklyn 11231
Facility Owner(s)	DOE

School Profile

- Summit Academy Charter School (Summit) is a middle and high school, which served 289 students¹ in grades 6-10 during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in 2009-2010 and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's authorized full grade span is 6-12 which it expects to reach in the 2015-2016 school year. The school is located in publicly-operated facilities in Brooklyn within Community School District (CSD) 15.²
- Summit enrolls new students, and backfills empty seats, in grades 6 and 7. There were no students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.³ The average attendance rate for the 2013-2014 school year as reported in February 2014 was 87%.⁴
- Summit was renewed during the 2013-2014 school year for a short-term renewal period of 3 years, and is consistent with the terms of its renewal application. The conditions of this short-term renewal granted in November 2013 included:
 - Summit Academy must have at least 85% of its authorized enrollment by BEDS Day each year.
 - As it pertains to meeting the needs of the most at-risk students, Summit must:
 - Comply with IDEA and NYS guidelines and mandates in the first year of the new charter term;
 - Develop a pre-referral/referral process that includes parent notification;
 - Report on progress toward IEP goals for all students with IEPs in a timely manner, and develop a tracking system for Related Services of students with IEPs; and
 - Conduct timely annual reviews of all IEPs.
- The school leadership for the 2013-2014 school year includes Natasha Campbell, Executive Director; Thomas Gordon, Principal; and Samease Handshaw, Director of Finance and Operations. The Principal was with the school from July 2013 until June 2014. The Board is in the process of identifying a replacement for the upcoming school year.
- Summit had a student to teacher ratio of 9:1 in the 2013-2014 school year, and served 18 sections across all grades, with an average class size of 17.⁵
- The lottery preferences for Summit's 2013-2014 school year included the New York State Charter Schools Act required preferences of returning students, students residing in the community school district of the school's location and siblings of students already enrolled in the charter school.⁶

¹ Enrollment reflects ATS data from 10/31/13.

² NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System database.

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

⁴ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

⁵ Self-reported information given on 9/18/14.

⁶ Summit Academy Charter School's 2013-2014 application.

Part 2: Summary of Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?

Overview of School-Specific Data through 2012-2013

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	17.8%	17.6%	20.0%	14.1%
CSD 15	45.8%	50.3%	51.1%	35.6%
Difference from CSD 15	-28.0	-32.7	-31.1	-21.5
NYC	40.1%	40.0%	42.5%	24.8%
Difference from NYC	-22.3	-22.4	-22.5	-10.7
New York State	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%
Difference from New York State	-35.4	-35.2	-35.1	-17.0

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	38.6%	46.1%	60.4%	18.8%
CSD 15	59.8%	64.8%	65.2%	33.4%
Difference from CSD 15	-21.2	-18.7	-4.8	-14.6
NYC	53.0%	55.8%	57.3%	26.5%
Difference from NYC	-14.4	-9.7	3.1	-7.7
New York State	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%
Difference from New York State	-22.4	-17.2	-4.4	-12.3

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

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	-	-	-	12.2%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	0.0%
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	0.0%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	-	-	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	-	-	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	-

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

Performance on the NYC Progress Report – Middle School Grades

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	C	B	B
Student Progress	-	C	C	A
Student Performance	-	C	B	B
School Environment	-	A	C	D
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	1.0	4.1	3.3

Summit Academy Charter School did not receive high school progress reports during school years 2009-2010 through 2012-2013. The school began enrolling ninth grade students in the 2012-2013 school year.

Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals

- Summit, according to its 2012-2013 Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED), met one of 13 of its applicable academic performance goals identified in its charter. Of the remaining twelve goals, the school did not meet eight and four were not determined because data was not available by time of submission. Additionally, the school has 12 academic performance goals identified in its charter that were not applicable in the 2012-2013 school year because the high school only had 9th grade in that school year.

Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment⁷

- The school determined that the focus of the 2013-2014 school year needed to be literacy and developing literacy teachers.
- The school moved from having outside consultants providing guided reading services to students, to having guided reading instruction delivered by in-house teachers in the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school uses Achievement Network for creating the ELA and math assessments, as well as for data collection.
- Through quarterly interim assessments, the school is able to determine progress towards academic goals, as well as compared to 32 other schools in the assessment network.
- The school utilizes Jupiter Grades to offer online access to student grades and behavior reports for parents and students.
- The school provides a Saturday Academy, office hours, and summer school as academic supports offering targeted remediation.
- The school implemented a Response to Intervention (RTI) program to identify and provide academic supports to struggling students.
- The school did not report on its professional development or teacher evaluation process for the 2013-2014 school year.

Representatives of the NYC DOE team visited the school on June 11, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- School leadership reported that:
 - Despite having challenges meeting authorized enrollment and enrollment targets in previous years, they have increased enrollment by increasing word-of-mouth recruitment and print advertisements.
 - On BEDS day, the school was above 85% of its authorized enrollment, at 89%.
 - A random sample of student IEPs were reviewed during the visit. All reviewed IEPs were up to date for the 2013-2014 school year.
 - Summit Special Education staff worked to improve their relationship with the CSE and develop approaches to assess students who had IEP goals that were out of date.
 - Summit developed a pre-referral/referral process that included parent notification.
 - The CSE and school held all of its IEP meetings by October 2013 and adjusted any outstanding IEP goals and promotional criteria to reflect the move to Common Core Learning Standards.
 - Summit Special Education staff is now using SESIS to its full capacity to understand student needs and has developed a tracking system for all students requiring special education services.
- Nine classrooms across all grades and content areas were observed by members of the visit team and the following was noted:
 - Half of the classrooms were taught by one instructor, with the other half of the classrooms having two teachers present, following a lead and assist or lead and monitor model. In half of the classrooms, independent practice was observed. Class size varied from 13 to 24 students, although one class only had six students.
 - In most classrooms, questioning was used to check for understanding. Questions ranged from basic recall to challenging students to demonstrate understanding, depending on the class.
 - Based on debriefs with instructional leaders after classroom visits, about half of the classrooms had instruction that was aligned with the school's instructional model and current academic priorities.

⁷ Self-reported information from school-submitted self-evaluation form on 3/10/14.

- On the day of the visit, one-on-one interviews were conducted with seven teachers, the High School Coordinator, and the Special Education Coordinator, and the following was noted:
 - Most of the teachers interviewed were in their first year at the school.
 - Most teachers interviewed reported receiving one formal observation, but mostly informal observations. They reported using the TeachBoost platform for receiving feedback.
 - Most staff interviewed reported the use of interim and summative assessments, including exit tickets, weekly quizzes, and unit tests. Some staff also discussed the use of the Achievement Network to create interim assessments.
 - Most staff interviewed reported weekly professional development held at the school. The staff reported that the professional development was not differentiated, and at times was self-guided. The staff indicated that the school could improve in this area.

Essential Question 2: Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

After reviewing information and documentation concerning Board turnover, Board minutes, reporting structure, organizational chart, annual accountability reporting documents, Board agendas, and school's website, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The Board has nine board members, all voting, with the exception of the Executive Director and school's Founder, who serves on the Board as an ex-officio member. The Board Chair, Eugene Moore, has been on the Board since July 2009.
- As evidenced from a review of Board rosters, two members who joined the Board in January 2009, resigned from the Board as of November 2013.
- As recorded in the Board's minutes, there is a clear reporting structure with school leadership providing regular updates on academic and operational performance to the Board and its committees.
- Some Board minutes and agenda items have been provided via the school's website for inspection by the public.

School Climate & Community Engagement

After reviewing information and documentation concerning leadership turnover, staff turnover, attendance rate, student turnover, NYC School Survey results and response rates, and PTO meetings, the NYC DOE notes the following:

- The school's founder is still the executive director of the school, as well as an ex-officio member of the school's Board. The principal, who joined the school in July 2013, resigned from the school in June 2014. The school's director of finance and operations has been with the school since 2009.
- Instructional staff turnover was 28.6% with eight out of 28 instructional staff not returning for the 2013-14 school year from the prior year. As of February 2014, during the 2013-14 school year, one teacher had left the school.⁸
- As of February 2014, average daily attendance for students during that school year was at 87%, which is lower than the school's charter goal of at least 95%.⁹
- Student turnover was 2.7% of students from the prior school year who did not return at the start of the 2013-2014 school year, and 21.5% of the students left the school between the start of the school year and February 2014.¹⁰
- The school reported having a parent organization, called the Family Achievement Council (FAC), as evidenced on the school's website.

2012-2013 NYC School Survey Results¹¹

Categories	Result		Community	Response Rate	Citywide Rate
Academic Expectations	Average		Parents	38%	54%
Communication	Average		Teachers	83%	83%
Engagement	Below Average		Students	79%	83%
Safety & Respect	Average				

⁸ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

⁹ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

¹⁰ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/24/14.

¹¹ Results are particular to the school type as identified in the 2013 School Survey.

Financial Health

Near-term financial obligations:

- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, and follow up, the school's unrestricted cash availability indicated a risk that the school may be unable to cover at least one month of its operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-2014 budget to the actual enrollment as of the last day for the 2013-2014 school year revealed that the school was 11% below its enrollment target, indicating a variance from projected general education per pupil revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

Financial sustainability based on current practices:

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

Annual Independent Financial Audit

- An independent audit performed for FY13 showed no material findings.

Essential Question 3: Compliance with charter and all applicable laws and regulations?

After a review of documentation submitted for the NYC DOE annual accountability reporting requirements for the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE finds the following:

Board Compliance

The Board is in compliance with:

- The Board's membership size falls within the range of no fewer than seven and no greater than 13 members, as outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws.
- Currently, officer positions outlined in the Board's bylaws are filled.

The Board is out of compliance with:

- The Board has not held the minimum number of Board meetings of at least 10, as outlined in its bylaws. Based on submitted minutes, the Board held eight meetings for the 2013-2014 school year in which quorum was reached.
- The Board did not provide written notice to the school's authorizer, NYC DOE, of two Board member resignations, as per the school's monitoring plan.

School Compliance

The school is in compliance with (as reviewed during May 2014):

- All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification.
- The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- The school had an application deadline of April 4, 2014 and lottery date of April 8, 2014 adhering to charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1.
- The school leader was trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.
- The school has posted its 2012-2013 NYSED Annual Report and annual audit to its website, as specified in charter law.

The school is out of compliance with:

- The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is not compliant with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization as of May 2014.

Essential Question 4: What are the school's plans for the next charter term?

As reported by the school's leadership, the following is noted:

- Summit was renewed for its second charter in the 2012-2013 school year, for a period of three years, and is consistent with the terms of its renewal application. The 2013-2014 school year is the first year of the second charter.
- The school maintains its original growth plan of a 6-12 school, adding one grade each year until it reaches its full grade span, expected in the 2015-2016 school year.

Enrollment and Retention Targets

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.
 - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
- In school year 2013-2014 Summit served a higher percentage of students who qualified for free or reduced price lunch compared to the CSD 15 average, but a lower percentage than the citywide average. The school served a smaller percentage of English Language Learner students compared to both CSD 15 and citywide averages. Summit served a percentage of students with disabilities comparable to that of CSD 15 and a higher rate than the citywide average.

Special Populations

	Free and Reduced Price Lunch					Students with Disabilities					English Language Learners				
	2009 -	2010 -	2011 -	2012 -	2013 -	2009 -	2010 -	2011 -	2012 -	2013 -	2009 -	2010 -	2011 -	2012 -	2013 -
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
School	78.9%	74.3%	65.8%	69.1%	71.3%	25.3%	24.0%	24.1%	17.7%	17.7%	4.2%	2.9%	2.6%	2.5%	3.5%
CSD 15	49.9%	55.0%	53.3%	55.9%	59.0%	18.7%	18.2%	17.6%	17.5%	18.1%	19.1%	19.5%	19.4%	17.6%	17.2%
NYC	62.1%	65.3%	68.1%	69.3%	72.7%	15.9%	15.9%	15.7%	15.5%	16.4%	16.1%	16.1%	15.5%	14.2%	13.9%

Additional Enrollment Information					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	6	6-7	6-8	6-9	6-10
CSD(s)	15	15	15	15	15

Comparisons to both the CSD(s) and City are made against students in grades K-8, 9-12 or K-12 depending on the grades the school served in each school year. Special population figures are as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.