



**JOHN W. LAVELLE PREPARATORY CHARTER SCHOOL RENEWAL
REPORT**

**2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
MARCH 2014**

Table of Contents

Summary of Renewal Recommendation	2
I. Charter School Overview	2
II. Overview of School-Specific Data	2
III. Rationale for Recommendation	4
School Overview and History	8
Renewal Process Overview	9
Findings	11
Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success	11
Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization.....	16
Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?	20
Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?	21
Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview	22
Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework	23
Appendix A: School Performance Data.....	32
Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data	34

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Name of Charter School	John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School
Current Board Chair(s)	William Henri
School Leader	Ken Byalin, President; Evelyn Finn, Principal
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	Wagner College, St. Paul's School of Nursing
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 31
Physical Address	1 Teleport Drive, Staten Island, NY 10311
Facility	Private
School Opened For Instruction	2009-2010 School Year
Current Charter Term Expiry Date	4/21/2014
Authorized Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at Expiry Date	6-10 / 375
Proposed Charter Term	Five Years
Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at New Expiry Date	6-12 / 510

II. Overview of School-Specific Data:

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	A	B	B
Student Progress	-	B	C	B
Student Performance	-	B	A	B
School Environment	-	A	A	A
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	5.0	5.0	5.5

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	32.3%	37.7%	45.0%	13.1%
CSD 31	47.6%	48.4%	51.3%	30.5%
Difference from CSD 31	-15.3	-10.7	-6.3	-17.4
NYC	40.1%	40.0%	42.5%	24.8%
Difference from NYC	-7.8	-2.3	2.5	-11.7
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-20.2	-17.1	-10.2	-18.1

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	40.9%	54.6%	41.7%	19.8%
CSD 31	59.6%	63.9%	63.1%	29.9%
Difference from CSD 31	-18.7	-9.3	-21.4	-10.1
NYC	53.0%	55.8%	57.3%	26.5%
Difference from NYC	-12.1	-1.2	-15.6	-6.7
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-23.7	-10.0	-24.0	-9.1

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

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	-	-	-	95.7%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	100.0%
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	90.5%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	-	-	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	-	-	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	-

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

Academic Goal Analysis (based on school's submission ¹)					
	1st Year 2009-2010	2nd Year 2010-2011	3rd year 2011-2012	4th Year 2012-2013	Cumulative 4 Year Total
Total Achievable Academic Goals	0	4	9	1	14
# Met	0	0	0	0	0
# Partially Met	0	0	0	0	0
# Not Met	0	4	9	1	14
% Met	N/A	0%	0%	0%	0%
% Partially Met	N/A	0%	0%	0%	0%
% Not Met	N/A	100%	100%	100%	100%

¹ Lavelle included student attendance and student retention among its academic goals but they aren't counted as such here. If those were included, the results would be: first year 100% (2/2) met; second year 33% (2/6 met); third year 18% (2/11 met), and fourth year 66% (2/3) met.

III. Rationale for Recommendation

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School (Lavelle Prep) has demonstrated academic achievement and progress as demonstrated by consistently high grades on the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Progress Report. In addition, Lavelle Prep's Student Progress grades and Student Performance grades have been positive and its overall percentile ranking for city middle schools on the NYC DOE Progress Report has been above the 60th percentile each year. In its most recent Progress Report, the school was in the 58th percentile of its peer group for English Language Arts proficiency and the 85th percentile of its peer group for math proficiency.

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include, "(a) Improve student learning and achievement;" and "(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure." Lavelle Prep has made progress through its initial charter term in meeting these two objectives, demonstrating success on its New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) annual Progress Reports and providing expanded learning opportunities to a population of Students with Disabilities and eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch that is higher than its district of location, Community School District (CSD) 31.

Lavelle Prep's mission is to provide a "rigorous college preparatory education that...empowers students for success." The school "welcomes all students, including those living with emotional challenges." True to its charter mission, the school's enrollment of Students with Disabilities (SwD) has been consistently higher than its district of location and near or above 30% each year of the term. For all core subjects, two teachers working in classes of 12 to 17 students, provide a supportive instructional environment with numerous opportunities for addressing individual student needs.

Lavelle Prep entered the fifth year of its first term of operation with the start of the 2013-2014 academic year giving the NYC DOE four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data to evaluate the academic performance of the school. In addition, Lavelle Prep has received three graded NYC DOE Progress Reports for its middle school grades. The school received its first ungraded High School Progress Report for the 2012-2013 school year; high schools do not receive a graded Progress Report until they have their first graduation class. Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D or F for Student Progress, Student Performance, and School Environment, with additional points for closing the achievement gap contributing to the overall grade. Grades are based on comparing school results in each category to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to school results citywide.

Lavelle Prep has consistently earned positive results on its overall grade on its three Progress Reports: an A on its initial Progress Report in 2010-2011 and Bs on its two most recent overall Progress Report grades. The school's percentile ranking for each of its Progress Reports has placed Lavelle Prep near the top-third or better of New York City middle schools, ranking in the 88th percentile in 2010-2011, the 67th percentile in 2011-2012, and the 63rd percentile on its most recent Progress Report.

The Student Progress subsection grade is the most heavily weighted of the Progress Report sections, representing 60% of the total points available, and Lavelle Prep's results during its first term have been mostly positive. The school earned a B grade on the Student Progress subsection in 2010-2011, then received a C in 2011-2012 and a B in 2012-2013. The school's growth percentiles over the past few years indicate that the school has had success in moving its students

forward academically based on individual student changes in adjusted growth percentile² from the previous year, including a separate metric for improving students in the school's lowest third of performers.

Lavelle Prep's Student Performance grades over the course of its first term have all been positive, with the school receiving a B in 2010-2011, an A in 2011-2012, and a B again in 2012-2013. Student Performance looks at three metrics: state assessment results in ELA, state assessment results in math, and the percent of students passing core courses (English, math, science and social studies).

The 2012-2013 school year was the first in which Lavelle Prep operated with a high school grade and it received its first ungraded high school Progress Report in the fall of 2013. An important Student Progress measure is credit accumulation³ and first year results are promising with 95.7% of its first year students earning 10 or more credits, which was better than all the schools in Lavelle Prep's peer group and 90% of city high schools.

Lavelle Prep has nine academic goals, all related to 75% of its students demonstrating proficiency (Level 3 or better) on the NYS ELA, math and science assessments. In the second year of the term, four of the nine were applicable and the school did not meet any of them. In third year of the term, all nine were applicable and the school did not meet any of them. In the fourth year, only one of the nine was applicable because of changes in the ELA and math NYS assessments⁴. Lavelle Prep did not meet the one applicable goal related to science in its fourth year. The school did make progress in relation to this goal, raising its proficiency result in science from 56% of its students scoring Level 3 or better to 65% reaching proficiency in 2012-2013, but still below the charter goal of 75%.⁵

Lavelle Prep is located in CSD 31, which consistently outperforms city averages in both ELA and math proficiency rates and is the only NYC school district not listed as a Focus School District by the New York State Department of Education. During its initial charter term, Lavelle Prep has not surpassed the district in proficiency in ELA or math, as measured by the percentage of students scoring at Level 3 or 4 on the state's assessments. However, its results on the Progress Report indicate academic success in both Student Progress and Student Performance when compared to peer schools throughout New York City. Lavelle Prep's enrollment includes a high percentage of SwD (near 30% or more of its enrollment during the current charter term). In addition, the school's percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Lunch (FRL) has increased from 72% in the first year to 81% in 2012-2013. It also serves a higher percentage of African American and Hispanic students than its district (just under 80% compared to 46%). As a result, the school serves a more academically at-risk population of students than the district. The progress Lavelle

² This measure calculates the median (middle) adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. A student's growth percentile is a number between 0 and 100, which represents the percentage of students with the same score on last year's test who scored the same or lower than the student on this year's test. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the Progress Report uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect average differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The Progress Report evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

³ Credit accumulation is an important measure of progress toward graduation. The metric considers the percentage of students who earn ten or more credits between fall and summer of an academic year, with at least six of these credits needing to be earned in one of the main subjects (English, math, science or social studies).

⁴ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis. The school's charter goals also include the school being deemed in good standing with state and federal accountability which the met in 2010-2011.

⁵ In addition to the outcomes based academic goals, Lavelle Prep identified daily attendance and student retention goals among its self-identified academic-related goals and met its goals all four years for both measures.

Prep has demonstrated compared to similar schools represents, despite the below district performance, an expanded learning opportunity for its at-risk students, particularly SwDs.

The school's primary mode of support for its SWD students is Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) and according to its most recent Progress Report, Lavelle Prep has ELA proficiency results for SwD in ICT settings that are better than 82% of its peer schools and 74% of all public middle schools in the city. The proficiency results in math are even stronger for SwD in ICT setting, better than 95% of its peer schools and better than 86% of public middle schools citywide. The school has a unique instructional program that features small classes and multiple adults in most classrooms, including all core subjects in a 17:1:1 ratio for 4.5 hours a day.

According to sub-group Growth Percentile metrics on the Progress Report, Lavelle Prep ranked in the top 20% of all middle schools in ELA for students in the lowest third and for Black/Hispanic males in the lowest third, evidence of closing the achievement gap. Math results were positive but not as strong, in the top third for students in the lowest third and the top half of Black/Hispanic males in the lowest third.

Over the course of its first charter term, the NYC DOE conducted five site visits to Lavelle Prep: Annual Visits in the Spring of 2010, 2011 and 2012, a financially focused visit in 2013, and, as part of the renewal process, a two day visit on October 9th and 10th of 2013. Based on these visits, DOE reviewers determined Lavelle Prep has developed a responsive education program and a supportive learning environment. In the spring of 2011, it was noted that the school's "instructional approach is well-thought out and supported by consistent structures, including planning, resources and instructional practices." The school also evidenced a strong collaborative professional learning environment that it continued to build on to further advance instructional practices, including aligning to Common Core expectations and improving use of instructional data. The May 2012 site visit report indicated that the school had added the Danielson Framework to support professional development for teachers and improve instruction. Over the course of the term, from site visit through the renewal visits, students were consistently observed as being on-task and responsive to instruction in a safe and orderly environment.

Lavelle Prep uses a team-teaching approach with at least one of two adults in the core classrooms holding special education certification. The program has two models. In one, the classroom features a dual-certified lead teacher with a teacher's assistant providing mandated services. In the other, a content-specific general education teacher works with a special education certified teacher to provide services. Lavelle Prep has 20 certified special education teachers. Additionally, the school has a special education coordinator who is on the school's academic alert team as well as its Behavioral Intervention Team. She also leads the school's Response to Intervention (RTI) implementation.

Governance, Operations & Finances

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has developed its governance structure and organizational design. The Board has not experienced significant turnover during the course of its charter term and has been led by William Henri since the October 2010, when the position transitioned from founding Chair Francisco Lugovina, who is still a Board member. The Board receives regular updates from school leadership related to the school's academic and financial health, as evidenced by meeting minutes.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has developed a stable school culture. The school's instructional leadership team has been stable over the course of this charter term. The school's NYC DOE School Survey results have consistently been Above Average to Well Above Average across all four categories, with the exception of one Average category result in 2012-2013. Participation in the School Survey has consistently been high among parents, teachers, and students, with even the lowest rate of parent participation widely surpassing the city

average. In addition, Lavelle Prep, as noted above, has met its charter goals for student attendance and retention during each year of its charter.

Overall, the school, because of an early move into a private facility, is in an adequate position to meet its near term financial obligations and is financial sustainable based on current practices. During the course of the term it has successfully managed financial challenges due to revenue shortfalls and taken pro-active steps to reduce risk. There was no material weakness in internal controls noted in the three independent financial audits for Fiscal Year (FY) 2013, FY2012 and FY2011, however, the school received a note in the FY2012 audit about liquidity and “going concern” issues.

Due to space constraints associated with the public facility Lavelle Prep was located in at the time the school was chartered, it moved into a private facility in August 2011, one year earlier than originally planned. This move into a private facility, coupled with a lower than budgeted special needs population, caused financial challenges for the school. In FY2012, the school’s independent auditors were concerned due to the revenue shortfall and because the school was operating with a working capital deficit. In order to meet its liquidity shortfall, the school deferred certain vendor payments to subsequent years, implemented employee salary cuts and received no interest loans from Board members during FY2013.

There was no liquidity or “going concern” notices in the FY 2013 independent financial audit and Lavelle Prep has made all debt obligation payments.

B. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

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

C. Plans for Next Charter Term

The school plans to continue to grow from its current six through ten grade span to become a full sixth through twelfth grade school by school year 2015-2016. The school also seeks to establish career readiness program partnerships with post-secondary educational organizations, although these relationships are still developing. The school has no immediate plans for replication or expansion.

For the aforementioned reasons, the NYCDOE recommends a full-term renewal. The school will reach its intended full grade span, 6-12, in the second year of the new charter term.

Part 2: School Overview and History

John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School (Lavelle Prep) is a middle school and high school serving approximately 380 students from sixth to tenth grades during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in the 2009-2010 school year, with sixth grade and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's previously authorized full grade span during its initial charter term is sixth grade through tenth grade. The school is located in a private facility at One Corporate Commons at One Teleport Drive in District 31, in Staten Island.

Lavelle Prep is committed to standards of excellence for all students, regardless of background. The school specifically targets students who have been identified as needing special educational services and attracts a high proportion of students who come from economically disadvantaged backgrounds. The school is committed to its students ultimately succeeding at the same levels as the City's well-prepared college-going youth.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades 6-7. The school received 406 applications for its Spring 2013 lottery.⁶

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

Special Populations⁷

	Free Reduced Lunch				Students with Disabilities				English Language Learners			
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
School	72%	70%	59%	81%	39%	41%	30%	28%	4%	5%	3%	3%
CSD 31	47%	50%	51%	54%	19%	19%	19%	20%	6%	6%	6%	5%
NYC	62%	64%	65%	69%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	15%	14%	14%

The above table indicates that the percent of Lavelle Prep students who are FRL or SWD has been consistently higher than its district of location and its ELL population comparable. (See page 21 for information on Lavelle Prep's recruitment and retention efforts.)

Lavelle Prep's Board of Trustees is chaired by William Henri. The school is led by President Ken Byalin and Principal Evelyn Finn, both of whom have been at the school for five years, since the school's inception. In 2012-2013, the school added Howard Lucks to the school's leadership team as Co-Principal. The school promoted founding teacher Chris Zilinski to Assistant Principal in the 2013-2014 school year.

⁶ Self-reported on Data Sheet Submitted with Renewal Application in October 2013.

⁷ Special population data is based on ATS snapshots as of October 31st of the given school year, with the exception of data for 2012-2013, which is based on an ATS snapshot as of October 26, 2012.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

Renewal Process

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

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

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

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

Renewal Report

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

As part of the review process, the NYC DOE prepares a draft report and provides a copy to the school to inspect for factual accuracy. The draft contains the findings, discussion, and the evidence for those findings. Upon receiving factual corrections from the school, the appropriate staff reviews its draft, may make any appropriate changes, and reviews the amended findings to make a recommendation to the Chancellor. The Chancellor's determination, and the findings on which that decision is based, is submitted to the Board of Regents for a final decision.

Is the school an academic success?

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

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

Academic success is rated as **Demonstrated, Partially Demonstrated, or Not Yet Demonstrated**. If a school does not yet have a NYC DOE Progress Report, it is rated as Not Yet Demonstrated.

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally sound, viable organization, CSAS focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the NACSA (National Association of Charter School Authorizers) Financial Framework⁸.

CSAS also 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 Survey,
- Data collection sheets provided by schools,
- Student, staff, and Board turnover,
- Authorized enrollment numbers, and
- Annual financial audits.

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

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

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

Staff Representatives

The following NYC DOE staff representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on October 9th and 10th, 2013:

- Richard Larios, Senior Director, Charter Schools Accountability and Support, NYC DOE
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, Charter Schools Accountability and Support, NYC DOE
- Gabrielle Mosquera, Director of Oversight, Charter Schools Accountability and Support, NYC DOE
- Mariama Sandi, Chairperson of Charter Committee on Special Education (Citywide), Division of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, NYC DOE

⁸ http://www.qualitycharters.org/assets/files/images/stories/pdfs/publications/Performance_Framework_Fall_2012_Draft.pdf, page 38-59

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

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

Academic Attainment and Improvement

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

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	A	B	B
Student Progress	-	B	C	B
Student Performance	-	B	A	B
School Environment	-	A	A	A
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	5.0	5.0	5.5

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	32.3%	37.7%	45.0%	13.1%
CSD 31	47.6%	48.4%	51.3%	30.5%
Differences from CSD 31	-15.3	-10.7	-6.3	-17.4
NYC	40.1%	40.0%	42.5%	24.8%
Differences from NYC	-7.8	-2.3	2.5	-11.7
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Differences from New York State	-20.2	-17.1	-10.2	-18.1

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	40.9%	54.6%	41.7%	19.8%
CSD 31	59.6%	63.9%	63.1%	29.9%
Differences from CSD 31	-18.7	-9.3	-21.4	-10.1
NYC	53.0%	55.8%	57.3%	26.5%
Differences from NYC	-12.1	-1.2	-15.6	-6.7
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Differences from New York State	-23.7	-10.0	-24.0	-9.1

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

Mission and Academic Goals

Over its charter term, Lavelle Prep has not yet achieved any of its directly academic goals, though it has met all four years of its charter term student attendance and student retention goals, which it included in among its academic goals⁹.

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

	Met in 2009-2010?	Met in 2010-2011?	Met in 2011-2012?	Met in 2012-2013?
1) 75% of 6th-7th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA test	N/A	No	No	N/A
2) 75% of 6th-7th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Math test	N/A	No	No	N/A
3) 75% of 7th-8th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA test	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
4) 75% of 7th-8th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Math test	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
5) 75% of 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science test	N/A	N/A	No	No
6) ELA-Students enrolled for 2 years in the 6th and 7th grade who performed proficient both years	N/A	No	No	N/A
7) ELA-Students enrolled for 2 years in the 7th and 8th grade who performed proficient both years	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
8) Math-Students enrolled for 2 years in the 6th and 7th grade who performed proficient both years	N/A	No	No	N/A
9) Math-Students enrolled for 2 years in the 7th and 8th grade who performed proficient both years	N/A	N/A	No	N/A

Responsive Education Program

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited the school on October 9th and 10th, 2013. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
 - Leadership and staff have worked together with consultants to align the school's curriculum with Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), making adjustments to instructional planning with Common Core specific student learning goals and essential questions for unit and lesson plans.
 - From its beginning, the school has stressed non-fiction texts and literacy across the curriculum, using CCLS for writing and reading in social studies, science and other curriculum areas.

⁹ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

- After the school's 2012-2013 NYS assessments results the school leadership determined that they had been limiting teaching CCLS to grade level materials and needed to increase the range of materials used to include above grade level materials as well. In addition, the school has made adjustments to writing prompts and questioning strategies, and has increased dissecting of language and concepts in math.
- Lavelle Prep is using Engage NY curriculum support resources to support CCLS alignment.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
 - The school has a unique instructional program that features small classes and multiple adults in most classrooms, including all core subjects in a 17:1:1 ratio for 4.5 hours a day. The school uses a team-teaching approach with at least one of two adults in the core classrooms holding special education certification. The program has two models. In one, the classroom features a dual-certified lead teacher with a teacher's assistant providing mandated services. In the other, a content-specific general education teacher works with a special education certified teacher to provide services.
 - The school has 20 certified special education teachers and three English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers. Lavelle Prep has a special education coordinator who is on the school's academic alert team and its Behavioral Intervention Team. She also leads the Response to Intervention (RTI) implementation.
 - Lavelle Prep has a developed referral process for special education students with its RTI program that it is continuing to refine.
 - ESL support is provided for English Language Learners who are at the beginning or intermediate stages of language acquisition, generally through a push-in support model.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
 - To help with its expansion into high school grades and as a part of its planned organizational model, Lavelle Prep hired an additional principal, Howard Lucks, in 2012-2013. The two principals share leadership of the school with Principal Finn providing middle school expertise and Principal Lucks high school expertise but both assume responsibility for overall administration of the school.
 - The school has also added to its instructional leadership structure by promoting one teacher to an assistant principal role, and other teachers to grade level team leader positions and subject-based academic coaching roles.
 - Teachers have flexibility in terms of unit and lesson plan formats but all follow a common basic structure and supports (identified goals, essential questions, Do Nows, guided practice, independent practice, differentiation identified, use of note-taking via Student Toolbox of notes, strategies, vocabulary, etc.).
 - Teachers are evaluated by the school's two principals. There are two to three formal observations a year, which include a formal review of lesson plans. The formal observations includes peer observers whose feedback is part of the review. The four content coaches do informal observations and meet weekly with the Co-Principals. Coaches also provide push-in support to teachers. Grade team leads provide teachers with additional support with parent outreach, coordinate referrals to the Behavioral Intervention Team and are responsible for grade level team professional development during the school's monthly Professional Development days.
 - The school's wellness courses are created by grade level teams of teachers, using a teacher created rubric for grading student performance in the course with some course topics including coping with stress, anti-bullying, creating a safe school, self-management, etc.
 - During the visit, DOE representatives visited nineteen classrooms, including classes from all grades, all core subjects, as well as music, Spanish, visual arts and wellness classes, with representatives of the school's leadership team, and the following was noted:
 - In all core classes but one two teachers were involved with instructional delivery. In some classes a third or fourth adult (paraprofessionals or additional push-in support) were observed.
 - In all observed classrooms, the number of students was between eleven and seventeen, except for one multi-grade high school literature class that had

eighteen students, with four adults in the room at the time of the observation, two teachers, a 1:1 paraprofessional, and a teacher provided push-in support.

- The most common forms of co-teaching observed were Lead and Assist or Lead and Monitor, with only two of examples of Team Teaching.
- Observed instruction included direct instruction, guided practice, independent practice, partner and table discussion, and some performance-based activities or projects.
- In sixteen of nineteen observed classrooms, students were consistently on-task through all or most of the lesson. In two of the three remaining classes the observed on-task behavior was mixed with some students consistently on-task and other frequently off-task. In one class, students were more consistently off-task than on. In eight of the observed classrooms students were actively compliant with teacher directions and instructions.
- As noted by the leadership team, the level of questioning observed needed to be more challenging in most classes. In observed classes, the emphasis was on basic recall questions and requests for students to explain or give evidence for answers but higher level questioning—application, synthesis, analysis and evaluate—were observed much less frequently than recall and explain responses.
- Pacing of observed lessons varied. Some lessons were efficient and effective with little or no down time while others had poor pacing with prolonged Do Nows or mini-lessons that left little time for guided/independent practice, or that were teacher centered with students spending much time listening or waiting to engage in the learning.
- Based on debriefs with the school's instructional leaders after classroom visits, all classrooms had instruction that aligned with school's mission or priorities, either fully or with various executional improvements. School leaders did note that two classrooms had very weak execution and that additional support from coaches and administration were needed.
- Assessment System
 - The school uses a variety of assessments, including Terra Nova, Scantron, assessments associated with particular programs (Orton-Gillingham, Achieve 3000), quarterly writing on demand assessments. The primary measures for monitoring learning by the school are teacher-created assessments.
 - Collaboration among grade and subject teams, peer and supervisory observations, and the support of the coaches are the means the school uses to ensure consistency and quality across teacher created assessments.
 - The school has struggled to find appropriate standardized assessments to use, replacing NWEA MAP with Scantron in the spring of 2012 and discontinuing ALEKS and looking at Ixcel to take its place for math assessment support. As a result, other than state assessments there are no external standardized measures providing longitudinal data
 - A document review of student writing portfolios showed improved writing year to year but also inconsistent use of writing rubrics, feedback and student reflection.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE Representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with nine teachers on the instructional staff.

- All interviewed teachers reported that they felt strongly supported by administration and their peers, that professional development and coaching were very helpful, and were proud to work at a school with such caring, hard-working adults all focused on what's best for students.
- All interviewed teachers talked consistently about what instructional data was used to support instructional planning and spoke to the purposeful inclusion of ELA Common Core elements in all content areas.
- All interviewed teachers felt supported by parents and that they were involved and positively responsive to teachers in matters concerning the academic and behavioral performance of their children.

In addition, NYC DOE visitors noted the following:

- Virtually all classrooms observed during the visit were safe, orderly, and conducive to learning. One observed instance of a student conflict resulted in a student abruptly leaving the class without permission. One of the two teachers went after him and the student returned to class and the group he had been working with without incident. One observed instance of a student in group work passively resisting participation also included students working to engage their reluctant partner and while his non-compliance went unnoticed at first by the classroom teachers, when it was noticed and addressed the student dropped his resistance and participated.
- Observed transitions were safe and orderly, and adult-student and student-student interactions were consistently respectful.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has established a developed governance structure and organizational design. On October 11, 2013, as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE interviewed the school's board of trustees. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has twelve active members. The Board has not experienced any attrition throughout its charter term, and consequently has kept membership within the minimum of five members and maximum of fifteen members established in its bylaws.¹⁰
- All of the Board's officer positions are currently filled.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes and reported on its Renewal Data collection Sheet.¹¹
- 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 evaluates the school's President, Ken Byalin, and the President evaluates the Co-Principals and the school's operational and development leaders. The Co-Principals evaluate instructional staff.
- The Board has active and functioning committees, as required by its bylaws, including an Executive Committee, a Finance and Audit Committee, a Governance and Nominating Committee, and an Education and Accountability Committee, as recorded in meeting minutes. The Board has also added a Development Task Force and a Research Task Force.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- The school has maintained consistency in its leadership team even as the team expanded. Lavelle Prep's current President, Ken Byalin, is the founding President.
 - The founding school instructional leader, Evelyn Finn, served as Principal until school year 2012-2013 and currently serves as one of the school's Co-Principals.
 - The school's second Co-Principal, Howard Lucks, joined the staff in 2011-2012 as the school expanded to high school grades.
 - Founding teacher Chris Zilinski was promoted to Assistant Principal in 2013-2014.
- While the school has in each year met its charter goal of retaining 80% of its students enrolled at the end one school year to the beginning of the next year, it has also experienced some significant attrition during the school year which, combined with end of year attrition, resulting in a seventh grade cohort of 72 students in 2010-11 becoming an eighth grade cohort of 45 students. This level of attrition has not repeated itself in 2012-2013 or 2013-2014, school leadership reported, as a result of clarified expectations, improved communication with parents, and school efforts to engage students.
- To date, the school has met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 75%.¹²

Average Daily Attendance	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
	93%	93%	94%	95%

¹⁰ Self-reported information from the Data Collection Form submitted with the Renewal Application in October 2013.

¹¹ Self-reported information from the Data Collection Form submitted with the Renewal Application in October 2013.

¹² Self-reported information from the Data Collection Form submitted with the Renewal Application in October 2013.

- Lavelle Prep has experienced staff turnover rates consistently below 20% throughout its charter term. Its highest degree of instructional turnover (11%) occurred during its first year of operation. This number reached 10% in 2012-2013. The school has experienced slightly more non-instructional staff turnover, with this number reaching its highest point (17%) in 2012-2013.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments on the Lavelle Prep's renewal. Approximately twenty-nine community members attended the hearing, with eighteen offering public comment. All speakers spoke in favor of the school's renewal; no speakers spoke against.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by Lavelle Prep for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 90% provided positive feedback, 5% provided neutral feedback, and 5% provided negative feedback regarding the school.
- Over the course of the charter term, the school's NYC School Survey results and response rates were:

John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School NYC DOE School Survey Results

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

John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

	Parents	Citywide	Teachers	Citywide	Students	Citywide
2009-2010	74%	49%	100%	76%	91%	82%
2010-2011	94%	52%	100%	82%	100%	83%
2011-2012	92%	53%	100%	82%	99%	82%
2012-2013	67%	54%	97%	83%	99%	83%

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

- The school partners with the Wagner College School of Nursing and St. Paul's School of Nursing to provide weekly guest educators for its Wellness curriculum.
- Lavelle Prep adopted an automated weekly call service in 2012-2013 to better communicate with parents. This supplements regular email and postal mail communications from the school as well as the school's Daily Planner system, which maps out student homework and required parent signoff.
- The school has an active Parent Teacher Association that meets monthly to set up committees in advance of school events, plan fundraising activities, and to determine issues to bring to the Board of Trustees. It should be noted that during the first part of the charter term, a group of twelve parents challenged school leadership on its implementation of the program described in its original charter, questioning communication, student management, and the absence of a mental health clinic. The school worked to clarify its student management procedures, improve its communication and revise its charter.
- Twelve students in grades six through nine were interviewed in four groups during the renewal visit (October 9 and 10, 2013).

- Students provided mixed reports on the rigor and difficulty of the academic work, though most reported liking the school's academic focus and the amount of help they received from teachers, especially in comparison to prior school experiences.
- Several students spoke about how much teachers care for them and for their academic future, and how teachers had high academic expectations for them.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the Fiscal Year (FY)2013 financial audit and a follow up review of FY2014 first quarter financials, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY2013 financial audit and a follow up review of FY2014 first quarter financials, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover between one and two months of operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-2014 budget to the actual enrollment as of October 31, 2013 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

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

- Based on the financial audits from FY2011 to FY2013, the school operated at an overall 3% deficit, however they had a 20% surplus in FY2011, prior to moving into a private facility and operated at a deficit in the two following fiscal years. The school is projected to end FY2014 with a 4% surplus.
- Based on the FY2013 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total liabilities than it had total assets however, based on the school's FY14 budget, the school is projected to have more total assets than total liabilities by the end of FY14.
- Based on the financial audits from FY2011 through FY2013, the school generated overall negative cash flow from FY2011 to FY2013, however the school had positive cash flow from FY2012 to FY2013 and is projected to end FY2014 with a positive cash flow.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits for FY2013, FY2012 and FY2011, however, the school received a note in the FY2012 audit about liquidity and "going concern" issues as described below.

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

- The school's Board of Directors Finance committee closely monitors the school's finances and receives monthly updates on cash flow, budget versus actuals and student enrollment.
- The school has a fundraising arm that is raising funds for special programmatic needs. The school does not include projected fundraising revenue in its operating budget.
- The FY2012 independent audit noted liquidity and "going concerns" because the school was in a vulnerable financial situation at the end of FY2012. The school took some of the following measures to mitigate the situation:
 - The school opted out of taking an additional 24 thousand square feet of available space to reduce future expenses.
 - The school reduced paraprofessional staffing hours, salary, and benefits, in a manner that reduced expenses but allowed the school to remain in compliance with meeting the obligations of SwDs in core subjects. The school reinstated the hours of all paraprofessional staff for this current school year.
 - The school changed its lottery preferences for the 2013-2014 in order to reserve 40% of seats for SwDs, which would ensure the school would meet their SwD enrollment target and revenue projections. A review of the school's first quarter monthly finances indicates that the school is meeting its target enrollment for SwD.

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

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

The Board is in compliance with:

- Membership size. The Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws.
- Submission of required documents. All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms and do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.¹³
- Availability of minutes and agendas. The Board has made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting them to the school's website.
- Timely submission of accountability document. The Board has provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the DOE.

The Board is out of compliance with:

- Required number of Board meetings. The school's bylaws indicate that the Board hold monthly meetings. In years two and four of the charter term, the Board did not hold the required number of monthly meetings, as evidenced by the Data Collection Sheet submitted with the school's renewal application.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of required documents. The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements and submission of its school safety plan.
- Fingerprint clearance. Over the charter term, all staff have the required fingerprint clearance.
- Certification of instructional staff. Instructional staff members are either state-certified or Highly Qualified under NCLB, and those that are not fall under the requirements outlined in the NY Charter Schools Act. A school can have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower.
- Insurance requirements. The school has submitted all appropriate insurance documents.

The school is out of compliance with:

- In 2010-2011, Lavelle Prep made a number of non-material charter revisions to reflect changes the school had implemented without prior DOE approval and during the period between its application approval and the second year of school operations. These included changes related to: assessments the school used for promotion; the school's behavioral management system; supplemental literacy and math programs; the school's science offering; the school's intake grades; the school's location; financial management responsibilities, reflecting the school's lack of ties to the Verrazano Foundation; the school's weekly instructional periods; the school's arts course sequence; length of school day; and instructional time extension.

¹³ Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

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

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

- The school plans to continue to grow to a complete its projected grade span of six through twelve by school year 2015-2016.
- The school also seeks to establish career readiness program partnerships with post-secondary educational organizations, although these relationships are still developing.
- The school has no immediate plans for replication or expansion.
- In its next term, Lavelle Prep will continue its efforts to develop its instructional and support staff to become leaders, providing improved professional development support to Teacher Assistants, and by continuing its partnerships with local teacher training programs at the College of Staten Island, Wagner College, St. John's University, and Touro College to strengthen its new teacher candidate pool.
- The school intends to extend two recent community partnership initiatives into the new term: The Lavelle Prep Community Performing Arts Space, providing access to an affordable venue for local performance arts groups, the Lavelle Prep Adopt-a-Class program to engage local community and business partners in the life of the school.
- In response to the 2010 amendments to the New York Charter Law requiring schools to attract and retain percentages of students who are designated as free and reduced lunch learners, students with disabilities, and English-language learners, is making demonstrated efforts to attract and retain these students.
 - The school has established outreach measures, such as creating translations of school materials into multiple languages, making available translators at school events, and advertising the school through various media outlets, in order to ensure compliance with the 2010 amendments.
 - The school's mission is to serve high percentages of students identified as needing special education services and Lavelle Prep's board and school leadership are well connected local agencies and service providers and leverage those connections to reach this audience of potential students.
 - The school's marketing and recruitment materials make clear that students with special needs are welcome, as well as those with from economically disadvantaged communities. They also describe the school's unique model with small class sizes and a co-teaching model in all core curriculum subjects.
 - In 2012, the school's charter was amended to establish a two-tiered lottery with 40% of available seats set aside for students with disabilities after the number and percent of non-special education applicants increased in the second and third year of the charter term.

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that is 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.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Statutory Basis for Renewal

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

- Improve student learning and achievement;
- Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system;
- Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.¹⁴

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.¹⁵

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.¹⁶ As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education (“NYC DOE”) institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act’s renewal standards:

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

Where the NYC DOE approves a renewal application, it is required under the Act to submit the application and a proposed charter to the Board of Regents for its review and approval.¹⁷

¹⁴ See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.

¹⁵ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

¹⁶ See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

¹⁷ § 2852(5)

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

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

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

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

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

Full-Term Renewal

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

Renewal with Conditions

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

Short-Term Renewal

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

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

Non-Renewal

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

The CSAS Accountability Framework

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

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

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

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

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

1c. Responsive Education Program

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

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

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

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

1d. Learning Environment

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

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

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

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

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

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

2a. Governance Structure and Organizational Design

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

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

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

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

2b. School Climate and Community Engagement

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

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

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

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

2c. Financial and Operational Health

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

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

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

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

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

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with their charter and agreement have:

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

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

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

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have:

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

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

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

3c. Applicable Regulations

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

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

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

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

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

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

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 (human resource policies for growing your own talent, for example, or fundraising or budget management to take care of anticipated capital needs and to mitigate risks for the unexpected, or board development to bring new talent or specific needs-based expertise to the school)

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

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

4c. School or Model Improvements

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

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

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

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

Appendix A: School Performance Data

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	32.3%	47.8%	47.3%	10.1%
CSD 31	47.6%	51.7%	53.5%	28.0%
Difference from CSD 31	-15.3	-3.9	-6.2	-17.9
NYC	40.1%	43.6%	45.3%	23.3%
Difference from NYC	-7.8	4.2	2.0	-13.2

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	40.9%	50.0%	42.6%	27.5%
CSD 31	59.6%	62.8%	65.7%	31.7%
Difference from CSD 31	-18.7	-12.8	-23.1	-4.2
NYC	53.0%	56.0%	59.3%	28.8%
Difference from NYC	-12.1	-6.0	-16.7	-1.3

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

% of Seventh Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	-	26.2%	39.8%	12.6%
CSD 31	46.6%	45.1%	52.6%	30.8%
Difference from CSD 31	-	-18.9	-12.8	-18.2
NYC	-	36.5%	43.3%	25.5%
Difference from NYC	-	-10.3	-3.5	-12.9

% of Seventh Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	-	60.3%	46.3%	13.7%
CSD 31	59.7%	65.1%	65.1%	28.9%
Difference from CSD 31	-	-4.8	-18.8	-15.2
NYC	-	55.5%	57.3%	25.0%
Difference from NYC	-	4.8	-11.0	-11.3

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

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	-	-	50.0%	18.6%
CSD 31	44.1%	41.5%	48.0%	32.5%
Difference from CSD 31	-	-	2.0	-13.9
NYC	-	-	39.0%	25.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	11.0	-6.8

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School	-	-	31.0%	15.9%
CSD 31	51.6%	57.6%	58.5%	29.0%
Difference from CSD 31	-	-	-27.5	-13.1
NYC	-	-	55.2%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-24.2	-9.8

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

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Progress Reports

[2012-2013 Academic Year](#)

[2011-2012 Academic Year](#)

[2010-2011 Academic Year](#)

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

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

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

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

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