



**KIPP AMP CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR
MARCH 2015**

Table of Contents

PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION	2
I. CHARTER SCHOOL OVERVIEW:	2
<i>Background Information</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Overview of School-Specific Data</i>	<i>3</i>
II. RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE	7
PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY.....	14
PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW	18
PART 4: FINDINGS	20
<i>Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? ...</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?.....</i>	<i>43</i>
PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS	44
PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK.....	47
APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA	59
APPENDIX B: HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA	61
APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA	67

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Background Information

KIPP AMP Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	David Massey
School Leader(s)	Emily Carroll (ES), Latasha Williams (MS), Natalie Webb (HS), Josh Zoia (KIPP NYC Superintendent)
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	KIPP NYC LLC
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School Districts 17 (Grades K-1, 5-8) and 7 (Grades 9-12)
Physical Address(es)	1224 Park Place, Brooklyn (Grades K-1, 5-8)
	201 East 144th Street, Bronx (Grades 9-12)
Facility Owner(s)	DOE (the high school site is a Charter Partnership building)
School Opened For Instruction	2005-2006
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	3/14/2015
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-12
Current Authorized Enrollment	949
Proposed New Charter Term	3.5 years [March 15, 2015 – June 30, 2018]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-12
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	949
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	Grades K-8: 2 – 4 sections per grade; Grades 9-12: N/A

Overview of School-Specific Data

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

Academic Goal Analysis						
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	Cumulative Charter Term Total
Total Achievable Goals	26	26	26	26	26	130
# Met	4	4	5	11	9	33
# Partially Met	0	1	2	0	1	4
# Not Met	7	7	5	8	11	35
# Not Applicable *	15	14	14	7	5	55
% Met	15%	15%	19%	42%	35%	25%
% Partially Met	0%	4%	8%	0%	4%	3%
% Not Met	27%	27%	19%	31%	42%	29%
% Not Applicable *	52%	54%	54%	27%	19%	42%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	36%	33%	42%	58%	43%	44%

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

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School	33.7%	28.8%	38.0%	14.1%	15.7%
CSD 17	31.3%	33.9%	36.8%	16.7%	18.6%
Difference from CSD 17 *	2.4	-5.1	1.2	-2.6	-2.9
NYC	40.5%	41.0%	45.0%	25.7%	27.4%
Difference from NYC *	-6.8	-12.2	-7.0	-11.6	-11.7
New York State **	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-19.5	-24.0	-17.1	-17.0	-14.9

% Proficient in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School	46.4%	62.6%	70.6%	15.0%	25.5%
CSD 17	40.5%	46.1%	50.4%	14.7%	17.5%
Difference from CSD 17 *	5.9	16.5	20.2	0.3	8.0
NYC	52.8%	56.7%	59.3%	27.3%	31.5%
Difference from NYC *	-6.4	5.9	11.3	-12.3	-6.0
New York State **	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-14.6	-0.7	5.8	-16.1	-10.7

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

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

Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School – All Students	55.0%	56.0%	68.0%	62.0%	61.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	14.4%	9.6%	82.6%	40.1%	44.7%
City Percent of Range- All Students	4.7%	5.2%	69.6%	41.2%	41.4%
KIPP AMP Charter School – School's Lowest Third	62.0%	66.5%	77.0%	75.5%	74.0%
Peer Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	8.5%	13.6%	78.7%	34.6%	43.7%
City Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	-5.1%	8.6%	66.2%	34.6%	40.4%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School – All Students	63.0%	80.0%	68.0%	60.0%	61.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	55.2%	86.3%	72.0%	37.4%	43.8%
City Percent of Range- All Students	49.5%	84.6%	71.4%	45.1%	49.2%
KIPP AMP Charter School – School's Lowest Third	60.5%	82.5%	75.0%	65.0%	76.0%
Peer Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	38.2%	85.8%	72.1%	21.3%	55.5%
City Percent of Range – School's Lowest Third	31.5%	84.8%	74.0%	20.2%	58.9%

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

Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	24.0%	45.0%	63.4%	66.7%	45.5%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	-	40.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	33.3%	37.0%	46.5%	51.6%	48.4%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	20.0%	56.4%	58.5%	45.2%	44.4%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	-	30.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	31.5%	59.4%	51.7%	48.1%	57.8%

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

KIPP AMP Charter School is one of four charter schools supported by the KIPP NYC LLC (KIPP NYC) Charter Management Organization (CMO) that share high school resources, staff and space at 201 East 144th Street, Bronx. The KIPP NYC CMO refers to this building, and the four schools sharing staff and resources within it, as KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School.¹ KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School is not a legal charter school, but rather the collection of the high school grades of four unique charter schools: KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP Infinity Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School and KIPP Academy Charter School. Three of these charter schools, including KIPP AMP Charter School, are authorized by the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Chancellor. Beginning in the 2010-2011 school year, the NYC DOE began grouping the high school grades of the four KIPP NYC CMO schools together for public reporting and accountability purposes, including the NYC School Survey, NYC DOE Progress Reports, and the 2013-2014 NYC School Quality Reports.

The high school graduation rates presented below reflect high school students from KIPP AMP Charter School only.

For high school performance data reflecting all students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School (i.e. high school students enrolled in all of the four KIPP NYC CMO schools serving high school students), including data on weighted Regents pass rates, credit accumulation, and closing the achievement gap metrics, please see Appendix B.

¹ The four KIPP NYC CMO schools whose high school grades together make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School are KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP Infinity Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School and KIPP Academy Charter School. KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School is not authorized by the NYC DOE Chancellor.

HS Performance Compared to NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013 ²	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School	-	-	-	86.4%	95.7%
NYC *	-	-	-	66.0%	68.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	20.4	27.3

* The New York State graduation rate calculation method was first adopted in NYC for the Cohort of 2001 (Class of 2005). The cohort consists of all students who first entered ninth grade in a given school year (e.g., the Cohort of 2005 entered ninth grade in the 2005-2006 school year). Graduates are defined as those students earning either a Local or Regents diploma and exclude those earning either a special education (IEP) diploma or GED.

² School year 2012-2013 was the first year in which KIPP AMP Charter School served twelfth grade students and, therefore, the first year in which the school had a graduating class.

II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 3.5 year short-term renewal with two academic conditions and one operational/compliance condition:

The academic performance conditions are as follows:

1. The school must demonstrate academic growth, as measured by the school's median adjusted growth percentile in ELA, for each year of the charter term. The median adjusted growth percentile in ELA for the school's students will be at or above the 50th percentile compared with:
 - (a) all other schools citywide of the same school type as determined by the NYC DOE in each year of the charter term;
 - (b) all other schools in the CSD of location of the same school type as determined by the NYC DOE in each year of the charter term; and
 - (c) the relevant peer group as determined by the NYC DOE in each year of the charter term.
2. The school must demonstrate academic growth, as measured by the school's median adjusted growth percentile in math, for each year of the charter term. The median adjusted growth percentile in math for the school's students will be at or above the 50th percentile compared with:
 - (a) all other schools citywide of the same school type as determined by the NYC DOE in each year of the charter term;
 - (b) all other schools in the CSD of location of the same school type as determined by the NYC DOE in each year of the charter term; and
 - (c) the relevant peer group as determined by the NYC DOE in each year of the charter term.

The operational/compliance condition is as follows:

1. As part of its oversight of KIPP AMP Charter School in its next term, the NYC DOE will require the school to report twice per school year on the results of its planned corrective actions to address the high rate of uncertified teachers employed by the school. This report should show that the school has made significant progress in reducing the number of uncertified teachers in order to be in compliance with the Charter Schools Act, which prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools, by the end of the next charter term.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, KIPP AMP Charter School has partially demonstrated academic success.

New York Charter Schools Act

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

§ 2850 (2)

- (a) Improve student learning and achievement;
- (b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- (c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- (d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- (e) Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system; and

(f) Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems by holding the schools established under this article accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

Data available for KIPP AMP Charter School indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting some of these objectives.

Mission and Vision

The mission of KIPP AMP Charter School (KIPP AMP) is to help students develop the academic and character skills necessary to achieve success in high school and college, be self-sufficient in the competitive world beyond and build a better tomorrow for themselves and us all. The school executes against this mission by providing a results-focused instructional program that emphasizes both academic achievement and character building. KIPP AMP students benefit from a continuum of services throughout their education, including KIPP Through College, a program designed to ensure that all KIPP AMP middle school graduates, including those who do not attend KIPP AMP's high school, attend and graduate from college.

School Specific Academic Performance

The school entered its tenth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The New York City Department of Education has five years of New York State (NYS) assessment data and five years of other academic indicator(s) to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at KIPP AMP Charter School over the course of the retrospective charter term.

Annual aggregate English Language Arts (ELA) and math proficiency rates on NYS assessments for KIPP AMP Charter School's middle school students have generally fallen below those of New York City during the current charter term.³ Aggregate math proficiency rates consistently exceeded those of Community School District (CSD) 17, though aggregate ELA proficiency rates for the school only exceeded those of CSD 17 in two of the five years of the retrospective charter term.

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

In 2012-2013, 15.0% of KIPP AMP Charter School's students were proficient in math on the NYS assessments. KIPP AMP Charter School's math proficiency was greater than 54% of all middle schools citywide but 71% of middle schools in CSD 17. However, when compared to middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools) KIPP AMP Charter School outperformed just 41% of similar schools. In 2012-2013, 14.1% of KIPP AMP Charter School's students demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA. With this level of proficiency, KIPP AMP Charter School outperformed 54% of all middle schools citywide but 71% of middle schools in CSD 17. KIPP AMP Charter School outperformed 54% of its peer schools.⁴

The following year, in 2013-2014, the percent of students at KIPP AMP Charter School who were proficient in math on NYS assessments rose to 25.5%. KIPP AMP Charter School's math proficiency was higher than 59% of all middle schools citywide. When compared to peer schools, KIPP AMP Charter School outperformed 58% of similar schools but outperformed 82% of CSD 17 middle schools. In 2013-2014, the percent of students at KIPP AMP Charter School who demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA also rose, to 15.7%. With this level of proficiency, KIPP AMP Charter School outperformed 54% of all middle schools citywide, 58% of middle schools in its peer group, and 59% of middle schools in CSD 17.

³ The only exceptions are for math proficiency in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, in which KIPP AMP Charter School's aggregate math proficiency exceeded the overall NYC proficiency for the comparable grade span.

⁴ Please note that while KIPP AMP Charter School began serving elementary school students in 2013-2014, the school was classified as a middle school for the 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report and the 2013-2014 School Quality Reports.

In 2013-2014, KIPP AMP Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile on NYS assessments was 61.0% with a City Percent of Range of 41.4%, placing the school in the 29th percentile of all middle schools citywide.⁵ Similarly, the school's peer and CSD percentiles were 43% and 35%, respectively. This means that over 50% of all other middle schools in KIPP AMP Charter School's peer group and over 60% of other middle schools in CSD 17 had an ELA median adjusted growth percentile greater than KIPP AMP Charter School's median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

In 2013-2014, KIPP AMP Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile on NYS assessments was 61.0% with a City Percent of Range of 49.2%, placing it in the 46th percentile of all middle schools citywide. The school's peer group and CSD percentiles were 35% and 76%, respectively. This means that over 60% of all other middle schools in KIPP AMP Charter School's peer group and just over 20% of other middle schools in CSD 17 had math median adjusted growth percentiles greater than KIPP AMP Charter School's median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

As noted above, KIPP AMP Charter School is one of four KIPP NYC CMO charter schools that share high school resources, staff and space. The high school grades of these schools are collectively known as KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. For more information on the aggregate academic performance of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, which is not a legal or stand-alone chartered entity, please see Appendix B. The high school graduation rate and Regents pass rate information presented below reflects high school students from only KIPP AMP Charter School.

For the 2013-2014 school year, KIPP AMP Charter School's four-year graduation rate was 95.7%. This rate was higher than the citywide average by 27.3 percentage points.

Over the five years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, KIPP AMP Charter School has met 44% of its applicable academic charter goals.^{6,7} KIPP AMP Charter School met nine of 21 applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year. Because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's academic performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, due to a change in state regulation the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two; further, due to the elimination of the accountability instrument, the DOE will not evaluate goals related to NYC DOE Progress Report grades beginning with the 2013-2014 school year. The school has generally demonstrated a stable trend of achievement of its stated charter goals over the five years of the charter term under review, though the school's success rate did fall over the last two years.

⁵ A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A percentile rank provides the percentage of schools that score lower than the school under consideration. A City Percent of Range of 41.4% indicates that the school's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was below the average but less than one standard deviation below the average (that only 41.4% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of KIPP AMP Charter School), while a citywide percentile of 29% indicates that KIPP AMP Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 29% of all middle schools citywide.

⁶ This calculation does not include goals which have not been evaluated (not applicable) either as a result of the goal no longer being measurable (e.g. NYC DOE Progress Report grades for 2013-2014 school year forward) or the goal not yet measurable for the school at the time of the annual reporting (e.g. high school graduation rate for an academic year in which the school was not serving grade twelve students).

⁷ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Middle School Progress Report, KIPP AMP Charter School received a C grade in all sections except School Environment, for which the school received a B grade. This ranked KIPP AMP Charter School in the 20th percentile of all middle schools citywide and represented a marked deterioration in overall performance from the prior two years. On its 2011-2012 NYC DOE Middle School Progress Report, KIPP AMP Charter School received an A grade in all sections except School Environment, for which the school received a B grade. This ranked KIPP AMP Charter School in the 88th percentile of all middle schools citywide. As its Overall Grade, the school earned a C and B in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, respectively.⁸

As previously noted, KIPP AMP Charter School is one of four KIPP NYC charter schools, only three of which are authorized by the NYC DOE Chancellor, that feed into KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. KIPP AMP Charter School did not receive a high school Progress Report for the 2012-2013 school year that reflected performance, progress and environment for the high school students specifically registered to KIPP AMP Charter School. However, a Progress Report was produced for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School based on the high school performance data of students enrolled at all four KIPP NYC charter schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. For more information on the Progress Report for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, please see Appendix B.

NYC DOE Progress Reports graded each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and were based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores were based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of 40 schools with similar student populations and to all schools citywide. The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report was the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constituted 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section was primarily based on median adjusted growth percentiles,⁹ which measure students' growth on state tests relative to other students with the same prior-year score. Although the NYC DOE Progress Report was discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, individual academic performance metrics from the former NYC DOE Progress Report are included in this renewal report for all years for which data was available in the current charter term.

Closing the Achievement Gap

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

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 57.8% of KIPP AMP Charter School's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places KIPP AMP Charter School in the 75th percentile of all middle schools citywide. In the same year, 48.4% of KIPP AMP Charter School's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this places KIPP AMP Charter School in the 42nd percentile of all middle schools citywide.

⁸ For purposes of the NYC DOE Progress Report, KIPP AMP Charter School was classified as a middle school for the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years.

⁹ A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the NYC DOE uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect average differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The NYC DOE evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 44.4% of KIPP AMP Charter School's students with disabilities experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places KIPP AMP Charter School in the 37th percentile of all middle schools citywide. In the same year, 45.5% of the school's students with disabilities experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this places KIPP AMP Charter School in the 22nd percentile of all middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 30.0% of KIPP AMP Charter School's English Language Learner students experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other English Language Learner students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places KIPP AMP Charter School in 24th percentile of all middle schools citywide. Similarly, only 40.0% of the school's English Language Learner students experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other English Language Learner students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; however this places KIPP AMP Charter School in the 52nd percentile of all middle schools citywide.

Please see Appendix B for high school closing the achievement gap data, which reflects high school students from all KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, not simply those enrolled at KIPP AMP Charter School.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

KIPP AMP Charter School is an operationally sound and fiscally viable organization. This assessment was made based on a review of the following indicators of operational and fiscal viability:

- KIPP AMP Charter School's FY11 mid-year, FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- KIPP AMP Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- KIPP AMP Charter School's 2014-2015 student/family handbook;
- On-site review of KIPP AMP Charter School's financial and operational records;
- KIPP AMP Charter School's FY15 budget and five-year projected budget;
- KIPP AMP Charter School's Board of Trustees financial disclosure forms;
- KIPP AMP Charter School's Board of Trustees minutes;
- KIPP AMP Charter School's Board of Trustees by-laws; and
- KIPP AMP Charter School's self-reported staffing data.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a partially developed governance structure and organizational design. Board Chair David Massey has been on the Board since January 2005. The Board's level of membership has stayed consistently within the minimum of five members and maximum of 25 members established in the Board's bylaws. The Board currently has six members.

The Board's Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, and Superintendent positions, as specified in the bylaws, are currently filled. However, the current bylaws also specify Principal positions, which appear to be vacant; these have been removed as officer positions in practice and, as of the writing of this report, the Board is revising its bylaws to reflect this change.

During the course of the retrospective charter term, the Board's bylaws did not require a specified number of regular Board meetings. In the first three of the past four completed academic years, the Board held four meetings which met quorum during the academic year, including its annual meeting. In the last completed academic year (2013-2014), the NYC DOE reviewed minutes for two Board meetings which met quorum during the academic year, including its annual meeting;

the Board was scheduled to hold two more meetings as recorded on the Board meeting calendar. The KIPP AMP Charter School Board holds its meeting concurrently with the meetings of the other four KIPP NYC affiliated charter schools and the KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School advisory Board.

Updates on the school's academic, financial, and operational progress are regularly provided not by the school's leadership team but by members of the KIPP NYC network. The KIPP NYC Superintendent regularly updates the Board on academic progress at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes, and regular operational and financial updates are provided by the KIPP NYC operations and finance staff.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture. The school experienced significant turnover in its middle school leadership staff, with three different leaders occupying the principal role over the course of the charter term. Additionally, primary instructional staff turnover has been consistently high over the charter term, though it has declined over the last year. In 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014, the percentage of primary instructional staff who did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year was 30%, 24%, 29% and 17%, respectively.¹⁰

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations. Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's current ratio of 6.24 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities. Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash of \$2,108,080, representing 85 days of operating expenses, which allows for at least two months of operation without an infusion of cash.

A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of November 30, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue. As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

There were no material weaknesses noted in the past three independent financial audits from FY12 to FY14; however, there was a significant deficiency noted for the mid-year FY11 financial audit. The deficiency noted in the audited financials pertained to untimely account reconciliations and adjustments.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, KIPP AMP Charter School has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations but not others.

Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range of five to 25 members outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, and currently has a full Board roster with six members.

The school's bylaws specify one required annual meeting but do not specify a required number of regular meetings. In school years 2010-2011 through 2012-2013 of the charter term, the Board held one annual meeting each year and also held the following number of regular meetings, as evidenced by the Board Yearly Meeting Schedule and collected meeting minutes: four in 2010-2011; four in 2011-2012, four in 2012-2013 and two in 2013-2014 for which minutes were reviewed.¹¹ Meetings are those which met quorum. Beginning with the 2014-2015 academic year, the Board has not held the number of board meetings required by the Charter Schools Act. The Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months per year. The Board has not updated its bylaws to comply with this requirement.

¹⁰ Self-reported information from the school's Renewal Data Collection Form, submitted in November 2014

¹¹ The NYC DOE did not collect Board minutes for the full 2013-2014 school year; however, four meetings were scheduled for this year as shown on the Board meeting calendar.

All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms, and these documents do not demonstrate conflicts of interest. The board has consistently submitted board resignation notices or new board member credentials within the required five days of change to the Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) for review and, if necessary, approval.

Although the Board has not consistently made all Board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting on the school's website, it does consistently post its most recent Board minutes and agenda to the school's website. Similarly, although the school has not posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law, it has posted the audit pertaining to FY13.

The Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term.

All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance. The school has submitted the required safety plan and has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification. The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization. The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.

The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is not compliant with state requirements for teacher certification. The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools. The school has 23 uncertified staff members. The school's plan to address this area of non-compliance is outlined on page 39.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

As part of its next charter term the school plans to:

- Continue phase-in of previously authorized elementary grades such that the school will serve students in grades kindergarten through twelve at full scale.

Part 2: School Overview and History

KIPP AMP Charter School is an elementary/middle/high school serving 846 students¹² in grades kindergarten, one, and five through twelve during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2005-2006 school year with grade five and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's authorized full grade span is grades kindergarten through twelve, which it is not expected to reach during the current charter term, which expires on March 14, 2015.¹³ The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in two NYC DOE¹⁴ owned buildings; though as a Charter Partnership building, the school's high school site is operated by the charter entity. The school serves its elementary and middle school grades in Community School District 17 in Brooklyn and its high school grades in Community School District 7 in the Bronx. The school's elementary and middle school grades are co-located with The School of Integrated Learning and the Middle School for Academic and Social Excellence.¹⁵ The school's high school grades are co-located with the high school grades of KIPP Infinity Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School and KIPP Academy Charter School; together the high school grades of these four KIPP NYC schools form KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School.¹⁶

KIPP AMP Charter School is an elementary, middle, and high school located in the Crown Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn (elementary and middle grades) and in the Bronx (high school grades). The school sets out to provide a results-focused instructional program that emphasizes both academic achievement and character building. KIPP AMP students benefit from a continuum of services throughout their education, including KIPP Through College, a program designed to ensure that all KIPP AMP middle school graduates, including those who do not attend KIPP AMP's high school, attend and graduate from college.

KIPP AMP Charter School is supported by KIPP NYC LLC (KIPP NYC), a service provider with a separate non-profit Board (for purposes of this report herein characterized as a Charter Management Organization) that supports four other KIPP charter schools throughout New York City. KIPP NYC's Shared Services Team provides services to KIPP AMP in the areas of leadership development, professional development, human resources, data management, operations, facilities management, fundraising, payroll, finance and purchasing, as well as staff and teacher recruitment. KIPP AMP pays a fee for these services equal to 11% of net state and federal government revenue received by the school to KIPP NYC LLC.

KIPP AMP Charter School's Board of Trustees is led by chair David Massey, who has been on the Board since January 2005. The school leadership team includes: Emily Carroll, Elementary School Principal, who has held this position since the launch of the school's elementary grades in September 2013; Latasha Williams, Middle School Principal, who has held this position since February 2015; and Natalie Webb, High School Principal, who has held this position since July 2009. The school is also overseen by KIPP NYC Superintendent Josh Zoia, who joined KIPP NYC in 2011 and has held this position since July 2012. Mr. Zoia will end his tenure in this position in June 2015. Starting in July 2015, Jim Manly will assume the position of KIPP NYC Superintendent.

The school typically enrolls new students in all grades, though kindergarten and grade five are considered the primary entry grades. There were 937 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery. The school does not enroll new students mid-year.¹⁷

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

¹² ATS data as of October 31, 2014

¹³ NYC DOE internal data

¹⁴ NYC DOE internal data

¹⁵ NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System

¹⁶ Please note that KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School is not a legal charter school entity nor is it separately chartered.

¹⁷ Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

Enrollment

Grade-Level Annual Enrollment *	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Kindergarten	-	-	-	-	104
Grade 1	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 2	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 3	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 4	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 5	86	89	91	87	88
Grade 6	77	81	87	87	95
Grade 7	59	59	73	93	85
Grade 8	53	57	49	57	79
Grade 9	24	32	26	26	32
Grade 10	-	22	28	28	29
Grade 11	-	-	19	21	21
Grade 12	-	-	-	20	21
Total Enrollment	299	340	373	419	554

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

Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	4	26
Grade 1	-	-
Grade 2	-	-
Grade 3	-	-
Grade 4	-	-
Grade 5	3	29
Grade 6	3	32
Grade 7	3	28
Grade 8	3	26
Grade 9	**	**
Grade 10	**	**
Grade 11	**	**
Grade 12	**	**
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	215	

* Lottery information is based on self-reported data from the 2013-2014 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. Section counts are based on self-reported information collected as part of the school's Renewal Application. Average Class Sizes for grades kindergarten and five through eight were determined by dividing ATS enrollment as of October 31, 2013 by the appropriate grade-level section count.

** Section counts and average class sizes for grades nine through twelve are not reported in the table above because the section counts and average class size data available includes all students enrolled at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, not simply those students enrolled in KIPP AMP Charter School.

Please see additional demographic data in Section 4 of this report for information regarding the enrollment of special populations at KIPP AMP Charter School. This information includes enrollment data for the percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners and students with disabilities as compared to the CSD and citywide averages, as well as targets recently finalized by the New York State Education Department.¹⁸

¹⁸ Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, Board of Regents authorized charter schools, including those authorized by NYC DOE, will be held accountable to enrollment targets established by NYSED for students with disabilities, English Language Learner students, and students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch. Please note that the recently finalized targets are currently based on enrollment in the 2010-2011 school year and may be updated in the future.

Part 3: Renewal Report Overview

Renewal Report

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

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

Is the school an academic success?

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

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

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

Is the school a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization, OSDCP focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the National Association of Charter School Authorizer's Core Performance Framework.¹⁹

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

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

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

¹⁹ Please refer to the following website for more information:

http://nacsa.mycrowdwisdom.com/diweb/catalog/item/id/126547/q/%20q=performance*20framework&c=82

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

As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with relevant laws and regulations as identified in the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework.

Staff Representatives

The following experts participated in the review of this school, including the renewal visit to the elementary and middle school campus on December 10 and 11, 2014, a renewal visit to the high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014, and subsequent meetings with members of the KIPP AMP Charter School Board and KIPP NYC CMO leadership team:

- DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Gabrielle Mosquera, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Caitlin Robisch, Director of Analytics, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Paul Yen, Data Analyst, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Lynnette Aqueron, Education Administrator and Senior School Improvement Specialist, NYC DOE Office of Special Education
- Arthur Sadoff, Independent Consultant

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal KIPP AMP Charter School has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has five years of academic performance data and five years of NYS assessment data at the time of this report. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments as well as other academic indicators, please see Appendices A and B.

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

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School	33.7%	28.8%	38.0%	14.1%	15.7%
CSD 17	31.3%	33.9%	36.8%	16.7%	18.6%
Difference from CSD 17 *	2.4	-5.1	1.2	-2.6	-2.9
NYC	40.5%	41.0%	45.0%	25.7%	27.4%
Difference from NYC *	-6.8	-12.2	-7.0	-11.6	-11.7
New York State **	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-19.5	-24.0	-17.1	-17.0	-14.9

% Proficient in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School	46.4%	62.6%	70.6%	15.0%	25.5%
CSD 17	40.5%	46.1%	50.4%	14.7%	17.5%
Difference from CSD 17 *	5.9	16.5	20.2	0.3	8.0
NYC	52.8%	56.7%	59.3%	27.3%	31.5%
Difference from NYC *	-6.4	5.9	11.3	-12.3	-6.0
New York State **	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-14.6	-0.7	5.8	-16.1	-10.7

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

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

Performance on the NYC Progress Report²⁰

Middle School Progress Report Grades	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Overall Grade	C	B	A	C	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	D	B	A	C	
Student Performance	C	B	A	C	
School Environment	A	B	B	B	

HS Performance Compared to NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013 ²¹	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School	-	-	-	86.4%	95.7%
NYC *	-	-	-	66.0%	68.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	20.4	27.3

* The New York State graduation rate calculation method was first adopted in NYC for the Cohort of 2001 (Class of 2005). The cohort consists of all students who first entered ninth grade in a given school year (e.g., the Cohort of 2005 entered ninth grade in the 2005-2006 school year). Graduates are defined as those students earning either a Local or Regents diploma and exclude those earning either a special education (IEP) diploma or GED.

Mission and Academic Goals

According to the Renewal Application submitted to the NYC DOE by KIPP AMP Charter School, as well as annual reports submitted to the New York State Education Department, over each of the five years in the retrospective charter term, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- 4 of 11 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 4 of 12 in the second year,
- 5 of 12 in the third year,
- 11 of 19 in the fourth year,²² and
- 9 of 21 in the fifth year.

²⁰ For purposes of the NYC DOE Progress Report, KIPP AMP Charter School was classified as a middle school for the 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 school years.

²¹ School year 2012-2013 was the first year in which KIPP AMP Charter School served twelfth grade students and, therefore, the first year in which the school had a graduating class.

²² It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that refer to comparative academic performance of the school (e.g. to the Community School District) were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals *

Academic Goals	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1. Each year, 75% of third through eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A	Not Met
2. Each year, 75% of third through eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State math examination.	Not Met	Not Met	Partially Met	N/A	Not Met
3. Each year, 75% of fourth and eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination. ²³	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
4. Each year, 75% of fifth through eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. Each year, each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam (baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam.	Not Met	Not Met	Partially Met	N/A	Not Met
6. Each year, each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State math exam (baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State math exam.	Not Met	Met	Met	N/A	Partially Met
7. Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by the NYC DOE.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met

²³ KIPP AMP Charter School did not administer the NYS Science examination to its eighth grade students in any year of the retrospective charter term. In lieu of the NYS Science Examination, eighth grade students at KIPP AMP Charter School took the NYS Earth Science Regents exam. Since this change was made without proper notification to the DOE, the progress for this goal is considered as Not Met.

Academic Goals		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
8.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State math exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by the NYC DOE.	Met	Met	Met	Not Met	Met
9.	Each year, the school will earn a score sufficient to place it in the 75th percentile of all schools on the NYC DOE Progress Report.	Not Met	Not Met	Met	Not Met	N/A
10.	Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing an English Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools as determined by the NYC DOE Progress Report peer schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	N/A
11.	Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing a Math Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools as determined by the NYC DOE Progress Report peer schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	N/A
12.	Each year, 80% of students enrolled in grades nine through twelve will accumulate 10 or more credits towards graduation.	Met	Partially Met	Met	Met	Met
13.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York Regents examination in ELA (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade 9 on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
14.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York Regents examination in math (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade 9 on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
15.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York Regents examination in science - Living Environment, Chemistry, or other (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade 9 on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	Met

Academic Goals		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
16.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York Regents examination in History - Global Studies or US History (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade 9 on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
17.	Each year, the average performance of students in the tenth grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT tests in Critical Reading and Mathematics. It is expected that the participation rate for this test will be 75% or greater.	N/A	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
18.	Each year, the average performance of students in the twelfth grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics. It is expected that the participation rate for this test will be 75% or greater.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met	Not Met
19.	Each year, 90% of students in the Graduation Cohort will complete the school's college placement program that will consist of passing 3 of the following courses in grades nine through twelve, respectively: Speech and Composition; Math and Verbal Reasoning; College Readiness; and Senior Research Institute College Counseling. (The program changed from 4 to 3 courses.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met	Not Met
20.	Each year, 70% of students in the Graduation Cohort will successfully pass a high school AP exam.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met	Not Met
21.	Each year, 85% of students in the Graduation Cohort will gain admission into a two and/or four year college.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
22.	Each year, 70% of students in the Graduation Cohort will enroll in a two and/or four year college.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
23.	Each year, 80% of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fourth year in the cohort.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met	Met
24.	Each year, 95% of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fifth year in the cohort.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met
25.	Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Report Card. ²⁴	Met	Met	Met	Met	N/A
26.	Each year, the school will have an average daily student attendance rate of at least 95%.	Met	Met	Not Met	Met	Not Met

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

²⁴ Goals that reference a school's status on the 2013-2014 NYSED Report Cards are not reported on because the 2013-2014 Report Cards have not yet been released.

Responsive Education Program

- School leadership reports that as of 2013-2014, the school administers the Northwest Evaluation Association Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) assessment three times per year (fall, winter, and spring) in grades kindergarten through eight.
 - Data from the spring administration of this assessment is used to inform two growth goals for the following academic year: a “typical growth” goal indicative of a year’s worth of progress and a “tiered growth” goal, a multiple of the typical growth goal that correlates to the performance level necessary for students to continue toward college readiness upon graduating from grade eight.
 - School leadership reports that its cohort growth in math and reading, as measured by NWEA MAP data, shows slow but consistent progress at the middle school level, as shown by the school-submitted data below.²⁵

Math NWEA MAP Cohort Growth Percentage of Students Scoring Above the 50th Percentile			
Cohort	Current Grade	Initial Test (Fall of Fifth Grade)	Spring 2014
Class of 2025	6 th Grade	36%	41%
Class of 2024	7 th Grade	28%	44%
Class of 2023	8 th Grade	38%*	53%
Class of 2022	9 th Grade	11%	50%

Reading NWEA MAP Cohort Growth Percentage of Students Scoring Above the 50th Percentile			
Cohort	Current Grade	Initial Test (Fall of Fifth Grade)	Spring 2014
Class of 2025	6 th Grade	41%	49%
Class of 2024	7 th Grade	51%	54%
Class of 2023	8 th Grade	50%*	57%
Class of 2022	9 th Grade	40%	55%

*Fall fifth grade data unavailable; spring fifth grade data used in place.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE conducted a renewal visit to the elementary and middle school campus on December 10 and 11, 2014 and to the high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**
 - School leadership reported that since winter 2013, its elementary grades have used the Common Core Learning Standards-aligned EngageNY math curriculum, delivered using the Cognitively Guided Instruction (CGI) instructional approach to best instill in students a conceptual understanding of math concepts. Elementary students receive a daily 70-minute math block divided between 40 minutes of EngageNY instruction and 30 minutes of CGI problem-solving.

²⁵ Source: NWEA MAP Data Files submitted by school on January 9, 2015

- The school has provided professional development to support teachers in this curricular shift, including sending teachers to observe successful Success Academy Charter School teachers deliver CGI lessons, as well as providing external consultants to provide training and coaching in conceptual math instruction.
- At the elementary school level, school leadership reported that its Common Core Learning Standards-aligned literacy platform is comprised of a station-based approach wherein students in small groups rotate between the following stations: guided reading, computer-based skills work, independent reading, whole-group instruction, and buddy reading. Students complete the rotations in small groups throughout the day. Students choose books according to their reading levels for self-reading and buddy reading. The elementary school literacy program also focuses on phonics instruction using Wilson's Foundations program.
 - Elementary students receive a daily total of 120 minutes of direct reading instruction, including 35 minutes of guided reading. Students also engage in a daily Writers Workshop for 35 to 40 minutes.
- At the middle school level, school leadership reports that in response to the challenges of Common Core Learning Standards and in tandem with a shift throughout the rest of the KIPP NYC region (based on research findings from the KIPP Foundation), the school has moved from using teacher-created math and ELA curricula specific to KIPP AMP to the Common Core Learning Standards-aligned curricula used across all KIPP NYC middle schools.
 - The middle school uses the Great Minds Eureka Math program, with students receiving nine hours of math instruction per week. The school reports that the Eureka Math curriculum provides scaffolded materials to help teachers deliver rigorous, differentiated lessons. School leadership reports that teachers are receiving professional development (PD) specifically focused around delivering these lessons using a more conceptually based approach.
 - The middle school also currently uses the scope and sequence and instructional objectives of the Great Minds' Wheatley curriculum maps for ELA instruction. As the KIPP Foundation is in the process of building out nationally standardized middle school lesson plans to align with these curriculum maps (with expected completion by the end of school year 2015-2016), the middle school currently continues to use lesson plans from the existing KIPP NYC ELA curriculum platform. Middle school students receive almost two hours of daily reading instruction in addition to receiving one hour of daily writing instruction as part of an integrated Humanities block.
 - Additionally, starting in school year 2013-2014, middle school students began taking the school's living environment course over both seventh and eighth grades in order to take the Living Environment Regents exam prior to entering high school. The school's intention is for students to enter high school with this core exam already completed in order to then increase their opportunities to earn an Advanced Regents Diploma through supplementary advanced science courses.
- At the high school level, school leadership reports that, while still providing students with a path toward a Regents or Advanced Regents diploma, the school's sequence of core courses and curricular supports has evolved substantially over the course of the charter term.
 - The school now offers 10 Advanced Placement (AP) courses across all five core content areas. In 2013-2014, the school created a pre-AP program to help prepare students for its AP world history and AP English language courses, and the school added an AP microeconomics course for school year 2014-2015.
 - Prior to school year 2013-2014, a team of KIPP NYC's math curriculum planners rewrote the school's integrated algebra curriculum and applied it to algebra instruction for the school's 2010 student cohort, one year before the state would require students to take the Common Core Learning Standards-aligned Algebra

Regents exam. Because the school believed that the algebra curriculum modules released by the state did not contain sufficient scaffolding of basic algebra skills or adequate differentiation supports at that time, its algebra team created materials that incorporated these elements. These included five lessons per week, including a workshop lesson, one individual quiz, one partner quiz, and one Review and Problem Solving assignment comprised of three to four open-ended problems aligned to Common Core Learning Standards assessments. These materials are differentiated for both the schools 15:1 and honors classes.

- The school's geometry team is in the process of shifting to Common Core Learning Standards-aligned curriculum during school year 2014-2015 following a similar process to that of the algebra team in school year 2013-2014.
 - The school has adopted a similar approach with respect to aligning its English curriculum to Common Core Learning Standards.
 - Prior to school year 2014-2015, a team of teachers revised the school's English curriculum after taking part in a year-long professional development course with Public Consulting Group. This course was intended to help the team increase teachers' capacity to implement rigorous instruction in close reading, vocabulary, argumentative writing, and inquiry-based research, and to help provide individualized just-in-time mentoring to faculty members around individually determined areas of need. The school is now implementing the aligned curriculum in grades nine through twelve.
 - The school's current tenth grade students will take the Common Core Learning Standards English Regents exam in June 2015.
 - The school has partnered with Microsoft to implement the company's Technology, Education and Literacy in Schools (TEALS) program as part of the school's first computer science program, piloting in school year 2014-2015. As part of this program, Microsoft recruits, trains, and places a technology professional into the school to serve as a volunteer part-time teacher in a co-teaching model with one of the school's computer science teachers for two years. At the end of this period, the school's computer science program will be operated using only internal resources and will include the addition of an AP computer science course in school year 2015-2016 and an elective web design and robotics course in school year 2016-2017.
- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**
 - School leadership reported that the school hired two additional learning specialists in school year 2014-2015, for a total of four learning specialists on staff. Learning specialists are divided into ELA and math content areas.
 - School leadership reports that as of 2014-2015 the middle school also has two math interventionists and two ELA interventionists who provide push-in and pull-out support to struggling students.
 - The school offers two Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) classes in kindergarten, three ICT classes in grade one, and two ICT classes in grades five and six.
 - At the time of the renewal visit, all of the special education teachers staffing the school's elementary school and middle school ICT classes were fully certified.
 - School leadership reported that the school's special education coordinator provides copies of Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) to all staff members who work with students who have disabilities.
 - Elementary and middle school students with IEPs were receiving push-in and pull-out special education teacher support services.
 - The school has speech and language pathologists on staff to work with all students in need of speech and language therapy services; the elementary and middle schools share one speech pathologist and the high school has its own speech and language therapist.

The school also uses outside agencies to provide students with the following related services on-site as mandated by their IEPs: occupational therapy, physical therapy, and speech therapy. The school provides mandated counseling through its own counseling staff.

- Although the school does not have an ELL Coordinator, the school does use ELL status as a selection criterion for students receiving additional intervention services.
- The school has established Child Study Teams (CSTs) at the elementary and middle school levels and Student Response Teams (SRTs) at the high school level. At all levels these teams are comprised of one special educator, one general educator, grade-level counselors, and the school's grade-level dean. These teams are responsible for developing Response to Intervention (RtI) plans for students who struggle academically, emotionally and/or behaviorally and whose behaviors are not improving after in-class interventions have been attempted. The resulting interventions are tracked and reported on during monthly CST and SRT meetings.
 - At the elementary school level, students are given Wilson Foundations as a Tier I intervention and use the Wilson Reading System as an additional Tier II support as needed.
 - At the middle school level, struggling students are provided instruction using Scholastic's Read 180 program as a Tier II intervention and its System 44 program as a Tier III intervention.
- School leadership reports that at the high school level, the school offers several layers of academic support both inside and outside of general instruction.
 - The high school offers additional, supportive courses for students who are struggling, including courses with a 15:1 student to teacher ratio to provide more individualized instruction. These smaller classes include both students who do and do not have IEPs.
 - Ninth grade students who struggle with literacy are placed into targeted reading intervention courses.
 - Students across all grades read leveled texts during their independent reading periods.
 - The high school provides several supports for struggling students taking Regents exams. Three dual-certified English teachers in grades nine and ten work with the school's student support team to teach small, intensely scaffolded classes geared towards preparing students for the English Regents exam. Similarly, a dual-certified math teacher works to prepare grade nine students for the Algebra Regents exam.
 - The high school offers three pre-Regents self-contained courses of eight or fewer students. These focus on building foundational skills for students who may not be ready for Regents-level material and are offered in literacy, math, and nonfiction studies in grades nine and ten.
 - Classes not taught by a dual-certified teacher are offered as reduced-size general education classes that receive push-in support from resource room teachers.
 - As observed at the time of the high school renewal visit on December 18 – 19, 2014, the high school has built a variety of transitional supports into its model, including:
 - A Summer Bridge program for incoming freshmen during which students complete assessments and are introduced to the high school's culture;
 - Socio-emotional counselors at all grade levels;
 - Provision of case managers (SETSS teachers) for all students with IEPs;
 - Career counselors who help guide eleventh grade students toward opportunities for internships as well as weekend and summer programs;
 - College counseling for all twelfth grade students, including IEP review (when applicable) and self-advocacy instructions for testing accommodations; and

- Use of the state's Adult Career and Continuing Education Services-Vocational Rehabilitation (ACCES-VR) program to help students obtain funding for college as well as provide vocational training for students who need it.

- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**

During the renewal visit to the school's elementary and middle school campus on December 10 and 11, 2014, 24 classrooms in grades kindergarten, one, and five through eight were observed with the elementary school principal, the elementary school dean of teaching and learning, the middle school principal, the middle school assistant principal, and a middle school academic interventionist.

- In all observed classes, teachers were following either an Integrated Co-Teaching instructional model or the models of lead and assist or lead and monitor.
- Observed class sizes observed ranged from 22 to 30 students in size, with two to three teachers in all classrooms.
- Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations included some basic fact recall, but mostly challenged students to demonstrate understanding.
- In most classrooms, checks for understanding included questioning, polling, classwork, and teacher observation.
- In some observed classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, and products, through small group instruction or independent practice, was observed. Examples include a kindergarten literacy lesson in which students were grouped into stations of independent reading, buddy reading, or Scholastic's iRead independent online practice, and a first grade math lesson on making groups of ten in which students in three groups were either being monitored as they worked on EngageNY math worksheets, independently worked on a math exercise using a tablet computer, or engaged in guided practice at the board and on the rug.
- In most observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
- In some observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Some off-task students were off task for a short duration, but others, particularly those in elementary classrooms, stayed off task and additionally escalated disruptive behaviors.
- Based on debriefs with the school's leadership team members after classroom visits, most classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

During the renewal visit to the school's high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014, 29 core subject classrooms (including those with SETSS) and elective classrooms in grades nine through twelve were observed with the high school principal and the high school dean of special education. Classrooms, teachers and students observed were not specific to KIPP AMP Charter School but included all KIPP NYC schools, including KIPP AMP, that share staff and resources at the KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School campus.

- In all observed classes, teachers were using either an ICT, lead and assist, or lead and monitor instructional approach.
- Classes observed ranged from 12 to 26 students in size with one teacher in most classrooms, but in some classrooms, such as the 15:1 and ICT settings, there were two teachers in a classroom.
- Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations included some basic fact recall, but mostly challenged students to demonstrate understanding or to compare or illustrate concepts. Examples included a ninth and tenth grade trigonometry/algebra II class where students were asked not only to solve quadratic equations graphically but to compare and contrast the method they used to methods used for prior equations, and a ninth grade honors English class in which students who had just read a passage from Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye* were challenged to write two to three paragraphs on how symbolism helped develop the passage's central idea.

- Some class activities challenged students to synthesize and evaluate their learning, such as a computer science class during which students designed coding rules in order to move characters within a “Space Invaders”-like computer program.
- In most classrooms, checks for understanding included questioning, classwork, teacher observation, peer review of work, and exit tickets. Examples include a global/history class that challenged students to debate the advantages and disadvantages of democracies and aristocracies.
- In some observed classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, and products was observed.
- In all observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
- In all observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were off task for a short duration.
- Based on debriefs with the school’s leadership team members after classroom visits, most classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

Learning Environment

During the renewal visit to the school’s elementary and middle school campus on December 10 and 11, 2014, NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 13 classroom teachers, two academic interventionists, one learning specialist, and one reading intervention teacher. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received weekly school-based professional development as well as participated in weekly content team meetings.
- Most interviewed teachers discussed the use of frequent informal observations for receiving feedback from coaches during weekly check-in meetings.
- A few teachers mentioned the use of the KIPP Framework for Excellent Teaching (KFET) for formal or informal teacher evaluations or goal-setting.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through both formal (such as NWEA MAP results, interim assessment results, and STEP reading assessment results) and informal assessments (such as observational notes and questioning).

During the renewal visit to the school’s high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014, NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 15 general and special education classroom teachers. The following was noted:

- Most interviewed teachers reported that they receive school-based professional development four times per week, hold department meetings two times per month, and meet in professional learning communities nine times per school year. They also reported that they were provided KIPP NYC regional professional development on-site four times per school year.
- Most interviewed teachers discussed both formal collaborative structures such as weekly grade/subject meetings (including SETSS meetings) as well as frequent and regular informal collaboration in the form of lesson planning between co-teachers and peer classroom visitations.
- Most interviewed teachers mentioned the use of the KFET for formal teacher evaluations conducted by the school’s department chairs every two weeks. These teachers reported that they receive both verbal and written feedback following the observation, and the written feedback is also logged into the school’s TeachBoost instructional leadership platform for reference. Teachers reported that they are encouraged to set three professional development goals for the school year.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through several types of both formal and informal assessments. Formal assessments mentioned included unit exams, interim mock Regents exams, and midterm exams. Informal assessments mentioned included quizzes, observation of classroom activities, exit tickets, “do nows”, writing assignments, GPA growth analysis, and homework analysis.

During the renewal visit to the school's elementary and middle school campus on December 10 and 11, 2014, NYC DOE representatives conducted group interviews with 32 students in grades kindergarten through one and five through eight. The following was noted:

- Many interviewed students reported that their teachers had high academic expectations for them, particularly in the context of AP and honors courses, but also felt supported by teachers in trying to reach those expectations.
- Many interviewed students spoke positively regarding the school's behavioral incentives and recognition of positive character traits.
- Many students stated that they had several opportunities both during and outside of school hours to receive academic help when they needed it.

During the renewal visit to the school's high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014, NYC DOE representatives conducted group interviews with 16 students in grades nine through twelve. The following was noted:

- All interviewed students reported that their teachers had high academic expectations for them but also felt supported by teachers in trying to reach those expectations.
- All interviewed students spoke positively regarding the school's behavioral incentives and recognition of positive character traits.
- All students stated that they had many opportunities both during and outside of school hours to receive academic help when they needed it.
- Many students spoke positively about the school's guidance and overall preparation efforts toward readying them for college and/or careers.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 95% of parents of elementary and middle school students at KIPP AMP Charter School agree or strongly agree "that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child" and 98% of parents who responded to the survey agree or strongly agree "that the school has high expectations for [their] child."²⁶

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey only 60% of elementary and middle school teachers at KIPP AMP Charter School agree or strongly agree that "order and discipline are maintained at the school" and only 56% disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that "at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school."²⁷

²⁶ According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 56% of parent respondents strongly agree that KIPP AMP Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 39% agree with the statement. Similarly, 60% of parent respondents strongly agree that KIPP AMP Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 38% agree with the statement.

²⁷ According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 12% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at KIPP AMP Charter School; another 48% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 8% strongly disagree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 48% of teacher respondents disagree with the statement; 40% agree with the statement; and 4% strongly agree with the statement.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

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

On December 19, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE met with a representation of the school's Board of Trustees independent of the school leadership team. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has six active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of five members and maximum of 25 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, and Superintendent positions, as specified in the bylaws, are currently filled. However, the current bylaws also specify Principal positions, which appear to be vacant; these have been removed as officer positions in practice and, as of the writing of this report, the Board is revising its bylaws to reflect this change.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes that were reviewed for Board meetings in school years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014 (14 meetings total).
- The KIPP NYC Superintendent, and employee of the school's Board, regularly updates the Board on academic progress at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes. Regular operational and financial updates are provided by the KIPP NYC operations and finance staff. These non-academic updates are from KIPP NYC network level personnel, however, and are not presented by members of the KIPP AMP school leadership team or onsite school personnel.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and the network as well as the network and school leadership team as evidenced by the school's organization chart and the school and KIPP NYC LLC leadership's monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes. As a result, accountability of the school leadership team to the Board is indirect with the KIPP NYC Superintendent playing a key role in the school accountability structure.
- The Board's bylaws state that the Board may form any Board committee (other than the Hiring committee) but is not obligated to do so. It is unclear from the Board minutes reviewed whether the Hiring Committee is active. However, Board leadership reported that it has established a standing Audit and Finance Committee in addition to its Hiring Committee, and both meet frequently but informally on a regular basis in between regular Board meetings.
- KIPP AMP Charter School's Board of Trustees is led by chair David Massey, who has been on the Board since January 2005. The school leadership team includes: Emily Carroll, Elementary School Principal, who has held this position since the launch of the school's elementary grades in 2013; Latasha Williams, Middle School Principal, who has held this position since February 2015; and Natalie Webb, High School Principal, who has held this position since July 2009. The school is also overseen by KIPP NYC Superintendent Josh Zoia, who joined KIPP NYC in 2011 and has held this position since July 2012. Mr. Zoia will end his tenure in this position in June 2015. Starting in July 2015, Jim Manly will assume the position of KIPP NYC Superintendent.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- The school met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% in three of the five years of the retrospective charter term. Average daily attendance for students over the course of the charter term is provided in the table below.²⁸

²⁸ The table reflects average daily attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2009-2010 through 2013-2014. The high school attendance information reflects attendance of all high school students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, not simply those enrolled at KIPP AMP Charter School. Please note that the school self-reported aggregate attendance rates in its Renewal Application which differ from the aggregate attendance recorded in ATS for

Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School*	96.0%	95.5%	93.8%	95.0%	94.1%
NYC**	93.4%	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	2.6	2.3	-0.1	1.4	0.9
High School Attendance					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School*	96.8%	96.4%	96.0%	95.5%	95.3%
NYC**	85.8%	85.5%	86.2%	86.1%	86.5%
Difference from NYC	11.0	10.9	9.8	9.4	8.8

* Attendance was taken from ATS.

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

- The school experienced significant leadership turnover in the middle school grades during the course of its charter term, with three principals having occupied this role since its last renewal in 2010.
- Staff turnover has not been consistent over the course of the charter term. In 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, the percentage of primary instructional staff who did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year was 30%, 24%, 29%, and 17%, respectively. There is evidence that this has affected student performance, although instructional turnover has generally improved over time. Student mobility is presented below for the charter term without comparison to other schools, the CSD or NYC as final student retention goals were not yet finalized by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term at the time of the writing of this report. Based on the NYC DOE's evaluation and not in comparison to any other school, the CSD or NYC averages, the school has had challenges with retaining students.

Mobility

Student Mobility out of KIPP AMP Charter School *					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Number of Students who Left the School	50	65	68	54	61
Percent of Students who Left the School	16.7%	19.1%	18.2%	13.5%	12.5%

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

- The NYC DOE has made changes to the NYC School Survey during the entirety of the retrospective charter term. Questions asked have been altered, added or deleted from year to year. Also, beginning with the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, survey categories will not be measured in total points out of 10 possible points. To allow for consistency during the evaluated charter term, selected questions, consistent with the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework were identified as relevant for charter schools. These are presented below for the

all school years. The school self-reported attendance rates of 96.0%, 95.7%, 94.3%, 94.3% and 94.7% for school years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, respectively.

elementary and middle school students, parents and teachers for the duration of the retrospective charter term. In the most recent year of survey results, 2013-2014, the percentage of teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing was not above citywide averages for any of the four selected questions. The percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for one of the three selected questions. The percentage of students agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for one of the three selected questions and equal to the citywide average for one of the other two questions.

- NYC School Survey Response Rates should be comparable over time, however, as the measurement of these has remained consistent. Response rates for elementary and middle school KIPP AMP parents, teachers and students (if participating) are presented below for each year of the charter term. The response rates for middle school KIPP AMP Charter School students have been above NYC averages in the last three years. The response rates for parents of elementary and middle school students at KIPP AMP Charter School have been equal to or above the citywide rates in only the last two years. The response rates for elementary and middle school teachers at KIPP AMP Charter School have fluctuated and have only been above the citywide averages in three of the last five years.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree							
Survey Question		KIPP AMP Charter School ****					Citywide Average
		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	80%	83%	69%	71%	62%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	49%	42%	51%	63%	45%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	79%	77%	74%	83%	81%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	89%	94%	94%	91%	96%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	85%	93%	94%	89%	92%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	87%	93%	95%	91%	93%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	78%	57%	92%	87%	60%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	68%	29%	100%	86%	60%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	73%	81%	96%	95%	80%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	-	-	72%	78%	64%	81%

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

** This question was phrased as "My teachers inspire me to learn" in the 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 School Surveys.

*** This question was not introduced until the 2011-2012 School Survey.

**** Survey results are presented for students, parents and teachers of only elementary and middle school grades of KIPP AMP Charter School. High school students enrolled at KIPP AMP Charter School, as well as parents of high school students enrolled at KIPP AMP Charter School and high school teachers, are not included in the above figures.

NYC School Survey Results

		Response Rates				
		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	KIPP AMP Charter School **	78%	72%	94%	93%	95%
	NYC	82%	83%	82%	83%	83%
Parents	KIPP AMP Charter School **	46%	47%	32%	55%	53%
	NYC	49%	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	KIPP AMP Charter School **	100%	78%	100%	85%	56%
	NYC	76%	82%	81%	83%	81%

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

** Survey results are presented for students, parents and teachers of only elementary and middle school grades of KIPP AMP Charter School. High school students enrolled at KIPP AMP Charter School, as well as parents of high school students enrolled at KIPP AMP Charter School and high school teachers, are not included in the above figures.

- The school's charter goals include, "each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more parents participate in the survey." This goal was evaluated based on elementary and middle school parent responses for the retrospective charter term. The school partially met this goal in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years.²⁹ The school did meet this goal in school year 2012-2013. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school's charter goals include, "each year, teachers will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more teachers participate in the survey." This goal was evaluated based on elementary and middle school teacher responses for the retrospective charter term. The school did not meet this goal in either the 2009-2010 or 2010-2011 school years. The school partially met this goal in the 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years.³⁰ This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school's charter goals include, "each year, students will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more students participate in the survey." This goal was evaluated based on middle school student responses for the retrospective charter term. The school did not meet this goal in the 2011-2012 school year. The school partially met this goal in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 school years.³¹ This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.

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

- At all grade levels, teachers are trained to implement the "Love and Logic" philosophy of classroom and behavior management developed by Jim Fay and Foster W. Cline, M.D, which emphasizes a combination of empathy, choice and reason to manage most classroom behaviors. In cases where this approach is not proving effective as a means of helping students regulate their own behavior, the school utilizes the Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) approach developed by Dr. Stuart Ablon of Massachusetts General Hospital. This approach stems from the idea that the most challenging student behaviors are often the byproducts of lagging thinking skills and are best addressed by teaching students the skills they lack, often through the use of conferencing at the time of an incident.
- The middle school uses a weekly "paycheck" to represent each student's social and academic performance. This logs each student's "KIPP dollars," which are awarded according to teacher comments across categories ranging from attendance and homework, to being a good teammate

²⁹ This goal was evaluated based on elementary and middle school parent responses for the retrospective charter term. If the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, or if the response rate was less than 50%, the goal was considered 'partially met.' In the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years, the elementary and middle school parent response rate for KIPP AMP Charter School was less than 50%.

³⁰ This goal was evaluated based on elementary and middle school teacher responses for the retrospective charter term. If the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, or if the response rate was less than 50%, the goal was considered 'partially met.' In the 2011-2012 school year, KIPP AMP Charter School received fewer than 7.5 points based on elementary and middle school teacher responses in the Engagement and Safety and Respect categories. In the 2012-2013 school year, KIPP AMP Charter School received fewer than 7.5 points based on elementary and middle school teacher responses in the Engagement category.

³¹ This goal was evaluated based on middle school student responses for the retrospective charter term. If the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, or if the response rate was less than 50%, the goal was considered 'partially met.' In the 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 school years, KIPP AMP Charter School received fewer than 7.5 points based on middle school student responses in all categories except Academic Expectations. In the 2012-2013 school year, KIPP AMP Charter School received fewer than 7.5 points in only the Safety and Respect category.

and displaying extra effort in the classroom. Students begin each week with fifty KIPP dollars and earn credits and/or deductions based on how they meet school-wide behavioral expectations.

- As a means of peer mentorship and support, the high school uses an Advisory system consisting of small groups of eight to 10 students that meet once a week throughout their high school careers to focus on character and academic skills. The faculty-created Advisory curriculum follows a scope and sequence covering the following themes: academic success; character development; college and career connection; grade unity; social responsibility; and team building. The Advisory program also engages students' families via communications with each student's advisor.
- School leadership reports that at its elementary and middle school campus in the Crown Heights neighborhood of Brooklyn, KIPP AMP has hosted a number of community events that are open to the school's families as well as invited neighborhood organizations and local residents. These have included a cookout at the NYC Housing Authority's Albany Houses Community Center during which the school's Legacy Jazz Band performed, and a Back to School Movie Night. Additionally, the Legacy Jazz Band has performed at several events in and outside of the school's neighborhood, including the Crown Heights Community Mediation Center's Arts to End Violence event in 2013 and at Lincoln Center multiple times during the charter term.
- Elementary and middle school leadership also reports that it has fostered partnerships with community-based groups in Crown Heights, including the Crow Hill Community Organization, Youth Organizing to Save Our Streets, the Crown Heights Community Mediation Center, the Crown Heights Youth Collective, St. John's Recreation Center, the Berean Community & Family Life Center, the Brooklyn Neighborhood Improvement Association, Change04Change, Community2Community, Hoops for Haiti, the Friends of Crown Heights Educational Center, Crown Heights Family & Community Support Services, the Bible Faith Tabernacle Church, and Greater Restoration Baptist Church.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school on January 28, 2015 at 1224 Park Place, Brooklyn, NY 11213 in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 75 participants attended the hearing with nine speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made during January 2015 until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 90% provided positive feedback regarding the school and 10% provided neutral feedback regarding the school.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's current ratio of 6.24 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash of \$2,108,080, representing 85 days of operating expenses, which allows for at least two months of operation without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of November 30, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

Financial Sustainability

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

- Based on the financial audits from mid-year FY11 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus over these audited fiscal years, and in FY14 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.12 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from mid-year FY11 through FY14, the school generated overall positive cash flow from mid-year FY11 to FY14, and the school had positive cash flow each year from FY11 to FY14.

There were no material weaknesses noted in the past three independent financial audits from FY12 to FY14; however, there was a significant deficiency noted for the mid-year FY11 financial audit.

A significant deficiency in the internal control over financial reporting with regard to untimely account reconciliations and adjustments was noted:

- Due to account reconciliations not being performed on a timely basis, the trial balance was not adjusted properly throughout the year and therefore any generated financial reports used by management and/or governance could not always be relied upon. As a result, adjustments were not to adjust and reconcile account balances during and after the final audit fieldwork. These areas included accounts payable, expenses, accounts receivable, revenue, due to/from accounts, and deferred revenue.

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

- The KIPP NYC Finance Team hired a new Controller in 2012 and added two staff accountants to better manage the transaction volume. They instituted new procedures for reconciling high-activity general ledger accounts and were able to automate the payroll and 403(b) reconciliations to save time and improve accuracy. Bank and corporate credit card accounts are consistently reconciled on a monthly basis and reviewed by the Controller and the Managing Director of Finance. All non-standard journal entries are also reviewed on a monthly basis by the Controller or the Managing Director of Finance.

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

Over the charter term, KIPP AMP Charter School has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations, but not others.

As of the review in February 2015, the Board of Trustees for KIPP AMP Charter School is in compliance with:

- **Membership size.** Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range of five to 25 members as outlined in both the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws. The Board currently has six active members.
- **Required number of monthly meetings.** The Board's current bylaws specify one required annual meeting but do not specify a required number of regular meetings. In the first three of the past four completed academic years, the Board held four meetings which met quorum during the academic year, including its annual meeting. In the last completed academic year (2013-2014), the Board held two meetings which met quorum during the academic year, including its annual meeting, and was scheduled to hold two more as recorded on the Board meeting calendar.
 - Beginning with the 2014-2015 academic year, the Board has not held the number of board meetings required by the Charter Schools Act. The Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months per year. The Board has not updated its bylaws to comply with this law.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.³²
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has not consistently made all Board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting on the school's website. However, it does consistently post its most recent Board minutes and agenda to the school's website.
- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** The board has consistently submitted board resignation notices or new board member credentials within the required five days of change to OSDCP for review and, if necessary, approval.

As of the review in February 2015, the Board is out of compliance with:

- **Submission of documents.** The Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term. However, while the school has posted in FY13 audit, the school has not posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law.

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

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Immunization.** The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.
- **Insurance.** The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2014-2015 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 4, 2014, adhering to charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1. Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently adhere to this requirement.
- **Fire Emergency.** One of the school leaders was trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.

³² Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

- **Student Discipline Plan.** The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be compliant with federal law.
- **Timely Submission of Invoicing and Reconciliation Documents.** Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently submit complete invoicing and reconciliation documents by the associated deadlines.

As of the review on December 2014, the charter school is out of compliance with:

- **Teacher certification.** The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is not compliant with state requirements for teacher certification. The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools. The school has 23 uncertified staff members.
 - According to KIPP NYC human resources (HR), during the hiring process KIPP AMP Charter School principals have emphasized finding Highly Qualified teachers with deep content experience who can build positive relationships with students and who are seeking a strong culture of high expectations. The school expects teachers, upon being hired, to become NYS-certified in their content area.
 - KIPP NYC HR leadership interviewed as part of the renewal process on January 8, 2015 reported that it offers the following support to help principals and teachers along the path to certification:
 - Holds regular one-on-one meetings between KIPP NYC HR staff and uncertified teachers to check in on progress towards certification.
 - Contracts with the NYC Charter School Center to provide additional support and guidance for uncertified teachers. In these meetings, KIPP NYC teachers identify gaps in coursework, test completion and other requirements and develop individualized plans to remedy each deficiency.
 - In the spring of 2013, KIPP NYC built a teacher certification database and tracking tool to monitor school and charter level teacher certification rates and progress toward completion, and to flag teachers who are not progressing towards certification.
 - In September 2014, KIPP NYC hired a consultant with expertise in teacher certification (formerly of the NYC Charter Center) to examine the status of teacher certification across KIPP NYC to make recommendations on how schools should proceed.

Additionally, the school briefly fell more than 15% below its authorized enrollment in school year 2014-2015, in violation of the school's charter agreement with the NYC DOE.³³ The current charter agreement specifies that student enrollment must be within 15% of the maximum authorized enrollment for the school.

Enrollment and Retention Targets

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

³³ Sources: NYC DOE Automate the Schools (ATS) internal data; KIPP AMP executed renewal charter agreement (2009-2010)

- As of the writing of this report, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act were still in a proposed status; these targets have since been finalized. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, as well as the recently finalized current enrollment targets developed by NYSED. It should be noted that these targets were developed using a different methodology than that used to develop the school-specific enrollment rates for each special population as presented below.³⁴
- In all years of operation, including the most recently completed school year 2013-2014, KIPP AMP Charter School:
 - generally served a lower percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to both the CSD 17 and CSD 7 rates in applicable years across applicable grades,³⁵ however the school generally served a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to the 2012-2013 CSD 5 high school rate and the citywide percentage in applicable years;³⁶ and
 - served a higher percentage of students with disabilities compared to the CSD 17 rate in three of the last five years and a higher percentage than the citywide rate in two of the last five years; in addition, KIPP AMP Charter School served a higher percentage of students with disabilities compared to the CSD 7 rate in one of the applicable three years and a higher percentage than the CSD 5 rate in the only applicable year; and
 - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to the relative CSD 17, CSD 7, CSD 5 and citywide percentages in all years of the retrospective charter term.

³⁴ Please see the following website for more information: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/enrollment-retention-targets.html>

³⁵ The school served a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch than the comparable CSD 7 high school rate in the 2013-2014 school year.

³⁶ The school served a lower percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch than the comparable citywide rate in the 2009-2010 school year.

Enrollment of Special Populations³⁷

Special Population		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Current) ³⁸
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	KIPP AMP Charter School	74.2%	80.3%	86.1%	85.9%	90.1%	90.2%
	CSD 17	91.9%	93.8%	93.1%	92.9%	92.5%	
	CSD 7	-	89.3%	89.8%	-	89.9%	
	CSD 5	-	-	-	78.3%	-	
	NYC	84.1%	78.4%	80.1%	79.3%	79.3%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	KIPP AMP Charter School	17.4%	19.7%	20.1%	16.0%	16.4%	12.1%
	CSD 17	16.2%	16.5%	15.9%	16.5%	17.3%	
	CSD 7	-	20.7%	19.3%	-	20.0%	
	CSD 5	-	-	-	13.1%	-	
	NYC	19.0%	18.4%	18.1%	18.4%	18.7%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	KIPP AMP Charter School	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.5%	1.3%	9.3%
	CSD 17	8.9%	9.4%	9.3%	9.2%	9.8%	
	CSD 7	-	17.5%	17.0%	-	15.2%	
	CSD 5	-	-	-	6.6%	-	
	NYC	12.8%	13.6%	13.0%	12.6%	13.1%	

Additional Enrollment Information

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	5-9	5-10	5-11	5-12	K, 5-12
CSD(s) ³⁹	17	17 (Grades 5-8) and 7 (Grades 9-10)	17 (Grades 5-8) and 7 (Grades 9-11)	17 (Grades 5-8) and 5 (Grades 9-12)	17 (Grades K, 5-8) and 7 (Grades 9-12)

³⁷ Comparisons of a charter school's special populations to the CSD and City are made relative only to the grades served by the school. For example, if a charter school serves grades kindergarten through five, comparisons of that school's special populations will only be made relative to grades kindergarten through five in the CSD and citywide. CSD comparisons are particular to the grades served in each CSD each year. Enrollment rates reflect demographic characteristics as of June 1 and enrollment as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.

State enrollment targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific enrollment target. The CSD for a multi-district school is the primary CSD as determined by each school. The enrollment is determined by the total number of students enrolled as of October 31, 2013. Any school with an unusual grade configuration (i.e. K, 6-9) should use an available grade configuration provided by SED that is most aligned as determined by the DOE, otherwise a school's actual grade span is used. For more information regarding SED's methodology behind the calculation of charter school enrollment and retention targets, please refer to the memo at <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2012Meetings/July2012/712brca11.pdf>.

³⁸ Targets were identified for KIPP AMP by using CSD 17 as the primary CSD and a grade range of grades five through twelve.

³⁹ In 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 KIPP AMP Charter School's high school grades were served in a privately-owned building located at 730 Concourse Village West in CSD 7 in the Bronx. The school's high school grades moved to a DOE-owned building at 625 West 133rd Street in CSD 5 in Manhattan for the 2012-2013 school year before moving to its permanent high school site at 201 East 144th Street in CSD 7 in the Bronx for the 2013-2014 school year. The school's permanent high school site is a Charter Partnership building, a building owned by the NYC DOE but leased out to the charter operator for an extended period of time.

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

As part of its next charter term the school plans to:

- Continue phase-in of the previously authorized elementary grades such that the school will serve students in grades kindergarten through twelve at full scale.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Renewal Process

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

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

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

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

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

Statutory Basis for Renewal

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

§2850:

- (a) Improve student learning and achievement;
- (b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- (c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- (d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- (e) Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system; and

- (f) Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools established under this article accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

When granted, a charter is valid for up to five years. For a school chartered under the Act to operate beyond the initial charter term, the school must seek and obtain renewal of its charter.⁴⁰

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

§2851.4:

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

- (a) A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in the charter.
- (b) A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private. Such statement shall be in a form prescribed by the board of regents.
- (c) Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school required by subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty-seven of this article, including the charter school report cards and the certified financial statements.
- (d) Indications of parent and student satisfaction.
- (e) The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents or the board of trustees of the state university of New York, as applicable, of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal. When developing such targets, the board of regents and the board of trustees of the state university of New York shall ensure (1) that such enrollment targets are comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the charter school is located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.

Such renewal application shall be submitted to the charter entity no later than six months prior to the expiration of the charter; provided, however, that the charter entity may waive such deadline for good cause shown.

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

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.⁴¹ 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;

⁴⁰ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

⁴¹ See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction; and
- The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and 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.⁴²

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.⁴³

⁴² § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.

⁴³ See § 2852(5).

Part 6: NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

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

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

Full-Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions

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

Short Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions

In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has two years or fewer of state-assessment results, or where any school has demonstrated mixed academic results or has uncertain organizational or financial viability, a short-term renewal with conditions may be considered.

Non-Renewal

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

Grade Expansions or Enrollment Changes

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

The NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

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

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

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

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

1. Is the School an Academic Success?

1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement

Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below:

- Meet absolute performance goals established in school charter
- Meet student progress goals established in school charter
- Meet other rigorous academic goals as stated on school charter
- Demonstrate increasing student achievement/growth
- Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students
- Are surpassing academic performance measures of DOE identified peer-schools
- Are surpassing academic performance measures compared with district/city proficiency averages

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

- Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates
- Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results
- Grades 8-12 College Readiness Credit Accumulation
- Percentage of Students Applying to and Being Admitted to College
- Percentage of Students Taking AP Courses and/or Percentage of Students Passing AP Courses
- When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results
- Results on state accountability measures
- Charter School Academic Goals
- School-reported internal assessments
- NYC DOE Progress Reports or School Quality Reports⁴⁴

1b. Instructionally Sound and Responsive Education Program

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

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

⁴⁴ Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE replaced the DOE Progress Report with the DOE School Quality Report. The 2012-2013 school year is the last year NYC public schools will have a Progress Report score. The Progress Report and School Quality Report contain similar indicators of performance.

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

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

1c. Learning Environment

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

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

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

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

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

2a. Mission and Goals

Schools with a successful mission and goals have many of the characteristics below:

- Have an animated mission statement and clearly articulated goals (both academic and non-academic) that staff, students and community embrace
- Demonstrate an active self-evaluation process that involves regular monitoring, an examination of practices based on outcomes against goals, and reporting on progress towards school goals
- Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data

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

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

2b. Leadership and Governance Structure

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

- Have a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations, with clear lines of accountability for the Board, school leadership and all staff
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate officers, committees, and a purposeful blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter
- Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly, but not limited to, Open-Meeting Law and conflict of interest laws, and is fully compliant with its Board approved by-laws (number of meetings, quorum, posting of calendar, agenda and minutes)
- Have a defined process for Board reflection on effectiveness, assessing developing needs, and plan for professional growth
- Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals and, if and when necessary, makes timely adjustments to that structure with proper notice to and approval by its authorizer
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provides regular feedback on instruction to teachers, including both formal and informal observations

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

- School charter
- Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, calendar of meetings, meeting agenda and minutes
- Annual conflict of interest forms
- Board resources for evaluating school leadership and staff, including rubric/performance metrics
- Board resources for self-reflection and professional growth
- Board development plan
- Board interviews
- Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook and core operational policies
- School calendar
- Professional development plans
- Stakeholder interviews (board, school leadership and staff)

2c. School Climate and Community Engagement

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

- A healthy professional school climate that is collaborative, student-centered, and open to parents and community support
- Employ an effective means of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including, but not limited to, the NYC DOE School Survey
- Have effective home-school communication practices and engagement strategies to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children
- Strong community-based partnerships that support and advocate for the school
- Engage families actively in the life of the school, including advocacy, community engagement, and feedback on school policies and initiatives
- Have a clear procedure for parents and staff to express concerns to school leadership and the Board, as appropriate, including a clearly articulated escalation path to authorizer
- Share instructional and operational practices with the larger NYC school community and actively seek opportunities for partnering and collaboration
- Encourage professional conversations about effective performance and quality instruction among staff, through, for example, such means as regular and periodic teaming (grade level teams, data days, etc.) and peer observations
- Have systems in place to evaluate professional development effectiveness and provide ongoing support for school-wide and individual initiatives

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

- NYC DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results
- Student retention and wait list data
- Staff retention data
- Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews
- Student and staff attendance rates
- Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences
- Parent association meeting calendar and minutes
- Community partnerships and sponsored programs
- Participation in NYC DOE initiatives and efforts to collaborate/partner with other NYC schools
- Parent and community feedback via public hearings, renewal calls to parents, etc.
- Community outreach documents (newsletters, announcements, invitations, etc.)
- School Professional Development Plan and staff feedback on professional development events
- Resources for evaluations and observations, scheduled opportunities for professional collaboration, staff feedback on professional development events
- Student/Family and Staff Handbooks

2d. Operational Health

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

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

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

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

2e. Financial Sustainability

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

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

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

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

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

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

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

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

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

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

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

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

- Meet all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, ELL and Special Education students to those of their community school district of location⁴⁵ or are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages for enrollment and retention
- Implement school policies related to student discipline and promotion and retention that are fully compliant with laws and regulations related to students with disabilities and due process regulations
- Conduct an independently verified fair and open lottery and manage enrollment process and annual waiting lists with integrity
- Employ instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and meet all certification requirements

⁴⁵ School-specific targets for enrollment and retention were developed by the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

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

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

3c. Applicable Regulations

Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have the characteristics below:

- Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns
- Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and complete all other financial reporting as required
- Boards that meet requirements for size, meeting frequency, public notice, applicable open-meeting and conflict of interest regulations, as well as comply with NYC DOE OSDCP's requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members
- Inform NYC DOE OSDCP, and where required, receive OSDCP approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization
- Effectively engaged parent associations

Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School or building safety plan; appropriate inspection documents
- Annual audits, escrow accounts, other financial reporting documents
- Board roster, calendar, agenda and minutes, conflict of interest documents, notification of changes/approval of new member request documents
- Charter revision requests
- Revised or new contracts
- Parent association calendar of meetings, identified officers, parent association agenda and minutes, parent satisfaction survey results
- Stakeholder interviews

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

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

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

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

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

4b. Organizational Sustainability

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

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

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

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

4c. School or Model Improvements

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

- Review performance carefully and even without major changes through expansion or replication, are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success
- Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission

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

- Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Renewal application revised charter including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and Board interviews
- Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) with partners or important vendors

Appendix A: School Performance Data

Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School					
Grade 5	26.8%	15.3%	34.1%	12.2%	18.9%
Grade 6	24.0%	33.3%	38.0%	12.8%	19.1%
Grade 7	51.7%	26.4%	33.8%	12.4%	13.3%
Grade 8	38.5%	44.6%	51.1%	21.8%	10.3%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 17 *					
Grade 5	-11.9	-24.5	-8.0	-7.4	-1.7
Grade 6	-7.1	-5.9	1.0	-0.9	2.6
Grade 7	20.6	-3.7	-4.3	-4.2	-3.8
Grade 8	13.5	17.2	20.2	4.4	-10.2
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC					
Grade 5	-19.4	-33.7	-18.1	-16.4	-9.5
Grade 6	-16.1	-10.3	-7.3	-10.5	-6.1
Grade 7	13.5	-10.1	-9.5	-13.1	-13.5
Grade 8	1.0	9.6	12.1	-3.6	-18.6

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP AMP Charter School					
Grade 5	26.8%	49.4%	55.3%	1.1%	15.6%
Grade 6	46.7%	67.9%	71.7%	20.9%	39.4%
Grade 7	62.1%	64.2%	79.2%	9.1%	19.3%
Grade 8	59.6%	73.2%	83.0%	38.2%	26.9%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 17 *					
Grade 5	-21.1	-1.6	0.2	-15.4	-10.3
Grade 6	6.7	21.4	23.0	3.5	19.7
Grade 7	20.4	18.4	30.1	-2.1	7.0
Grade 8	26.3	31.4	33.8	23.9	14.0
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC					
Grade 5	-32.9	-13.5	-9.9	-28.5	-23.2
Grade 6	-6.3	11.9	12.4	-7.9	5.6
Grade 7	9.5	8.7	21.9	-15.9	-10.3
Grade 8	13.3	20.7	27.8	12.4	4.2

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

Regents Pass Rates

KIPP AMP Charter School			
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Integrated Algebra	92%	93%	96.4%
Algebra 2 / Trigonometry	75%	65%	66.7%
Comprehensive English	89%	85%	94.9%
U.S. History	100%	93%	95.2%
Chemistry	50%	58%	30.0%
Physics	83%	33%	23.1%
Living Environment	94%	96%	97.3%
Language Other Than English	-	-	100.0%

Appendix B: High School Performance Data

The high school performance data presented below reflects high school students from all four KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up “KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School”.⁴⁶ The percentage of students that attended KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School that were KIPP AMP Charter School students is as follows:

- In 2009-2010, the NYC DOE had not yet begun grouping the KIPP NYC CMO charter schools together under KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. As a result, all data presented for the 2009-2010 school year reflects students enrolled in KIPP AMP Charter School only.
- In 2010-2011, 17% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP AMP Charter School students.
- In 2011-2012, 15% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP AMP Charter School students.
- In 2012-2013, 13% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP AMP Charter School students.
- In 2013-2014, 13% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP AMP Charter School students.

HS Performance Compared to Peer and NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	-	-	-	91.5%	95.1%
NYC *	-	-	-	66.0%	68.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	25.5	26.7
College and Career Preparatory Course Index **					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	-	-	-	80.9%	74.7%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	79.0%	71.0%
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	100.0%	99.3%

* The New York State graduation rate calculation method was first adopted in NYC for the Cohort of 2001 (Class of 2005). The cohort consists of all students who first entered ninth grade in a given school year (e.g., the Cohort of 2005 entered ninth grade in the 2005-2006 school year). Graduates are defined as those students earning either a Local or Regents diploma and exclude those earning either a special education (IEP) diploma or GED.

** The College and Career Preparatory Course Index score was not introduced until the 2010-2011 school year and peer and city percent of range scores were not available until the 2011-2012 school year. A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A peer/city percent of range of 50% represents the position of the average and can be interpreted as a school outperforming 50% of their peer group/city.

⁴⁶ The four KIPP NYC CMO schools whose high school grades together make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School are KIPP Infinity Charter School, KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School and KIPP Academy Charter School. KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School is not authorized by the NYC DOE Chancellor.

Weighted Regents Pass Rates

2014					
	English	Math	Science	Global History	U.S History
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.13	1.57	2.00	1.23	1.26
Peer Percent of Range	60.9%	89.3%	100.0%	95.2%	76.3%
City Percent of Range	73.9%	95.2%	96.8%	92.2%	84.6%
2013					
	English	Math	Science	Global History	U.S History
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.06	1.58	1.80	1.16	1.10
Peer Percent of Range	50.0%	97.5%	100.0%	83.3%	59.5%
City Percent of Range	65.0%	100.0%	85.1%	84.0%	68.0%
2012					
	English	Math	Science	Global History	U.S History
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.36	2.05	2.16	1.54	1.24
Peer Percent of Range	59.7%	92.4%	100.0%	58.2%	50.0%
City Percent of Range	60.7%	93.8%	94.8%	60.9%	53.0%
2011					
	English	Math	Science	Global History	U.S History
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.17	1.69	2.01	1.34	-
Peer Percent of Range	40.9%	67.5%	100.0%	40.5%	-
City Percent of Range	51.9%	74.1%	91.7%	54.7%	-
2010 ⁴⁷					
	English	Math	Science	Global History	U.S History
KIPP AMP Charter School	-	-	2.6	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	100.0%	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-	100.0%	-	-

The Weighted Regents Pass Rate measures students' progress since the corresponding eighth grade test, with more weight given to students with lower proficiency based on eight grade test results.

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

⁴⁷ In 2009-2010 the NYC DOE was not yet grouping all four KIPP NYC CMO schools together at the high school level for accountability purposes; each of the four schools received individual high school Progress Reports. The data presented for the 2010 Regents examinations reflects KIPP AMP Charter School students only and not the larger body of students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. In the 2009-2010 NYC DOE High School Progress Report for KIPP AMP Charter School, the Peer and City Percent of Ranges for the Science Weighted Regents Pass rate were reported as 183.7% and 151.7%, respectively. These figures have been changed to 100.0% in the table for consistency, because the percent of range methodology was changed the following year, in 2010-2011, so that the highest possible percent of range for a school was 100.0%.

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits ⁴⁸					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	85.7%	76.4%	84.9%	88.3%	90.4%
Peer Percent of Range	53.1%	16.6%	48.5%	54.5%	62.9%
City Percent of Range	74.8%	56.7%	69.7%	74.2%	78.5%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	-	86.6%	84.7%	87.9%	88.6%
Peer Percent of Range	-	56.8%	52.2%	61.9%	62.9%
City Percent of Range	-	77.1%	71.8%	76.7%	78.6%
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	-	-	90.3%	89.8%	87.2%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	71.6%	69.6%	61.7%
City Percent of Range	-	-	83.5%	81.7%	77.3%

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

Closing the Achievement Gap

4-year Weighted Diploma Rate*					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities **	-	-	-	253.8%	359.1%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	-	325.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	-	-	-	217.9%
College and Career Preparatory Course Index ***					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	-	-	-	14.3%

* The weighted diploma rate assigns a weight to each type of diploma based on the relative level of proficiency and college and career readiness indicated by the diploma type and based on certain student demographic characteristics.

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

*** The College and Career Preparatory Course Index score for the students in the lowest third citywide was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

⁴⁸ The data on first year students earning 10+ credits reflects high school students from all four KIPP NYC CMO schools that served high school students for school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The 2009-2010 data reflects only those high school students enrolled in KIPP AMP Charter School.

Performance on the NYC Progress Report – KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School

High School Progress Report Grades	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Overall Grade	-	-	-	A	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	-	-	-	A	
Student Performance	-	-	-	B	
School Environment	-	-	-	A	
College and Career Readiness *	-	-	-	A	

* The College and Career Readiness grade was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

Regents Pass Rates

KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School			
	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Integrated Algebra	83.0%	91.0%	93.0%
Algebra 2 / Trigonometry	78.8%	78.9%	70.6%
Comprehensive English	96.0%	92.9%	93.3%
U.S. History	98.5%	95.0%	92.2%
Chemistry	58.7%	62.4%	28.5%
Physics	72.2%	45.6%	43.9%
Living Environment	93.3%	91.9%	95.7%
Language Other Than English	-	99.2%	99.3%

Academic Performance of KIPP NYC College Prep

The high school performance data presented here in Appendix B reflects high school students from all four KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, a created but not legally chartered separate entity.

For the 2013-2014 school year, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's four-year graduation rate was 95.1%. This rate was higher than the citywide average by 26.7 percentage points. KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's four-year graduation rate was in the 89th percentile of high schools citywide. When compared to high schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools) KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School outperformed 84% of similar schools.

Credit accumulation is self-reported by charter schools to the NYC DOE. In general, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's overall credit accumulation rates have been higher than both the average credit accumulation rates of its peer group schools and the average credit accumulation rates of all high schools citywide over the charter term. The Peer and City Percent of Ranges for first, second and third year students were above 50% in all years (with the exception of first year credit accumulation in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012), meaning that the school outperformed its peer group and the citywide average along

each metric. The only exceptions occurred in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, when the Peer Percent of Range for first year students was below 50% in each of the two years.⁴⁹

In the most recent school year, 2013-2014, 90.4% of first year students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School earned 10+ credits, placing the school in the 56th percentile of its peer group schools and the 75th percentile of all high schools citywide.⁵⁰ Additionally, 88.6% of second year students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School earned 10+ credits, again placing the school in the 56th percentile of its peer group schools and the 75th percentile of all high schools citywide. Finally, 87.2% of third year students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School earned 10+ credits; placing the school in the 62nd percentile of its peer group schools and the 79th percentile of all high schools citywide.

Weighted Regents pass rates in English, Math, Science, Global History and U.S. History were at or above both the citywide averages and the averages for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's peer group in the most recent school year, 2013-2014. In general, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School compares favorably against its peer group schools and all high schools citywide when analyzing weighted Regents pass rates over the course of the current charter term, though peer and citywide comparisons show that KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School has historically performed less favorably in English and History.

A Progress Report was produced for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School for the 2012-2013 school year based on the high school performance data of students enrolled at all four KIPP NYC CMO charter schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School received an Overall grade of A on its 2012-2013 NYC DOE High School Progress Report, as well as A grades in all other sections with the exception of Student Performance, for which it received a B grade. This ranked KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School in the 85th percentile of all high schools citywide.

NYC DOE Progress Reports graded each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and were based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores were based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of 40 schools with similar student populations and to all schools citywide. The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report was the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constituted 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section was primarily based on median adjusted growth percentiles,⁵¹ which measure students' growth on state tests relative to other students with the same prior-year score. Although the NYC DOE Progress Report was discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, individual academic performance metrics from the former NYC DOE Progress Report are included in this renewal report for all years for which data was available in the current charter term.

Closing the Achievement Gap

The high school closing the achievement gap data reflects high school students from all KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School.

Students in the lowest third citywide at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School had a four-year weighted diploma rate of 217.9% in 2013-2014. However, only 14.3% of this same group of students met the requirements for the College and Career Preparatory Course Index (CCPCI). The school did not serve

⁴⁹ A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A City Percent of Range of 50.0% represents the average and indicates that the school's credit accumulation rate was equal to the average score for all high schools citywide.

⁵⁰ A percentile rank provides the percentage of schools that score lower than the school under consideration. A citywide percentile of 75%, for example, indicates that the school's credit accumulation rate was above 75% of high schools citywide.

⁵¹ A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the NYC DOE uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect average differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The NYC DOE evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

the minimum percentage of students designated as in the lowest third to receive peer or city percent of range data for either the weighted diploma rate or the CCPCI.⁵²

In 2013-2014, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's students with disabilities had a four-year weighted diploma rate of 359.1%. This rate was associated with a City Percent of Range of 85.5%, i.e. above the citywide average.

In 2013-2014, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's English Language Learner students had a four-year weighted diploma rate of 325.0%. However, the school did not serve the minimum percentage of students designated as English Language Learners to receive peer or city percent of range data.⁵³

⁵² For a school to be included in the NYC DOE's calculation of peer and city averages for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics and, thus, for the school to receive peer and city percent of range data for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, the school's population percentage for the relevant special population must be at least 25% of the City percent of range. Students in the lowest third citywide made up only 8.6% of the KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School student population in 2013-2014, which corresponded to a City Percent of Range of only 13.2%.

⁵³ For a school to be included in the NYC DOE's calculation of peer and city averages for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics and, thus, for the school to receive peer and city percent of range data for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, the school's population percentage for the relevant special population must be at least 25% of the City percent of range. English Language Learner students made up only 3.7% of the KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School student population in 2013-2014, which corresponded to a City Percent of Range of only 6.7%.

Appendix C: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Comprehensive Report 2013-2014](#)

[Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-2013](#)

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