



Charter Schools Institute  
*The State University of New York*

# Summary of Findings and Recommendations

---

*Proposal to establish:  
Family Life Academy Charter School II*

June 5, 2011

## **Executive Summary**

The proposal to establish the Family Life Academy Charter School-II (“FLACS-II”) was submitted to the Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) by lead applicant Renee Willemsen-Goode on February 28, 2011 in response to the Institute’s Request for Proposals (“RFP”) that was released on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (the “SUNY Trustees”) on January 3, 2011.

FLACS II would seek to “empower all of its K-5 students, regardless of race, ethnicity, country of origin, socioeconomic status, and/or English language proficiency, to demonstrate mastery of the New York State standards.” The proposed school intends to occupy private leased space located in New York City Department of Education (“NYCDOE”) Community School District (“CSD”) 9 at 800 East 156th Street in the Bronx. FLACS II would operate from the upstairs floor of the Bronx Spanish Evangelical Church. The proposed facility was secured in conjunction with the school’s community partner, the Latino Pastoral Action Center (“LPAC”). The school would open with in the fall of 2012 with 100 students in Kindergarten and 1<sup>st</sup> grade and would add one grade each year thereafter through the initial charter period. FLACS II would reach its enrollment capacity of 300 students in Kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grade in the final year of the proposed charter period and envision expanding through the 8<sup>th</sup> grade in a subsequent charter period if granted.

FLACS II would replicate the successful Family Life Academy Charter School (“FLACS”), which is authorized by the SUNY Trustees, based on the model described below. Student performance data of FLACS is also provided below.

Consistent with the May 2010 amendments to the New York Charter Schools Act (the “Act”), the Institute finds: 1) that the proposal for FLACS II rigorously demonstrates the criteria detailed in the Institute’s RFP including the mandatory criteria set forth in Education Law subdivision 2852(9)(b)(i); 2) that the proposed school has conducted thorough and meaningful public review processes to solicit community input regarding the proposal in accordance with the requirements in the RFP, which conform with Education Law subdivision 2852(9)(b)(ii); 3) the proposal is one that best satisfies the objectives contained within the RFP based on the content of the proposal and its supporting documentation, and is therefore qualified within the meaning of Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(d); and 4) the Institute has scored the proposal pursuant to Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(c), and there are enough charters to be issued by the SUNY Trustees pursuant to the January 2011 RFP to accommodate the proposals and all other RFP applicants that the Institute is recommending for approval.

Based on the foregoing:

The Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the charter proposal for the Family Life Academy Charter School II.

## **Background and Description**

While SUNY may still award a small number of charters pursuant to its traditional application process, amendments to the Act made additional charters to form new education corporations available only through an RFP process. The Institute received 25 total proposals to create new charter schools in response to the RFP issued on January 3, 2011. The current review cycle could

legally result in a maximum of 63 new charters approved by the SUNY Trustees, per Education Law subdivision 2852(9), 30 of which reflect charters that were available but not awarded in response to the August 2010 RFP. Two of the current 25 proposals were submitted in response to the expedited timeline provided for in the January 2011 RFP and subsequently approved, leaving 61 possible charters to be approved.

The Institute conducted a rigorous evaluation of the FLACS II proposal including academic, fiscal and legal soundness reviews. Pursuant to its protocols, the Institute has met with the applicant, the proposed board of trustees, which will oversee the school and a member of the school's community partner. In addition, members of SUNY Trustees' Education, College Readiness and Success Committee had an opportunity to interview the lead applicant and members of the founding board.

The mission the FLACS II would be as follows:

The Family Life Academy Charter School-II (FLACS-II), in conjunction with the Latino Pastoral Action Center and parents, seeks to empower all of its K-5 students, regardless of race, ethnicity, country of origin, socioeconomic status, and/or English language proficiency, to demonstrate mastery of the New York State standards, help them take responsibility for their own learning, and encourage them to explore and affirm human values. FLACS-II seeks to have an orderly, nurturing, dynamic and safe environment in which learning is engaging, meaningful, and joyful in preparing students to attend and successfully complete high school and college.

The school would implement the following key design elements in pursuit of its mission:

- an extended school day;
- a focus on literacy in alignment with Common Core State Standards;
- a focus on English language learners (“ELLs”) and immigrant students;
- active instructional leadership;
- rigorous assessment and accountability;
- data-driven planning;
- early interventions;
- a commitment to special education;
- differentiation of instruction;
- shared responsibility for learning;
- professional development that enriches teaching;
- consistent discipline;

- family involvement;
- a school culture and core values focused on excellence; and
- a focus on preparation for high school and beyond.

The founding group selected the Melrose section of the Bronx as the location for the proposed school for several reasons. First, at the original FLACS, which is located west of the proposed location for FLACS II in CSD 9, the school received nearly 100 applications from residents of CSDs 7 and 8 between 2009 and 2011; FLACS currently has 18 enrolled students from these areas. The proposal notes that parents of children on FLACS’ waiting list from the FLACS II neighborhood regularly approach staff with hopes of learning of an opening for enrollment.

FLACS II would have a total of 183 days of instruction for the 2012-2013 school year. The school day would run from 8:10 to 4:10 for teachers and from 8:15 to 3:30 for students in K-5<sup>th</sup> grade. As noted above, the proposed program reflects the founders’ intent to replicate the success of FLACS, which is in its tenth year of operation and serves 382 students in K-7<sup>th</sup> grade. Notably, 34% of FLACS student population are ELLs. FLACS has consistently performed better than its district of location and similar schools statewide on both the state English Language Arts (“ELA”) and math exams, which is illustrated below by tables that provide student performance data for the last three years.

<b>FLACS: 2009-10</b>							
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Testing Grades</b>	<b>School Percent Proficient</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Time Adjusted Percent Proficient<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent Free Lunch</b>	<b>Effect Size<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Percentile</b>
ELA	3-6	41.5	27.3	69.2	75.6	0.33	29
Math	3-6	56.1	32.2	91.2	75.6	0.48	39

<sup>1</sup> Effect Size is a statistical measure calculated by dividing the difference between the actual and predicted outcome by the standard deviation. It reflects the difference between a school’s attained and expected performance in each tested grade, relative to other schools with similar free-lunch statistics and tested grades. (The Effect Size for all grades is weighted by the number of students tested in each grade.) The school’s overall performance rating is based on the following Effect Size ranges: Above 0.79 - Higher than expected to a large degree; 0.50 to 0.79 - Higher than expected to a medium degree; 0.30 to 0.49 - Higher than expected to a small degree; 0.01 to 0.29 - Slightly higher than expected; -0.29 to -0.01 - Slightly lower than expected; -0.30 to -0.49 - Lower than expected to a small degree; -0.50 to -0.79 - Lower than expected to a medium degree; Below -0.79 - Lower than expected to a large degree.

<sup>2</sup> In 2009-10, the State Education Department (SED) raised its achievement standard, by increasing the scaled score cut off for proficiency or Level 3 performance on the English language arts and mathematics exams. In order to maintain a consistent standard for determining meeting the absolute and growth measures, the Institute requested that the school report 2009-10 results on these measures using a 650 scaled score cut-off, as SED had used a 650 cut-off in the previous few years. SED then refined the cut score for its own NCLB accountability system. While following the same principle of maintaining year-to-year consistency in cut scores, the state has also taken into account when the two exams were administered in 2010 compared to previous years. As the exams were administered later in the year, students had more learning opportunities prior to the exam. As such, SED set the cut scores slightly higher than 650 in each grade. For the purpose of evaluating the goals’ three absolute and growth measures, the Institute has adapted SED’s “time-adjusted” cut-offs. In developing the performance summaries for 2009-10, the “time-adjusted” cut offs are used where possible (the absolute and growth measures), while the previously released cut offs are used for all other measures.

In 2009-10, the most recent year for which data is available, with 41.5 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency on the ELA exam and 56.1 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency on the math exam, the school outperformed the district of location by 22.8 and 23.9 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. With 75.6 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, FLACS performed higher than expected to a small degree when compared to similar schools statewide in ELA, demonstrating an Effect Size of 0.33. On the math exam, the school also performed higher than expected to a small degree while demonstrating an Effect Size of 0.48.

<b>FLACS: 2008-09</b>						
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Testing Grades</b>	<b>School Percent Proficient</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Free Lunch</b>	<b>Effect Size<sup>ii</sup></b>	<b>Percentile</b>
ELA	3-5	86.8	54.8	76.6	1.28	77.5
Math	3-5	95.6	78.8	76.6	1.03	82.5

In 2008-09, with 86.8 percent of its students scoring at or above proficiency on the ELA exam and 95.6 percent of its students scoring at or above proficiency on the math exam, the school outperformed the district of location by 32 and 16.8 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. With 76.6 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, Family Life Academy performed higher than expected to a large degree when compared to similar schools statewide in ELA, demonstrating an Effect Size of 1.28. On the math exam, the school also performed higher than expected to a large degree while demonstrating an Effect Size of 1.03.

<b>FLACS: 2007-08</b>						
<b>Subject</b>	<b>Testing Grades</b>	<b>School Percent Proficient</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Free Lunch</b>	<b>Effect Size<sup>ii</sup></b>	<b>Percentile</b>
ELA	3-5	67.2	43.9	80.6	0.68	62.5
Math	3-5	90.4	71.4	80.6	0.94	77.5

In 2007-08, with 67.2 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency on the ELA exam and 90.4 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency on the math exam, the school outperformed the district of location by 23.3 and 19 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. With 80.6 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, Family Life Academy performed higher than expected to a medium degree when compared to similar schools statewide in ELA, demonstrating an Effect Size of 0.68. On the math exam, the school performed higher than expected to a large degree while demonstrating an Effect Size of 0.94.

The proposed school’s educational program would include instruction in ELA, math, social studies, science, music, art, physical education, health education, computers and science lab. FLACS II would use Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Journeys, a research-based program that provides resources for whole and small group instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, and comprehension. The school would use Saxon Mathematics and Houghton Mifflin Harcourt for social studies.

Like the school after which it is modeled, FLACS II will have a specific focus on supporting ELLs and immigrant students in the community. The school would implement an at-risk admissions factor

for ELLs. The school would utilize a Sheltered English Immersion model of its own design, based on the model used at Family Life Academy, and would adapt practices for ELLs from program models such as Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) and English for Students of Other Languages (ESOL). However, the main instructional method that FLACS II will utilize to serve ELLs will be using English as a Second Language (ESL). Various approaches to teaching ESL will be used to ensure that students acquire the English language skills needed to be proficient in English as well as succeed at a high level.

The primary instructional leader of FLACS II would be the principal. The school would have an active Leadership Team directly involved with promoting quality instruction and focused on high expectations for all students. The principal would also create an Instructional Team whose primary responsibility will be to support the faculty and staff. This team will expand as the school adds additional students and would eventually include the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, ESL teacher/coordinator, and special education teacher/coordinator and specialized consultants. This team would actively monitor instruction and would meet weekly to share findings and best practices, and implement plans to address any areas of concern. The constant monitoring and feedback would support teachers in examining decisions about their practice.

Professional development at FLACS II would focus on learning and sustaining improved student achievement. The topics would emerge from student data, research and its implication on student achievement, teacher knowledge of content, practice, and ongoing inquiry. Professional development would nurture collegiality, develop shared leadership, and equip teachers with the skills to hold all students to high academic standards. The applicant notes that the school would be responsive to the needs of the faculty and students, with opportunities for differentiation based on teacher strengths and needs. It would also utilize a teacher observation rubric to determine total staff and differentiated teacher needs.

The management structure of FLACS II would consist of the (a) school's board of trustees; (b) principal, who would report directly to the board; (c) director of finance and operations; (d) assistant principal; (e) instructional leadership team, which includes the principal and assistant principal, as well as the data specialist, ESL coordinator, special education coordinator, and instructional coaches; and (f) operations manager.

LPAC will be the sole partner organization of FLACS II. LPAC is the founder and visionary of Family Life Academy Charter School. LPAC now plans to expand its mission by replicating FLACS in the same spirit of promoting academic excellence for the poor, disenfranchised and otherwise at-risk minority population. As a result, LPAC will be the community sponsor of FLACS II and will acquire the necessary real estate and enter into a landlord/tenant agreement with the Bronx Spanish Evangelical Church.

The by-laws of FLACS II indicate that the school board would consist of not less than seven voting members. The proposed initial members that would serve on the proposed board of trustees are set forth below.

1. **Ms. Evelyn Castron** – worked in education since 1974 starting as an elementary school teacher and rising to the position of school superintendent in CSD 4; after retiring from the NYCDOE, she has worked as an educational consultant and currently serves on the Brooklyn Diocese Board of Education.

2. **Francisco Lugoviña** – founding team member and former chairman of the board of trustees of the Family Life Academy Charter School and member of the board of trustees of the Regents’ authorized John W. Lavelle Preparatory Charter School (authorized by the NYCDOE); has been in business in the Bronx for over 35 years; degree in Finance from Iona College.
3. **Greg Nannery** – law school graduate was has applied for admission to the New York Bar; taught law to high school students and has worked closely with young adults through the judicial system.
4. **Wanda Torres-Mercado** – Director of HEOP surpassing all performance goals and was recognized for her leadership by the State Education Department (“SED”); strong record in fiscal management and extensive experience in the management and administration of programs.
5. **Florence G. Wolpoff** – served as a guidance counselor and many other roles within the educational system and has personal insight as to the causal incidents affecting poor performance of students and how to reverse this trend; highly experienced in bilingual and special education programs.

As noted above, the applicant worked closely with LPAC to ensure the school would have adequate space to implement the educational program as proposed. In addition, the proposal includes evidence of support and commitment from the owner of the facility that is being proposed for use by the school. The Institute reserves the right to review and approve all facilities and proposed lease agreements.

The fiscal impact of FLACS II on the district of residence, the New York City School District, is summarized below.

<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Per Pupil Aid Rate Assumed</b>	<b>Per Pupil Aid Revenue Only</b>	<b>Total Budget for New York City (in billions)</b>	<b>(%) of Total NYC Ed. Budget</b>
100 (2011-12 school year – year 1)	\$13,527	\$1,352,700	\$19.007	0.007%
300 (2015-16 school year – year 5)	\$14,781	\$4,434,400	\$20.704	0.021%

The calculations above assume there will be no annual increase in per-pupil aid in years 1 and 2 (2012-13, 2013-14) and a three percent increase each year thereafter for the remainder of the charter period (2014-15 thru 2016-17). The NYCDOE yearly budget figures were accessed from the latest, December 2010, Financial Status Report (FSR) published on the NYCDOE website. No information was available for 2015-16 and 2016-17 so no increase in spending was assumed for that year. Using the moderately aggressive assumptions for per-pupil aid and revenue and the district’s four-year operational budgeting assumptions, along with the fundamentally conservative assumptions for years four and five of the proposed charter period, illustrates a maximum fiscal impact of the proposed school on the district.

It should be noted that the NYCDOE estimate used by the Institute in conducting its analysis is subject to unpredictable increases and decreases in any given year given the nature of per-pupil

funding for the district. While the school has included in its proposal estimated calculations accounting for special education revenue, federal Title I funds, other federal grants and/or funds provided by the district and to be received by the school, the Institute's calculations and analysis do not account for these sources of potential revenue.

The Institute finds that the fiscal impact of the proposed school on the New York City School District, public charter and nonpublic schools in the same geographic area would be minimal.

The Institute has notified the school district as well as public and private schools in the same geographic area of the proposed school and, as of the date of this report, has received no comments from these entities.

The applicant has conducted public outreach, in conformity with a thorough and meaningful public review process prescribed in the RFP, to solicit community input regarding the proposed school (Ed. Law §2852(9-a)(b)(ii)).

The RFP also contained minimum eligibility and preference criteria to reflect the requirements of Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a). The proposal met the eligibility requirements, as evidenced by the following:

- The proposal was complete and met the following basic criteria:
  - submitted by the appropriate deadline;
  - was complete, i.e., include a Transmittal Sheet, Proposal Summary and responses to all RFP requests;
  - individual responses adequately addressed each specific request; and
  - the proposal was coherent.
- The proposal met the standard for describing a quality educational program and provided sufficient evidence that the proposed school is likely to operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner, to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in Education Law subdivision 2850(2) *as well as* demonstrated a rigorous commitment to student achievement.
- The proposal included a viable plan to meet the enrollment and retention targets established by the SUNY Trustees for students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, and students who are eligible to participate in the federal free and reduced-price lunch program (as detailed in Request No. 24).
- The proposal provided evidence of public outreach that conforms to the process prescribed by the SUNY Trustees for the purpose of soliciting and incorporating community input regarding the proposed charter school.

As the FLACS II proposal met the eligibility criteria, the Institute's evaluation continued with a full review of the proposal, an interview of the founding team and requests for clarification and or amendments to the proposal. The review process then continued with an evaluation of the proposal in relation to the eleven Preference Criteria contained in the RFP for which proposals can earn credit as described in the RFP's Scoring Rubric. The purpose of the Scoring Rubric was to prioritize proposals in the event that the number of proposals meeting the SUNY Trustees' requirements exceeded the maximum number of charters to be issued in 2011. In the event of a tie for the last

charter both proposals will be rejected unless one applicant agreed to withdraw his or her proposal for consideration in a subsequent RFP. The preference criteria, which in addition to eligibility criteria and the overall high standards established by the SUNY Trustees, included the demonstration of the following in compliance with Education Law subdivisions 2852(9-a)(c)(i)-(viii):

- increasing student achievement and decreasing student achievement gaps in reading/language arts and mathematics;
- increasing high school graduation rates and focusing on serving specific high school student populations including, but not limited to, students at risk of not obtaining a high school diploma, re-enrolled high school drop-outs, and students with academic skills below grade level;
- focusing on the academic achievement of middle school students and preparing them for a successful transition to high school;
- utilizing high-quality assessments designed to measure a student's knowledge, understanding of, and ability to apply, critical concepts through the use of a variety of item types and formats;
- increasing the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;
- partnering with low performing public schools in the area to share best educational practices and innovations;
- demonstrating the management and leadership techniques necessary to overcome initial start-up problems to establish a thriving, financially viable charter school; and
- demonstrating the support of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located and the intent to establish an ongoing relationship with such school district.

While the Institute received a total of 25 proposals in response to its January 2011 RFP, only 14 have been recommended for approval including two in March 2011, which were approved by the SUNY Trustees. All of the 14 proposals recommended for approval met the eligibility criteria and were therefore assessed a score using the rubric contained in the RFP. The proposal for the Family Life Academy Charter School II earned a score of 35 preference points out of a possible total of 64. Based on this score and the other information and findings set forth herein, the Institute is recommending that the SUNY Trustees approve the proposal to establish the Family Life Academy Charter School II, which would not exceed the statutory limit in Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(a).

### **Findings**

Based on the comprehensive review of the proposals and interviews of the applicant and the proposed board of trustees, the Institute makes the following findings.

1. The charter school described in the proposal meets the requirements of Article 56 of the Education Law (as amended) and other applicable laws, rules, and regulations as reflected in (among other things):
  - the inclusion of appropriate policies and procedures for the provision of services and programs for students with disabilities and English language learners;
  - the required policies for addressing the issues related to student discipline, complaints, personnel matters and health services;
  - an admissions policy that complies with the Act, federal law and the U.S. Constitution;
  - the inclusion of the proposed by-laws for the operation of the school's board of trustees; and
  - the inclusion of an analysis of the projected fiscal and programmatic impact on surrounding public and private schools.
  
2. The applicant has demonstrated the ability to operate the school in an educationally and fiscally sound matter as reflected in (among other things):
  - the provision of an educational program that meets or exceeds the State performance standards;
  - the articulation of a culture of self-evaluation and accountability at both the administrative and board level;
  - the student achievement goals articulated by the applicant;
  - an appropriate roster of educational personnel;
  - a sound mission statement;
  - a comprehensive assessment plan;
  - the provision of sound start-up, first-year, and five-year budget plans;
  - a plan to acquire comprehensive general liability insurance to include any vehicles, employees, and property;
  - evidence of adequate community support for, and interest in, the charter school sufficient to allow the school to reach its anticipated enrollment;
  - the inclusion of descriptions of programmatic and independent fiscal audits, with fiscal audits occurring at least, annually;
  - the inclusion of a school calendar and school day schedule that provide at least as much instruction time during a school year as required of other public schools; and
  - the inclusion of methods and strategies for serving students with disabilities in compliance with all federal laws and regulations.

3. Granting the proposal is likely to: 1) improve student learning and achievement; and 2) materially further the purposes of the Act. This finding is reflected by (among other things):
  - the inclusion of a curriculum framework document that demonstrates how the proposed curriculum will ensure that students will meet or exceed the performance standards of the Board of Regents reflecting the adoption of the Common Core State Standards;
  - a comprehensive plan to assess student achievement through the use of State tests, externally-verifiable standardized tests and other diagnostic assessments;
  - an extended school year and school day;
  - a specific focus on English language learners, including an at-risk admissions preference for these students and robust programs and strategies to meet their needs;
  - programs to meet the needs of all students at risk of academic failure;
  - the inclusion of significant opportunities for professional development of the school's instructional staff prior the start of each school year and throughout the year;
  - a commitment to providing an educational program focused on outcomes, not inputs; and
  - an organizational structure with an explicit focus on instructional leadership to improve teaching and student learning.
4. The proposed charter school would meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets, as prescribed by the SUNY Trustees, of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the federal free and reduced price lunch program as required by Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(b)(i).

The data upon which to base the enrollment and retention targets mandated by the amendments to the Act was not available at the time the statute mandated the RFP be issued. As a result, the Institute developed internal evaluation criteria regarding the enrollment and retention of each class of student referenced in the amendments to the Act such that the Institute could make the determination that the applicant would meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets when developed. During the first year of the charter term, SUNY will develop such targets, and 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 proposed charter school would be located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.” The Institute will conduct separate analyses for setting enrollment and retention targets, respectively. The former analysis will be based on the demographic and classification characteristics of cohorts of students first entering the

school; the latter analysis will be based on the characteristics of cohorts of students leaving the school. The comparison will be to an individual school or schools within the district that are representative of the districts' relevant sub-populations. During each year in the charter period, the same methodology will be applied to each charter school to determine if it has met its district-based target. Based on the foregoing, the Institute finds that the proposals have rigorously demonstrated that the proposed charter schools would meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets, to be prescribed by SUNY during the first year of each charter in accordance with the amendments to the Act.

5. The applicant has conducted public outreach for the school, in conformity with a thorough and meaningful public review process prescribed by the SUNY Trustees, to solicit community input regarding the proposed charter school and to address comments received from the impacted community concerning the educational and programmatic needs of students in conformity with Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(b)(ii).
6. The Institute has determined that the proposal rigorously demonstrates the criteria and best satisfies the objectives contained within the RFP, and, therefore, is a "qualified application" within the meaning of Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(d) that should be submitted to the Board of Regents for approval.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

Based on its review and findings, the Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the proposal to establish the Family Life Academy Charter School II to open in the Bronx in September of 2012.

# Family Life Academy Charter School II

## Basic Identification Information

Lead Applicant(s):	Renee Willemsen-Goode
Management Co.:	None
Other Partners:	Latino Pastoral Action Center
Location (District):	New York City Community School District 8
Student Pop./Grades:	Opening with 100 students in K - 1 <sup>st</sup> grades; growing to 300 students K - 5 <sup>th</sup> grades
Opening Date:	September 2012

## School District of Proposed Location Profile

New York City School District 8			
Enrollment (2009-10):		31,184	
Percent (2009-10):			
African-American:		27	
Hispanic:		63	
Asian, White, Other:		10	
Percent Qualifying for Free or Reduced Priced Lunch (2009-010):		85	
English Language Arts (2009-10)		Mathematics (2009-10)	
Grade	Percent Proficient	Grade	Percent Proficient
3	39	3	46
4	36	4	53
5	38	5	55
6	29	6	42
7	26	7	42
8	27	8	33

Source: demographic data are from the New York State Accountability and Overview Report 2009-10; test data are from the 2009-10 results released on the New York City Department of Education's website.