



Charter Schools Institute  
*The State University of New York*

## **Summary of Findings and Recommendations**

---

*Proposals to establish:  
Icahn Charter School 6 and Icahn Charter School 7*

June 5, 2011

## Executive Summary

The proposals to establish the Icahn Charter School 6 (“Icahn 6”) and Icahn Charter School 7 (“Icahn 7”) were submitted to the Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) by lead applicants Julie Goodyear and Gail Golden 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.

Icahn 6 and Icahn 7 would join the existing network of schools modeled after the high performing, SUNY authorized, Carl Icahn Charter School 1. The mission of both schools would be to have “students graduate armed with the skills and knowledge to participate successfully in the most rigorous academic environments, and will have a sense of personal and community responsibility.” Icahn 6 and Icahn 7 would locate in facility space from the New York City Department of Education (“NYCDOE”) located in New York City Community School District (“CSD”) 9 (Bronx). The schools would open in the fall of 2012 serving 108 students in Kindergarten through 2<sup>nd</sup> grade and would add one grade each year thereafter through the initial charter period. The schools would reach their enrollment capacity of 252 students in Kindergarten through 6<sup>th</sup> grade in the final year of the proposed charter period and envision expanding through the 8<sup>th</sup> grade in the subsequent charter period if granted.

The schools would share services with the other schools in the Icahn network. The superintendent of the network would supervise each of the schools’ principals, and the network’s director of operations would oversee all non instructional functions. The schools would also implement the educational program in place at all of the other Icahn Charter Schools (all authorized by the SUNY Trustees), which is set forth below. Student performance data is presented below for the Icahn Charter Schools that have State assessment data.

The Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the charter applications for Icahn 6 and Icahn 7. The same board of trustees that oversees Icahn Charter Schools 1-5 is proposed to oversee Icahn 6 and 7 and would continue its affiliation with the Foundation for a Greater Opportunity which provides start-up support for all of the Icahn schools. Given that this board has successfully operated with a waiver from the SUNY rule prohibiting 40 percent of a schools board from serving as members of the same organization with respect to its affiliation with the Foundation for a Greater Opportunity, and has extensive knowledge and experience as a charter school board, the Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees grant the waiver again.

Consistent with the May 2010 amendments to the New York Charter Schools Act (the “Act”), the Institute finds: 1) that the proposals for the Icahn Charter Schools 6 and 7 each rigorously demonstrate 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 schools have each conducted thorough and meaningful public review processes to solicit community input regarding each proposal in accordance with the requirements in the RFP, which conform with Education Law subdivision 2852(9)(b)(ii); 3) the proposals are ones that best satisfy the objectives contained within the RFP based on the content of the proposals and their supporting documentation, and are therefore qualified within the meaning of Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(d); and 4) the Institute has scored each 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.

Based on the foregoing:

The Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the charter proposals for Icahn Charter School 6 and Icahn Charter School 7.

### **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 it 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 Icahn 6 and Icahn 7 proposals including academic, fiscal and legal soundness reviews. Pursuant to its protocols, the Institute has met with the applicant, the proposed board of trustees and other members of the founding team.

The mission of Icahn 6 and Icahn 7 is as follows: “Icahn Charter Schools 6 and 7, using the Core Knowledge curriculum developed by E.D. Hirsch, will provide students with a rigorous academic program offered in an extended day/year setting. Students will graduate armed with the skills and knowledge to participate successfully in the most rigorous academic environments, and will have a sense of personal and community responsibility.”

The founders would implement the following key design elements at each school in pursuit of their mission:

- effective use of the Core Knowledge Curriculum;
- small class sizes;
- longer school day and year;
- individualized instruction through the use of the Targeted Assistance program;
- rigorous and daily student assessments;
- a culture that celebrates learning; and
- enrichment opportunities for all students.

The curriculum for the schools is based on E. D. Hirsch’s Core Knowledge. The proposals include references to the pertinent research to support the use of this curriculum with at-risk students. The founding principal of the original Icahn Charter School 1, who is now superintendent of all of the Icahn Charter Schools, has extensive experience training teachers in the implementation of Core Knowledge and will be involved in training the teachers of the new schools on this curriculum. Likewise, core leaders within the Icahn Charter School (including its principal, business manager and staff developer) will join the superintendent to provide training for new staff prior to the opening of Icahn Charter Schools 6 and 7.

The SUNY Trustees have authorized five Icahn Charters Schools to date. Three of these schools currently have state testing data available for English Language Arts (“ELA”) and math, which is presented below. The Icahn Charter Schools have consistently demonstrated the ability to improve student learning and therefore further the purposes of the Act. In particular, as the tables below illustrate, the school have consistently outperformed the district of location and similar schools statewide based on the percent of students that qualify for the federal free lunch program. In fact, the schools surpassed their comparison school groups by wide margins in most years.

2009-10							
Icahn Charter School 1							
	Testing Grades	School Percent Proficient	District Percent Proficient	Time Adjusted Percent Proficient <sup>1</sup>	Percent Free Lunch	Effect Size <sup>2</sup>	Percentile
ELA	3-8	62.6	25.4	93	72	1.64	65
Math	3-8	87.4	36.4	99.1	72	2.02	94

Icahn Charter School 2							
	Testing Grades	School Percent Proficient	District Percent Proficient	Time Adjusted Percent Proficient	Percent Free Lunch	Effect Size	Percentile
ELA	3-4	83.3	35.6	96.6	50	2.15	94
Math	3-4	94.4	46.1	98.3	50	2.21	99

<sup>1</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.

<sup>2</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.

<b>Icahn Charter School 3</b>							
	<b>Testing Grades</b>	<b>School Percent Proficient</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Time Adjusted Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Free Lunch</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>	<b>Percentile</b>
ELA	3	58.3	30	68.8	65.1	1.01	58
Math	3	91.7	29.6	100	65.1	2.36	97

In 2009-10, the most recent year where testing data is available, with 62.6 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in ELA and 87.4 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in math, Icahn Charter School 1 exceeded the district of location by 37.2 and 51 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. In addition, with 72 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, the school performed higher than predicted to a large degree when compared to similar schools statewide in both ELA and math, demonstrating Effect Sizes of 1.64 and 2.02, respectively.

With 83.3 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in ELA and 94.4 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in math, Icahn Charter School 2 exceeded the district of location by 47.7 and 48.3 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. In addition, with 50 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, the school performed higher than predicted to a large degree when compared to similar schools statewide in both ELA and math, demonstrating Effect Sizes of 2.15 and 2.21, respectively.

With 58.3 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in ELA and 91.7 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in math, Icahn Charter School 3 exceeded the district of location by 28.3 and 62.1 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. In addition, with 65.1 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, the school performed higher than predicted to a large degree when compared to similar schools statewide in both ELA and math, demonstrating Effect Sizes of 1.01 and 2.36, respectively.

<b>2008-09</b>					
<b>Icahn Charter School 1</b>					
<b>Testing Grades</b>	<b>School Percent Proficient</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Free Lunch</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>	<b>Percentile</b>
3-8	94	52.2	63.6	2.24	92.5
3-8	99	72	63.6	1.35	92.5

<b>Icahn Charter School 2</b>					
<b>Testing Grades</b>	<b>School Percent Proficient</b>	<b>District Percent Proficient</b>	<b>Percent Free Lunch</b>	<b>Effect Size</b>	<b>Percentile</b>
3	100	66.5	52.1	1.8	99
3	100	90.9	52.1	1.21	99

In 2008-09, with 94 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in ELA and 99 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in math, Icahn Charter School 1 exceeded the district of location by 41.8 and 27 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. In addition, with 63.6 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, the school performed higher than predicted to a large degree when compared to similar schools statewide in both ELA and math, demonstrating Effect Sizes of 2.24 and 1.35, respectively.

With 100 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in ELA and math, Icahn Charter School 2 exceeded the district of location by 33.5 and 9.1 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. In addition, with 52.1 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, the school performed higher than predicted to a large degree when compared to similar schools statewide in both ELA and math, demonstrating Effect Sizes of 1.8 and 1.21, respectively.

2007-08					
Icahn Charter School 1					
Testing Grades	School Percent Proficient	District Percent Proficient	Percent Free Lunch	Effect Size	Percentile
3-8	85.1	38.5	66.8	2.00	87.5
3-8	97.6	61.4	66.8	1.64	92.5

In 2009-10, with 85.1 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in ELA and 97.6 percent of its students performing at or above proficiency in math, Icahn Charter School 1 exceeded the district of location by 46.6 and 36.2 percentage points in ELA and math, respectively. In addition, with 66.8 percent of its students eligible for the federal free lunch program, the school performed higher than predicted to a large degree when compared to similar schools statewide in both ELA and math, demonstrating Effect Sizes of 2.00 and 1.64, respectively.

The Icahn Charter Schools 6 and 7 by-laws each indicate that their school boards would consist of not less than 5 voting members, and not more than 25. The proposed initial members of the board of trustees of each school, who also serve as members of the board of trustees of Icahn Charter Schools 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are set forth below.

- 1. Carl C. Icahn** – President and Chairman, Icahn & Co.; Chairman of the Board, Starfire Holding Corporation; Trustee, Mt. Sinai School of Medicine and Mt. Sinai Hospital; member of the Board of Directors of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts; B.A., Princeton University.
- 2. Gail Golden** – Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of Lowestfare.com, Inc.; formerly Chief Executive Officer and President of Global Travel Marketing; Director and Secretary, Foundation for a Greater Opportunity.
- 3. Seymour Fliegel** – President of the Center for Educational Innovation-Public Education Association; formerly a teacher, assistant principal, principal, director of alternative education, deputy superintendent and superintendent in the New York City school system; member of the Advisory Boards of the Gilder Lehrman Institute of American History, Donna Hanover Giuliani’s Cool Schools, Public School Artworks and the Young Women’s Leadership School Foundation; member of the Board of Directors, Foundation for a Greater Opportunity.
- 4. Karen Mandelbaum** – Graduate of Kean Teacher’s college in New Jersey; member of

the Board of Directors, Women’s Division of the Albert Einstein Medical School; Vice President of the Board of Directors, Livingston Symphony Orchestra; member of the Board of Directors, ADL Women’s Division.

5. **Robert Sancho** – Vice President of Development and External Affairs, Bronx-Lebanon Hospital Center; formerly a teacher and deputy superintendent in the New York City school system; member of the Board of Directors, Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute; B.A., Inter-American University of Puerto Rico; M.S., Hunter College.
6. **Edward Shanahan** – President/Headmaster, Choate Rosemary Hall; formerly Dean of the College at Dartmouth College and Dean of Students at Wesleyan University; member of the Boards of Directors of St. Luke’s Education Foundation (Bronx, NY), Bermuda-based, Schools, Colleges, University Underwriters, Ltd. (SCUUL) and the Connecticut Association of Independent Schools (CAIS); President of the Board of Directors, Foundation for a Greater Opportunity.
7. **Tina March** – Chief Financial Officer, Icahn Management Co.; B.A., Dickinson College; M.B.A., Rutgers University.
8. **Keith Cozza** – Chief Compliance Officer, Icahn Capital L.P. and Chief Financial Officer, Icahn Associates Corp; B.S, University of Dayton.
9. **Julie Goodyear** – Executive Director, Foundation for a Greater Opportunity and the Icahn Scholars Program; formerly Associate Director of Admissions, Choate Rosemary Hall; B.A., New York University; M.A.L.S., Wesleyan University.

The applicants have worked closely with the NYCDOE to ensure the schools would be provided public facility space if approved. The founding team has demonstrated an ability to secure private space if public space is not available and has presented a viable plan for doing so. Any NYCDOE space would have to be approved through the new provisions of the Education Law related to the co-location of charter schools. In addition, the Institute reserves the right to review and approve all facilities, and, pursuant to the Act, would have to hold a hearing on behalf of the SUNY Trustees prior to each school occupying district school space.

The fiscal impact of Icahn 6 and 7 each on the district of residence, the New York City School District, is summarized below.

Number of Students	Per Pupil Aid Rate Assumed	Per Pupil Aid Revenue Only	Total Budget for New York City (in billions)	(%) of Total NYC Ed. Budget
108 (2011-12 school year – year 1)	\$13,527	\$1,460,916	\$19.007	0.008%
252 (2015-16 school year – year 5)	\$14,781	\$3,724,812	\$20.704	0.018%

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 each 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 each 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 each 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 schools. On May 26, 2011, the Institute received positive comments on each proposal from the NYC Schools Chancellor as follows: "The proposals are replications of existing . . . high performing charter school. Chancellor Dennis Walcott recommends this charter application to support the children of New York City."

The applicants have conducted public outreach for each school, in conformity with a thorough and meaningful public review process prescribed in the RFP, to solicit community input regarding the proposed schools (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). Each proposal met the eligibility requirements, as evidenced by the following:

- Each 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 proposals were coherent.
- Each 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.
- Each 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).
- Each 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 Icahn 6 and Icahn 7 proposals each met the eligibility criteria, the Institute's evaluation continued with a full review of the proposals, an interview of the founding team and proposed boards of trustees, and requests for clarification and or amendments to each proposal. The review process

then continued with an evaluation of each 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 proposals for the Icahn Charter School 6 and Icahn Charter School 7 each earned a score of 37 preference points out of a possible total of 64. Based on these scores and the other information and findings set forth herein, the Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the proposals to establish the Icahn Charter School 6 and Icahn Charter School 7, 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 applicants and the proposed boards of trustees, the Institute makes the following findings.

1. The charter school described in each 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 applicants have demonstrated the ability to operate each 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 daily 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 each 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 specifies 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;
  - robust Targeted Assistance programs to meet the needs of 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. Each 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 applicants have conducted public outreach for each 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 each 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 proposals to establish the Icahn Charter School 6 and Icahn Charter School 7 to open in the Bronx in September of 2012.

## Icahn Charter Schools 6 and 7

### Basic Identification Information

Lead Applicant(s):	Julie Goodyear and Gail Golden
Management Co.:	None
Other Partners:	None
Location (District):	New York City Community School District 9
Student Pop./Grades:	Opening with 108 students in K - 2 <sup>nd</sup> grades; growing to 252 students K -6 <sup>th</sup> grades
Opening Date:	September 2012

### School District of Proposed Location Profile

New York City School District 9			
Enrollment (2009-10):		34,694	
Percent (2009-10):			
African-American:		33	
Hispanic:		64	
Asian, White, Other:		3	
Percent Qualifying for Free or Reduced Priced Lunch (2009-010):		91	
English Language Arts (2009-10)		Mathematics (2009-10)	
Grade	Percent Proficient	Grade	Percent Proficient
3	28	3	37
4	31	4	39
5	27	5	42
6	23	6	37
7	19	7	35
8	24	8	31

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.