



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

2014-15 School Evaluation Report

New Roots Charter School

VISIT DATE: MAY 12-13, 2015

REPORT ISSUED: JULY 21, 2015

SUNY Charter Schools Institute
41 State Street, Suite 700
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 445-4250
(518) 320-1572 (fax)
www.newyorkcharters.org

INTRODUCTION

This School Evaluation Report presents the school’s 2013-14 Performance Review and Summaries, which provide an analysis of the attainment of the key academic goals in the school’s Accountability Plan. Following these achievement results, the report offers an analysis of evidence collected during the school visit on May 12-13, 2015. While the SUNY Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) conducts a comprehensive review of evidence related to all the State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks (the “SUNY Renewal Benchmarks”) near the end of a charter term, most mid-cycle school evaluation visits focus on a subset of these benchmarks. This subset, the Qualitative Education Benchmarks, addresses the academic success of the school and the effectiveness and viability of the school organization. They provide a framework for examining the quality of the educational program, focusing on teaching and learning (i.e., curriculum, instruction, and assessment), as well as leadership, organizational capacity and board oversight. The Institute uses the established criteria on a regular basis to provide schools with a consistent set of expectations leading up to renewal.

The appendix to the report contains a School Overview with descriptive information about the school, including enrollment and demographic data, as well as historical information regarding the life of the school. It also provides background information on the conduct of the visit, including information about the evaluation team and puts the visit in the context of the school’s current charter cycle. Finally, the appendix displays the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks.

The report below provides benchmark evidence to support these conclusions in order to highlight areas of concern. The Institute intends this selection of information to be an exception report. As such, limited detail and evidence about positive elements of the educational program are not an indication that the Institute does not fully recognize evidence of program effectiveness. This report does not contain an overall rating or comprehensive indicator that would specify at a glance the school’s prospects for renewal; however, it does summarize the various strengths of the school and notes areas in need of improvement based on the Qualitative Education Benchmarks.

SCHOOL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Opening Information

Date Initial Charter Approved by SUNY Trustees	September 8, 2008
Date of School Opening	September 7, 2009

Location and 2014-15 Enrollment

Address	District	Facility	Enrollment	Grades
116 North Cayuga St., Ithaca, NY	Ithaca	Private	148	9-12

2013-14 School Performance Review

Performance Summary

In 2013-14, the first year of its three year Accountability Period, New Roots Charter School (“New Roots”) did not meet its key academic Accountability Plan goals in English language arts (“ELA”) and mathematics as measured against New York State’s college and career readiness standard. New Roots also fell short of meeting its high school graduation and college preparation goals. The school met its science, social studies, and No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) goals.

English language arts

During 2013-14, New Roots did not meet its ELA goal according to the three available measures in its Accountability Plan calibrated to the state’s college and career readiness standard, currently defined as achieving a score of at least 75 on the Regents English exam or fully meeting Common Core expectations on the Regents Exam in English Language Arts (Common Core). With 49 percent of the school’s 2010 Accountability Cohort meeting the standard, New Roots fell short of its target of 75 percent proficiency. The school Accountability Performance Level (“APL”) fell short of both the state’s Annual Measureable Objective (“AMO”) and the Ithaca City School District’s (the “district’s”) APL.

Mathematics

According to the three available measures calibrated to the state’s college and career readiness standard (currently defined as achieving a score of at least 80 on the Regents Integrated Algebra exam or fully meeting Common Core expectations on the state’s Algebra 1 (Common Core) exam), New Roots failed to meet its mathematics goal during 2013-14. With 26 percent of students in the school’s 2010 Accountability Cohort scoring at or above the college and career readiness standard, the school fell short of its target of 75 percent. The school’s APL in mathematics did not meet or exceed the state’s AMO nor did it meet or exceed the district’s APL.

Science

New Roots met its science goal during 2013-14. With 89 percent of its 2010 Accountability Cohort scoring at or above proficiency on a Regents science exam, the school met its absolute benchmark of 75 percent proficiency. The school also exceeded the district’s secondary science proficiency rate of 82 percent.

Social Studies

New Roots met its social studies goal during 2013-14 when it met its benchmarks on all four measures under the goal. With 83 percent of the school’s Accountability Cohort achieving proficiency on the Regents U.S. History exam, the school met its absolute target of 75 percent and outperformed the district’s proficiency rate by five percentage points. With 86 percent of the 2010 Accountability Cohort meeting the proficiency standard on the Regents global history exam, the

school exceeded its absolute proficiency benchmarks of 75 percent and exceeded the district's performance on the exam by nine percentage points.

NCLB

New Roots met its NCLB goal as it has not been identified as a school requiring a local assistance plan, or as a priority or focus school.

High School Graduation

New Roots fell short of meeting its high school graduation goal during 2013-14, as it had during 2012-13, according to the five available measures under this goal. The school did not meet its benchmarks on the two leading indicators for high school graduation: New Roots promoted 70 percent of the school's 9th and 10th graders to the subsequent grade during 2013-14, falling short of the target of 75 percent. The school did not meet its second leading indicator with only 46 percent of the school's 2012 cohort passing at least three of the Regents exams required for graduation by the end of the 2013-14 school year falling far short of its 75 percent benchmark.

New Roots graduated only 51 percent of its 2010 graduation cohort at the end of 2013-14 and the school did not meet its absolute target of a 75 percent graduation rate. The school also failed to meet or exceed the district's graduation rate of 84 percent. New Roots graduated 64 percent of its 2009 five year graduation cohort falling far short of its target of 95 percent.

College Preparation

New Roots did not meet its college preparation goal. Of the school's 26 graduates, all were accepted to a two year or four year college program before the end of their senior year at the school; however, only 17 students matriculated into college for the 2014-15 school year resulting in a matriculation rate of 65 percent and falling 10 percentage points below the school's target. With 77 percent of New Roots' graduates earning college level credit through concurrent enrollment at local colleges, the school exceeded its target of 75 percent for this measure. In contrast, only one of the school's graduates met the state's aspirational performance standard by graduating after having met the state's college and career readiness standards in both ELA and mathematics.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY New Roots Charter High School



	2010-11		MET	2011-12				MET	2012-13				MET
	2007 Cohort N	%		2008 Cohort N	%				2009 Cohort N	%			
English Language Arts													
ABSOLUTE MEASURES													
1. Each year, 65 percent of students will score at least 75 on the Regents English exam.	N	%		32	96.9		YES	53	75.5		YES		
2. Each year, 65 percent of students who scored at Level 1 or 2 on their NYS 8 th grade ELA exam will score at least 75 on the Regents English exam.	Low Performing Entrants N	%		Low Performing Entrants N	%			Low Performing Entrants N	%				
	N	%		NA	NA		NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	
3. Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	PI	AMO		PI	AMO		YES	APL	AMO		NO		
				194	188			130	163				
COMPARATIVE MEASURE													
4. Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) in Regents English of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the	Comparison: Ithaca CSD School District			Comparison: Ithaca CSD School District				Comparison: Ithaca CSD School District					
				96.9	84.0		YES	75.5	NA		NA	NA	
GROWTH MEASURES													
5. Each year, under the state's high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state's median growth.	2009 Cohort N	Target	Result	2010 Cohort N	Base	Target	Result	2011 Cohort N	Base	Target	Result		
				37	60.7	60.8	63.1	43	68.4	68.5	69	YES	
			-				YES						
Mathematics													
ABSOLUTE MEASURES													
1. Each year, 65 percent of students in the high school Accountability Cohort will meet the college	N	%		32	90.6		YES	53	83		YES		
2. Each year, 65 percent of students who scored at Level 1 or 2 on their NYS 8 th grade Math exam will score at least 80 on the Regents Math exam.	Low Performing Entrants N	%		Low Performing Entrants N	%		NA	Low Performing Entrants N	%		NA	NA	
	N	%		NA	NA		NA	NA	NA		NA	NA	
3. Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on the Regents English exam of students completing their fourth year in the Accountability Cohort will meet the Annual Measurable Objective	PI	AMO		PI	AMO		YES	APL	AMO		NO		
				188	186			108	142				
COMPARATIVE MEASURE													
4. Each year, the Accountability Performance Level (APL) on a New York State Regents mathematics exam of students in the fourth year of their high school Accountability Cohort will exceed the APL of comparable students from the local school district	Comparison: Ithaca CSD School District			Comparison: Ithaca CSD School District				Comparison: Ithaca CSD School District					
				90.6	80		YES	83	NA		NA	NA	
5. Each year, under the state's high school Growth Model (under development) the relative growth of selected students will exceed the state's median growth.	2009 Cohort N	Base	Target	Result	2010 Cohort N	Base	Target	Result	2011 Cohort N	Base	Target	Result	
					37	46.0	46.1	50.7	43	57.8	57.9	56.2	
							YES					NO	

Data Sources: New York State and City data, workbooks submitted by schools and databases compiled by the Institute.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY New Roots Charter High School



	2010-11			MET	2011-12			MET	2012-13			MET		
	Cohort	N	% promoted		Cohort	N	% promoted		Cohort	N	% promoted			
High School Graduation														
ABSOLUTE MEASURES														
1. Each year, 75 percent of students in first and second year high school Total Graduation Cohorts will earn at least ten credits (if 44 needed for graduation) or five credits (if 22 needed for graduation) each year.	2007	N	%*		2008	32	84	YES	2009	66	67	NO		
	2008	N	%*		2009	49	82	YES	2010	52	83	YES		
	2009	N	%*		2010	37	75	YES	2011	46	85	YES		
	2010	N	%*		2011	36	86	YES	2012	34	85	YES		
	All	N	%*		All	154	81.7	YES	All	198	78.5	YES		
2. Each year, 75 percent of students will score at least 65 on at least three different Regents exams required for graduation by the completion of their second year in the cohort.	2009 Cohort N % passing ≥ 3 Regents				2010 Cohort N % passing ≥ 3 Regents				2011 Cohort N % passing ≥ 3 Regents					
					53 41.5%			NO	46 59.0%			NO		
3. Each year, 75 percent of students will graduate after the completion of their fourth year.	2007 Cohort N %				2008 Cohort N %				2009 Cohort N %					
					34 70.6%			NO	66 66.7%			NO		
4. Each year, 95 percent of students will graduate after the completion of their fifth year.	2006 Cohort N % Graduating				2007 Cohort N % Graduating				2008 Cohort N % Graduating					
									36 66.7%			NO		
COMPARATIVE MEASURE														
5. Each year, the percent of students graduating after the completion of their fourth year will exceed that of the local school district.	Comparison: Ithaca City Schools School District				Comparison: Ithaca City Schools School District				Comparison: Ithaca City Schools School District					
					70.6 78			NO	66.7 NA			NA		
College Preparation														
COMPARATIVE MEASURES														
1. Each year, the average performance of students in the 10th grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT tests in Critical Reading and Mathematics.	Reading	N	PSAT	PSAT	Reading	31	64	41.2	YES	Reading	26	44.2	45.4	NO
	Math	N	PSAT	PSAT	Math	31	35	42.0	NO	Math	26	41.9	46.5	NO
2. Each year, the average performance of students in the 12th grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics.	N School State				N School State				N School State					
	Reading				Reading	20	561	483	YES	Reading	29	537	483	YES
	Math				Math	20	484	500	NO	Math	29	517	500	YES
SCHOOL DESIGNED MEASURES														
3. College Preparation Each year, 75 percent of graduating students will demonstrate their preparation for college by passing an Advanced Placement (AP) exam, a College Level	N %				N %				N %					
					32 31%			NO	53 32%			NO		
4. College Attainment and Achievement 75 percent of students will matriculate into a 2- or 4-year college.	N %				N %				N %					
					24 71%			NO	44 48%			NO		

Data Sources: New York State and City data, workbooks submitted by schools and databases compiled by the Institute.

Benchmark Conclusions and Evidence

Instructional Leadership. Structurally, New Roots has adequate instructional leadership to support the development of teachers, but leaders lack sufficient training to guide teachers in effectively implementing the exploratory, discovery based lessons that align with the school’s vision.

- New Roots’ instructional leadership team consists of the principal, two assistant principals and an academic coordinator. The academic coordinator also has responsibilities as the school’s lead science teacher; the assistant principals have additional academic coordinating duties as well, including one who is responsible for coordinating all of the school’s special education services. The principal oversees the instructional leadership team’s coaching activities and norms observations and expectations for teacher performance. The size of the instructional leadership team should be sufficient to support the development of the school’s small teaching staff, but the additional responsibilities and lack of training prevent instructional leaders from focusing fully on improving teacher performance.
- Instructional coaches and teachers develop performance goals and monitor progress toward meeting them. The goals reflect high expectations for students, e.g., 75 percent of students will score at or above proficiency on an interim or Regents exam. Instructional leaders monitor teachers’ performance against these goals mid-year and at the end of the school year. Depending on performance levels at the time of the mid-year evaluation, teachers and leaders may revise the goal for the second half of the school year by ramping up expectations. Teachers receive clear written feedback that includes analysis of pedagogical skill and performance against identified goals.
- Leaders provide sustained coaching to teachers while providing extra attention to new and struggling teachers. Although instructional leaders identify active learning and peer-to-peer interaction as a school-wide priority, the visit team found little evidence of effective lessons that included active student learning. Early in the school’s existence, New Roots contracted with Expeditionary Learning Schools (“EL”) to implement inquiry-based, interdisciplinary learning. Because of budget restrictions, the school has not renewed its contract with EL but endeavored to maintain this approach to teaching and learning. Teachers report needing more support to implement the exploratory, discovery based lessons that align with the school’s vision. The instructional leaders lack adequate training and experience with this model and teachers require more support to effectively implement student-centered, interdisciplinary lessons.
- Teachers have common planning time once per week within content areas and across grade levels and report that this time is sufficient for planning, coordination, and conferencing.
- The school’s professional development priority for this year focused on developing and implementing lessons with active learning roles for students. Professional development sessions during the school year focused on developing strong learning targets for lessons and

making connections across different curricular areas. These foci align with the school's vision for pedagogy.

Use of Assessment Data. Beyond interim assessments, the school's assessment system lacks the necessary precision to identify programmatic weaknesses and implement appropriate mid-course corrections.

- New Roots has an assessment system that it uses to monitor individual student progress toward mastery of specific skills and performance indicators, and the school uses data from quarterly interim assessments to evaluate teacher performance. Teachers implement assessments that include performance tasks as well as standard format assessments. Teachers are solely responsible for aligning these assessments and specific learning targets to state performance standards and the rigor of relevant Regents exams.
- Throughout the school, teachers regularly use formative assessments and other strategies to check student understanding. These practices link to the curriculum and could serve as a progress monitoring strategy to inform re-teaching. However, school leaders do not require teachers to routinize these practices. As a result, these practices do not consistently and effectively identify content and skills for re-teaching.
- The school administers interim assessments at the end of each quarter in all core subject areas. Several staff members comprise an academic leadership team as well as an instructional leadership team, whose responsibilities include monitoring of the results of these assessments. The academic leadership team uses the assessment results to provide oversight of curriculum planning and teachers' professional learning plans.
- Assessment data is not widely disseminated and the school has not determined which information is most appropriate for monitoring student performance. The school plans to begin managing data, but currently no member of the staff is solely responsible to make student performance or outcome data easily accessible and consistently utilized to inform strategies and decisions.
- Teachers use various forms of evidence, including assessments, to inform their instruction. This includes anecdotal and observational data, student work, and group projects. Policies and expectations for how and when teachers will use data to monitor their lesson planning and curriculum adjustments is not explicit or systematic, therefore the use of data across the school is inconsistent.
- Parents receive information regarding students' progress through progress reports, individualized credit recovery plans for specific students and conferences; however, not all students consistently receive accurate information regarding progress toward graduation. New Roots hosts parent conferences annually, but the school lacks a shared expectation for participation. School leaders do not monitor teachers' efforts to ensure high levels of participation.

Curriculum. Though the school’s curriculum supports teachers in instructional planning insofar as teachers know what to teach and when to teach it, teachers need more support in planning to implement projects and learning expeditions while addressing students’ skill deficiencies.

- The school includes elements of the EL model in its approach to instruction, which includes specific instructional strategies, as well as methods for creating unit plans that incorporate experiential learning, authentic real world content and data gathering. While leaders express this feature as a core element of the school’s curriculum design, few teachers have received adequate professional development and support to implement the EL model.
- New Roots implements a curriculum that originates from state learning standards, Education for Sustainability standards, and Environmental Roundtable’s curriculum. This content serves as the focus of unit and expedition planning, interdisciplinary projects and daily lessons. The school engages local higher education experts to assist in the selection and development of aspects of the curriculum, such as math and environmental studies.
- Teachers use interim and summative assessment results from the prior year to develop and revise scope and sequence documents. Each course contains a consistently developed curriculum map with essential questions, overarching learning goals, specific learning targets and specific projects. With the curricular documents detailing the core competencies in which New Roots expects students to achieve mastery guiding lesson planning, teachers know what to teach and when to teach it.
- The school’s process for assessing the quality of the curriculum is not systematic and is not consistently applied. The learning targets represent a useful tool wherein leaders may evaluate the curriculum to determine alignment to the standards or goals of the curriculum, or to determine whether the curriculum is developmentally appropriate for students. However, leaders have not articulated or consistently implemented a process for conducting this evaluation of the curriculum across all content areas.

Pedagogy. Teachers struggle to implement lessons that align with the school’s vision of active, student-centered instruction that prepares students for college and career.

- Teachers plan and deliver purposeful lessons that align to the school’s curriculum (16 of 18 classes observed). New Roots endeavors to plan and implement lessons requiring students to engage actively in learning. Although instructional leaders have identified this as a school-wide professional development priority based on observation and student outcome data, only a few teachers consistently and fully implement this model.
- A slight majority of teachers effectively use checks for student understanding (10 of 18 classes observed). In classes where teachers do not effectively check for student understanding, teachers either use questioning for factual recall or to check in on progress toward completing the activity to admonish students to finish. In other classes, teachers use cold calling and student conferencing to gauge student understanding of the material. In one class, with students working in small groups, the teacher occasionally called together the liaison from each

group and provided information or instructions to adjust instruction based on information the teacher gathered during student conferences.

- Few teachers include opportunities for students to engage in higher order thinking and develop deep understanding of the lesson material (5 of 18 classes observed). In those cases, teachers ask students to relate the lesson material to real world problems often focused on an environmental issue that is locally observable and understood by the students. In most cases, teachers require students to provide factual recall. Where students struggle, teachers provide the appropriate response to move the lesson forward rather than adjust instruction to address student misunderstanding.
- A majority of teachers engage students in lesson activities and maintain classroom environments that focus on academic success (12 of 18 classes observed). Despite a school-wide policy that students must power off cell phones upon entry into the school, some teachers tolerate texting and other low-level misbehavior such as chatting. Occasionally, teachers allow students to opt out of learning.

At-Risk Students. Inconsistent data reporting and monitoring continues to impede New Roots' ability to address the educational needs of at-risk students effectively. As is the case in the academic program overall, the school does not use assessment data to evaluate the effectiveness of its intervention programs.

- Despite bearing primary responsibility for monitoring and tracking students' learning activity, advisory teachers do not regularly consult student assessment data to monitor learning progress.
- New Roots uses a model linked to the advisory structure for analyzing students who are off track and determining which students require intervention. As students with Individualized Education Programs ("IEPs") enroll at the school, New Roots schedules an IEP meeting to determine the proper placement and programming for each student. The school provides afterschool tutoring, Saturday school, as well as personalized intervention plans for students who are off track in their coursework. Staff designed and added a math lab course to provide additional support to students that have demonstrated low Regent exam scores and/or are off track in their courses from the prior year. Evidence of the effectiveness of the math lab program is not available at this time.
- The student success team meets regularly to develop individualized intervention plans and monitor student progress.
- Data reporting and monitoring is inconsistent. The school does not regularly conduct data cycles that include systematic progress monitoring and adjusting plans based on the result of interventions, and the school has yet to implement a plan to hire a data manager.
- The school evidences pockets of communication between classroom teachers and at-risk program staff regarding student progress on intervention plans; however, a time-bound consistent method for communicating progress to all relevant teachers does not exist. New

Roots does not ensure all teachers are aware of individual student progress on intervention plans.

- The school has a plan to identify and support English language learners but does not currently enroll any students who require English language acquisition supports.

Organizational Capacity. The school carries out its day-to-day operations well, but lacks the capacity and resources to act with urgency to improve student achievement outcomes. Limited financial resources create budgetary constraints at a time the school requires additional resources for its academic program.

- New Roots has established an administrative structure that should enable the school to carry out its mission. The principal oversees a team of instructional leaders that provides coaching to the teaching staff. The operations manager is responsible for maintaining the school facility, ensuring teachers' access to instructional materials, and monitoring the school's finances. The school's dean implements the school's discipline policy. This structure allows the principal and instructional coaches to focus on teaching and learning.
- New Roots' enrollment remains below the 20 percent collar allowable in its charter contract, resulting in per-pupil revenue below budget projections. In addition to eliminating some staff positions, New Roots reduced some roles to part-time to manage costs. Despite cuts, the principal and board have prioritized program needs and are currently conducting a hiring search for additional staff members to analyze student performance data systematically after having prioritized program needs in consultation with the school's board.
- The Institute issued a violation letter on June 4, 2015 regarding the enrollment level. If the 2015-16 actual enrollment for the 1st quarter is not within the collar limits, a corrective action plan will be initiated to remedy the enrollment deficiency. Low enrollment makes it more difficult to achieve academic and financial plans. The Institute received – and is very concerned about - the Application and Admissions summary that reported the projected enrollment of only 114 students. With a chartered enrollment of 200 students, that is a 43% deficit. This situation requires immediate and constant attention by the school leader and board.
- The school retains a majority of its staff each year; however, the principal struggles to find high quality teachers and other staff members. One teacher is on a performance improvement plan.
- Despite a clear advisory curriculum and related professional development sessions, not all students consistently receive information about their progress toward meeting graduation requirements as a result of the school's lacking capacity in this area.
- The school is critically evaluating its programmatic supports to 9th and 10th graders after recognizing deficiencies in performance and student engagement in those grades. Leaders are considering multiple changes to the program including different assessments and changes to the master schedule to better meet the learning needs of students. Although the instructional leaders discussed the need for changes to improve the school's program, New Roots has not implemented any changes designed to improve student outcomes.

Board Oversight. Despite implementing thoughtful action plans to address deficiencies in the educational program, the New Roots board's efforts have not ensured that the school consistently achieves its Accountability Plan goals.

- The New Roots board utilizes multiple committees to monitor the school's academic and fiscal health as it works to achieve the school's mission. The board continually monitors the school's interim academic performance as well as graduation and college attainment rates. In consultation with the school's superintendent, the board has implemented action plans to address perceived deficiencies.
- Trustees closely monitor the school's financial health and, at the time of the visit, reported a positive outlook. The SUNY Fiscal Dashboard reports that the school has slipped from being "fiscally strong" for three years to "fiscally adequate" as of June 30, 2014.
- The school's superintendent provides regular updates about the school's academic program, including data about students' progress toward meeting graduation requirements. When necessary and at the board's request, academic departments have presented information at board meetings to supplement the board's close monitoring of the program. Notwithstanding this close monitoring, the board has a plan in place to make the school's data reports more systematic and consistent.
- The board has established priorities that they hope will ensure the success of New Roots' students. It regularly monitors the school's implementation of its action plan and monitors sufficient information, including academic outcome data and financial indicators, to develop midcourse corrections when necessary. Despite these efforts, the school struggles to achieve its Accountability Plan goals.

APPENDIX
SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Mission Statement

New Roots Charter School will prepare our diverse student body to meet the challenges of citizenship, work and life-long learning in the 21st century. Our interdisciplinary academic program will feature hands-on, community-based learning that supports students in solving real-world problems. New Roots Charter School students will earn a Regents diploma and demonstrate readiness for higher education by earning college credit and creating a graduation portfolio that demonstrates that they have met or exceeded all 28 New York State Learning Standards. Our school community will create a model of secondary education that integrates best practices in sustainability education with those proven to support educational equity.

Student Demographics¹

	2012-13		2013-14		2014-15 ²
	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of Ithaca CSD Enrollment	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of Ithaca CSD Enrollment	Percent of School Enrollment
Race/Ethnicity					
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0	1
Black or African American	6	10	7	10	8
Hispanic	5	5	2	6	1
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2	12	3	13	3
White	79	67	81	66	81
Multiracial	9	5	6	6	6
Special Populations					
Students with Disabilities	20	13	24	12	15
English Language Learners	0	4	0	5	0
Free/ Reduced Lunch					
Eligible for Free Lunch	41	24	47	26	-- ³
Eligible for Reduced-Price Lunch	9	6	1	4	--
Economically Disadvantaged	53	34	57	35	60

¹ Source: 2012-13 and 2013-14 New York State School Report Cards.

² The Institute derived the 2014-15 Students with Disabilities, ELL and Economically Disadvantaged statistics from the school's October 2014 student enrollment report to NYSED (2014-15 BEDS Report). District data are not yet available. Because NYSED releases data up to a full year after the conclusion of any one school year, the data presented in this table may differ from current information reported by the school and included in this report.

³ School FRPL enrollment data for 2014-15 are not available.

School Characteristics

School Year	Chartered Enrollment	Actual Enrollment ⁴	Original Chartered Grades	Actual Grades
2009-10	125	100	9-10	9-10
2010-11	175	115	9-11	9-11
2011-12	225	171	9-12	9-12
2012-13	200	191	9-12	9-12
2013-14	200	151	9-12	9-12
2014-15	200	148	9-12	9-12

Board of Trustees⁵

Board Member Name	Position
Dr. Jason Hamilton	Chair/President
Dr. Synnove Heggoy	Secretary
Conrad Metcalfe	Trustee
Joseph Wilson	Trustee
Catherine Thompson	Trustee
Kati Torello	Trustee
Jennifer Bokaer-Smith	Trustee
Dr. Roger Richardson	Trustee
Tina Nilsen-Hodges	Trustee Ex-Officio

School Leadership History

School Year(s)	School Leader(s) Name and Title(s)
2009-10 to Present	Tina Nilsen-Hodges, Principal and Superintendent

School Visit History

School Year	Visit Type	Evaluator (Institute/External)	Date
2009-10	First Year Visit	Institute	March 25, 2010
2010-11	Evaluation Visit	Institute	May 17-19, 2012
2013-14	Initial Renewal Visit	Institute	October 8-9, 2013
2014-15	Evaluation Visit	Institute	May 12-13, 2015

⁴ Source: The Institute's official enrollment binder. (Figures may differ slightly from New York State School Report Cards, depending on date of data collection.)

⁵ Source: Institute records at the time of the visit.

CONDUCT OF THE SCHOOL EVALUATION VISIT

School Visit Team

Date(s) of Visit	Evaluation Team Member	Title
May 12-13, 2015	Jeffrey Wasbes	Executive Deputy Director for Accountability
	David Montes de Oca	External Consultant

Context of the Visit

Charter Cycle	
Charter Term	1 st Year of Three-Year Subsequent Charter Term
Accountability Period ⁶	2 nd Year of Three-Year Accountability Period
Anticipated Renewal Visit	Fall 2016

⁶ Because the SUNY Trustees make a renewal decision in the last year of a charter term, the Accountability Period ends in the next to last year of the charter term. For initial renewals, the Accountability Period is the first four years of the charter term. For subsequent renewals, the Accountability Period includes the last year of the previous charter term through the next to last year of the current charter term.

State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks

Version 5.0, May 2012

Introduction

The State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks¹ (the “SUNY Renewal Benchmarks”) serve two primary functions at renewal:

- They provide a framework for the Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) to gather and evaluate evidence to determine whether a school has made an adequate case for renewal. In turn, this evidence assists the Institute in deciding if it can make the required legal and other findings in order to reach a positive recommendation for renewal. For example, the various benchmarks that the Institute uses to determine whether the school has had fiscally responsible practices in place during the last charter period allow the Institute to determine with greater precision whether the school will operate in a fiscally sound manner during the next charter period, a finding that the New York Charter Schools Act requires the SUNY Trustees to make.
- At the same time that the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks provide a framework for the Institute to collect and review evidence, they also provide the school with a guide to understanding the Institute’s evaluative criteria. As the Institute uses the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks (or some sub-set of them) as the framework for conducting its ongoing school evaluation visits, school leaders should be fully aware of the content of the Benchmarks at the time of renewal.

The SUNY Renewal Benchmarks are organized into four inter-connected renewal questions that each school must answer when submitting a renewal application. The benchmarks further reflect the interwoven nature of schools from an academic, organizational, fiscal and/or legal perspective. For example, the Institute could reasonably place many of the academic benchmarks under the heading of organizational effectiveness. More generally, some redundancy exists because the Institute looks at the same issue from different perspectives.

Precisely how the Institute uses the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks, during both the renewal process and throughout the charter period, is explained in greater detail in the *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University of New York* (the “SUNY Renewal Practices”), available on the Institute’s website at: www.newyorkcharters.org/schoolsRenewOverview.htm. Responses to frequently asked questions about the Institute’s use of the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks appear below:

¹ Research on public school reform, known as the effective schools movement, has embraced the premise that, given certain organizing and cultural characteristics, schools can teach all children the intended curriculum and hold them to high academic standards. Over the decades, the accumulated research into effective schools has yielded a set of common characteristics that all effective schools share. These characteristics are so consistently prevalent among successful schools that they have come to be known as the *Correlates of Effective Schools*. The Renewal Benchmarks adapt and elaborate on these correlates.

- Revised May 2012 -

- The Institute does not have a point system for recommending renewal. A school cannot simply tally up the number of positive benchmark statements in order to determine the Institute’s recommendation.
 - Some benchmarks are weighed more heavily than others. In particular, the Institute gives the greatest weight to how well the school has met its academic Accountability Plan goals.
 - Despite the fact that the Accountability Plan comprises only a single benchmark, a school’s performance on that benchmark is critical. In fact, it is so important that while the Institute may recommend non-renewal for fiscal and organizational failures (if sufficiently serious), excellence in these areas will not excuse poor academic performance.
- The Institute does not use every benchmark during every kind of renewal review, and how the benchmarks are used differs depending on a school’s circumstances. For example, the Qualitative Education Benchmarks (Benchmarks 1B-1F, 2C and 2D) are given far less weight in making a renewal decision on schools that the Institute has previously renewed. Similarly, less weight is accorded to these benchmarks during an initial renewal review where a school has consistently met its academic Accountability Plan goals.
 - The Institute also may not consider every indicator subsumed under a benchmark when determining if a school has met that benchmark, given the school’s stage of development or its previous track record.
- Aside from Benchmark 1A on academic Accountability Plan goals (which is singular in its importance), no school should fear that a failure to meet every element of every benchmark means that it is not in a position to make a case for renewal. To the contrary, the Institute has yet to see a school that performs perfectly in every respect. The Institute appreciates that the benchmarks set a very high standard collectively. While the Institute certainly hopes and expects that schools aim high, it is understood that a school’s reach will necessarily exceed its grasp in at least some aspects.

In this fifth edition of the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks, the Institute has made some revisions to the Qualitative Educational Benchmarks, namely those benchmarks used for ongoing school evaluation visits, to streamline the collection of evidence. For example, the Institute has incorporated Student Order and Discipline into Pedagogy, and Professional Development into Instructional Leadership. The Institute has rewritten some of the overarching benchmark statements to capture the most salient aspects of school effectiveness, organizational viability, legal compliance, and fiscal soundness. Some of the bulleted indicators within benchmarks have been recast or eliminated. Finally, the Institute has added some indicators to align the benchmarks with changes in the Charter Schools Act (e.g., provisions in meeting enrollment and retention targets when assigned and abiding by the General Municipal Law).

It is important that the entire school community understand the renewal process. All members of a school’s leadership team and board should carefully review both the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks and the SUNY Renewal Practices. Note that a renewal overview document for parents, teachers and community members is also available on the Institute’s website at: www.newyorkcharters.org/schoolsRenewOverview.htm. Please do not hesitate to contact the Institute with any questions.

State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks

Renewal Question 1 Is the School an Academic Success?	
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 1A</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Academic Accountability Plan Goals</p>	<p>Over the Accountability Period, the school has met or come close to meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals.</p> <p>The Institute determines the extent to which the school has met the Accountability Plan goals in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English language arts; • mathematics; • science; • social studies (high school only); • NCLB; • high school graduation and college preparation (if applicable); and • optional academic goals included by the school.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 1B</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Use of Assessment Data</p>	<p>The school has an assessment system that improves instructional effectiveness and student learning.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school regularly administers valid and reliable assessments aligned to the school’s curriculum and state performance standards; • the school has a valid and reliable process for scoring and analyzing assessments; • the school makes assessment data accessible to teachers, school leaders and board members; • teachers use assessment results to meet students’ needs by adjusting classroom instruction, grouping students and/or identifying students for special intervention; • school leaders use assessment results to evaluate teacher effectiveness and to develop professional development and coaching strategies; and • the school regularly communicates to parents/guardians about their students’ progress and growth.

	Renewal Question 1 Is the School an Academic Success?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 1C</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Curriculum</p>	<p>The school’s curriculum supports teachers in their instructional planning.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school has a curriculum framework with student performance expectations that provides a fixed, underlying structure, aligned to state standards and across grades; • in addition to the framework, the school has supporting tools (i.e., curriculum maps or scope and sequence documents) that provide a bridge between the curriculum framework and lesson plans; • teachers know what to teach and when to teach it based on these documents; • the school has a process for selecting, developing and reviewing its curriculum documents and its resources for delivering the curriculum; and • teachers plan purposeful and focused lessons.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 1D</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Pedagogy</p>	<p>High quality instruction is evident throughout the school.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teachers deliver purposeful lessons with clear objectives aligned to the school’s curriculum; • teachers regularly and effectively use techniques to check for student understanding; • teachers include opportunities in their lessons to challenge students with questions and activities that develop depth of understanding and higher-order thinking and problem solving skills; • teachers maximize learning time (e.g., appropriate pacing, on-task student behavior, clear lesson focus and clear directions to students); transitions are efficient; and • teachers have effective classroom management techniques and routines that create a consistent focus on academic achievement.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 1E</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Instructional Leadership</p>	<p>The school has strong instructional leadership.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school’s leadership establishes an environment of high expectations for teacher performance (in content knowledge and

	<p style="text-align: center;">Renewal Question 1 Is the School an Academic Success?</p>
<p><u>Evidence Category</u></p>	<p><u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u></p>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 1F</p> <p>At-Risk Students</p>	<p>pedagogical skills) and in which teachers believe that all students can succeed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the instructional leadership is adequate to support the development of the teaching staff; • instructional leaders provide sustained, systemic and effective coaching and supervision that improves teachers’ instructional effectiveness; • instructional leaders provide opportunities and guidance for teachers to plan curriculum and instruction within and across grade levels; • instructional leaders implement a comprehensive professional development program that develops the competencies and skills of all teachers; • professional development activities are interrelated with classroom practice; • instructional leaders regularly conduct teacher evaluations with clear criteria that accurately identify teachers’ strengths and weaknesses; and • instructional leaders hold teachers accountable for quality instruction and student achievement. <p>The school meets the educational needs of at-risk students.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school uses clear procedures for identifying at-risk students including students with disabilities, English language learners and those struggling academically; • the school has adequate intervention programs to meet the needs of at-risk students; • general education teachers, as well as specialists, utilize effective strategies to support students within the general education program; • the school adequately monitors the progress and success of at-risk students; • teachers are aware of their students’ progress toward meeting IEP goals, achieving English proficiency or school-based goals for struggling students;

	Renewal Question 1 Is the School an Academic Success?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school provides adequate training and professional development to identify at-risk students and to help teachers meet students' needs; and • the school provides opportunities for coordination between classroom teachers and at-risk program staff including the school nurse, if applicable.

	Renewal Question 2 Is the School an Effective, Viable Organization?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 2A</p> <p>Mission & Key Design Elements</p> <p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 2B</p> <p>Parents & Students</p> <p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 2C</p> <p>Organizational Capacity</p>	<p>The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school faithfully follows its mission; and • the school has implemented its key design elements. <p>Parents/guardians and students are satisfied with the school.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school regularly communicates each child's academic performance results to families; • families are satisfied with the school; and • parents keep their children enrolled year-to-year. <p>The school organization effectively supports the delivery of the educational program.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school has established an administrative structure with staff, operational systems, policies and procedures that allow the school to carry out its academic program; • the organizational structure establishes distinct lines of accountability with clearly defined roles and responsibilities; • the school has a clear student discipline system in place at the administrative level that is consistently applied; • the school retains quality staff; • the school has allocated sufficient resources to support the achievement of goals; • the school maintains adequate student enrollment; • the school has procedures in place to monitor its progress toward meeting enrollment and retention targets for special education students, ELLs and students who qualify for free and reduced price lunch, and adjusts its recruitment efforts accordingly; and • the school regularly monitors and evaluates the school's programs and makes changes if necessary.

	Renewal Question 2 Is the School an Effective, Viable Organization?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 2D</p> <p>Board Oversight</p>	<p>The school board works effectively to achieve the school’s Accountability Plan goals.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • board members possess adequate skills and have put in place structures and procedures with which to govern the school and oversee management of day-to-day operations in order to ensure the school’s future as an academically successful, financially healthy and legally compliant organization; • the board requests and receives sufficient information to provide rigorous oversight of the school’s program and finances; • it establishes clear priorities, objectives and long-range goals, (including Accountability Plan, fiscal, facilities and fundraising), and has in place benchmarks for tracking progress as well as a process for their regular review and revision; • the board successfully recruits, hires and retains key personnel, and provides them with sufficient resources to function effectively; • the board regularly evaluates its own performance and that of the school leaders and the management company (if applicable), holding them accountable for student achievement; and • the board effectively communicates with the school community including school leadership, staff, parents/guardians and students.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 2E</p> <p>Governance</p>	<p>The board implements, maintains and abides by appropriate policies, systems and processes.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the board effectively communicates with its partner or management organizations as well as key contractors such as back-office service providers and ensures that it receives value in exchange for contracts and relationships it enters into and effectively monitors such relationships; • the board takes effective action when there are organizational, leadership, management, facilities or fiscal deficiencies; or where the management or partner organization fails to meet

	Renewal Question 2 Is the School an Effective, Viable Organization?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
	<p>expectations; to correct those deficiencies and puts in place benchmarks for determining if the partner organization corrects them in a timely fashion;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the board regularly reviews and updates board and school policies as needed and has in place an orientation process for new members; • the board effectively recruits and selects new members in order to maintain adequate skill sets and expertise for effective governance and structural continuity; • the board implements a comprehensive and strict conflict of interest policy (and/or code of ethics)—consistent with that set forth in the charter and with the General Municipal Law—and consistently abides by them throughout the term of the charter; • the board generally avoids conflicts of interest; where not possible, the board manages those conflicts in a clear and transparent manner; • the board implements a process for dealing with complaints consistent with that set forth in the charter, makes the complaint policy clear to all stakeholders, and follows the policy including acting on complaints in a timely fashion; • the board abides by its by-laws including, but not limited to, provisions regarding trustee election and the removal and filling of vacancies; and • the board holds all meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law and records minutes for all meetings including executive sessions and, as appropriate, committee meetings.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 2F</p> <p>Legal Requirements</p>	<p>The school substantially complies with applicable laws, rules and regulations and the provisions of its charter.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school compiles a record of substantial compliance with the terms of its charter and applicable state and federal laws, rules and regulations including, but not limited to, submitting items to the Institute in a timely manner, and meeting teacher certification (including NCLB highly qualified status) and background check requirements, FOIL and Open Meetings Law;

	Renewal Question 2 Is the School an Effective, Viable Organization?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school substantially complies with the terms of its charter and applicable laws, rules and regulations; • the school abides by the terms of its monitoring plan; • the school implements effective systems and controls to ensure that it meets legal and charter requirements; • the school has an active and ongoing relationship with in-house or independent legal counsel who reviews and makes recommendations on relevant policies, documents, transactions and incidents and who also handles other legal matters as needed; and • the school manages any litigation appropriately and provides litigation papers to insurers and the Institute in a timely manner.

	Renewal Question 3 Is the School Fiscally Sound?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 3A</p> <p>Budgeting and Long Range Planning</p>	<p>The school operates pursuant to a long-range financial plan in which it creates realistic budgets that it monitors and adjusts when appropriate.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school has clear budgetary objectives and budget preparation procedures; • board members, school management and staff contribute to the budget process, as appropriate; • the school frequently compares its long-range fiscal plan to actual progress and adjusts it to meet changing conditions; • the school routinely analyzes budget variances; the board addresses material variances and makes necessary revisions; and • actual expenses are equal to, or less than, actual revenue with no material exceptions.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 3B</p> <p>Internal Controls</p>	<p>The school maintains appropriate internal controls and procedures.</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school follows a set of comprehensive written fiscal policies and procedures; • the school accurately records and appropriately documents transactions in accordance with management’s direction, laws, regulations, grants and contracts; • the school safeguards its assets; • the school identifies/analyzes risks and takes mitigating actions; • the school has controls in place to ensure that management decisions are properly carried out and monitors and assesses controls to ensure their adequacy; • the school’s trustees and employees adhere to a code of ethics; • the school ensures duties are appropriately segregated, or institutes compensating controls; • the school ensures that employees performing financial functions are appropriately qualified and adequately trained; • the school has systems in place to provide the appropriate information needed by staff and the board to make sound financial decisions and to fulfill compliance requirements;

	Renewal Question 3 Is the School Fiscally Sound?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p style="text-align: center;">SUNY Renewal Benchmark 3C</p> <p>Financial Reporting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a staff member of the school reviews grant agreements and restrictive gifts and monitors compliance with all stated conditions; • the school prepares payroll according to appropriate state and federal regulations and school policy; • the school ensures that employees, trustees and volunteers who handle cash and investments are bonded to help assure the safeguarding of assets; and • the school takes corrective action in a timely manner to address any internal control or compliance deficiencies identified by its external auditor, the Institute, and/or the State Education Department or the Comptroller, if needed. <p>The school has complied with financial reporting requirements by providing the SUNY Trustees and the State Education Department with required financial reports that are on time, complete and follow generally accepted accounting principles.</p> <p>The following reports have generally been filed in a timely, accurate and complete manner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • annual financial statement audit reports including federal Single Audit report, if applicable; • annual budgets and cash flow statements; • un-audited quarterly reports of income, expenses, and enrollment; • bi-monthly enrollment reports to the district and, if applicable, to the State Education Department including proper documentation regarding the level of special education services provided to students; and • grant expenditure reports.
<p style="text-align: center;">SUNY Renewal Benchmark 3D</p> <p>Financial Condition</p>	<p>The school maintains adequate financial resources to ensure stable operations. Critical financial needs of the school are not dependent on variable income (grants, donations and fundraising).</p> <p>The following elements are generally present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school maintains sufficient cash on hand to pay current bills and those that are due shortly;

	Renewal Question 3 Is the School Fiscally Sound?
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school maintains adequate liquid reserves to fund expenses in the event of income loss (generally three months); • the school prepares and monitors cash flow projections; • If the school includes philanthropy in its budget, it monitors progress toward its development goals on a periodic basis; • If necessary, the school pursues district state aid intercepts with the state education department to ensure adequate per pupil funding; and • the school accumulates unrestricted net assets that are equal to or exceed two percent of the school's operating budget for the upcoming year.

Renewal Question 4 If the School’s Charter is Renewed, What are its Plans for the Term of the Next Charter Period, and are they Reasonable, Feasible and Achievable?	
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 4A</p> <p>Plans for the School’s Structure</p>	<p>Key structural elements of the school, as defined in the exhibits of the Application for Charter Renewal, are reasonable, feasible and achievable.</p> <p>Based on elements present in the Application for Charter Renewal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school is likely to fulfill its mission in the next charter period; • the school has an enrollment plan that can support the school program; • the school calendar and daily schedules clearly provide sufficient instructional time to meet all legal requirements, allow the school to meet its proposed Accountability Plan goals and abide by its proposed budget; • key design elements are consistent with the mission statement and are feasible given the school’s budget and staffing; • a curriculum framework for added grades aligns with the state’s performance standards; and • plans in the other required Exhibits indicate that the school’s structure is likely to support the educational program.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 4B</p> <p>Plans for the Educational Program</p>	<p>The school’s plans for implementing the educational program allow it to meet its Accountability Plan goals.</p> <p>Based on elements present in the Application for Charter Renewal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for those grades served during the last charter period, the school has plans for sustaining and (where possible) improving upon the student outcomes it has compiled during the last charter period including any adjustments or additions to the school’s educational program; • for a school that is seeking to add grades, the school is likely to meet its Accountability Plan goals and the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks at the new grade levels; and • where the school will provide secondary school instruction, it has presented a set of requirements for graduation that students are likely to meet and that are consistent with the graduation standards set by the Board of Regents.

Renewal Question 4 If the School’s Charter is Renewed, What are its Plans for the Term of the Next Charter Period, and are they Reasonable, Feasible and Achievable?	
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>SUNY Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 4C</p> <p>Plans for Board Oversight and Governance</p>	<p>The school provides a reasonable, feasible and achievable plan for board oversight and governance.</p> <p>Based on elements present in the Application for Charter Renewal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • school trustees are likely to possess a range of experience, skills, and abilities sufficient to oversee the academic, organizational and fiscal performance of the school; • plans by the school board to orient new trustees to their roles and responsibilities, and, if appropriate, to participate in ongoing board training are likely to sustain the board’s ability to carry out its responsibilities; • if the school plans to change an association with a partner or management organization in the term of a future charter, it has provided a clear rationale for the disassociation and an outline indicating how it will manage the functions previously associated with that partnering organization; and • if the school is either moving from self-management to a management structure or vice-versa, or is changing its charter management organization/educational service provider, its plans indicate that it will be managed in an effective, sound and viable manner including appropriate oversight of the academic and fiscal performance of the school or the management organization.
<p>SUNY Renewal Benchmark 4D</p> <p>Fiscal & Facility Plans</p>	<p>The school provides a reasonable, feasible and achievable fiscal plan including plans for an adequate facility.</p> <p>Based on the elements present in the Application for Charter Renewal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the school’s budgets adequately support staffing, enrollment and facility projections; • fiscal plans are based on the sound use of financial resources to support academic program needs; • fiscal plans are clear, accurate, complete and based on reasonable assumptions; • information on enrollment demand provides clear evidence for the reasonableness of projected enrollment; and • facility plans are likely to meet educational program needs.