



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

Renewal Recommendation Report

UFT Charter School

Report Date: February 21, 2013

Visit Date: October 9-11, 2012

Charter Schools Institute
State University of New York
41 State Street, Suite 700
Albany, New York 12207
518/433-8277
518/427-6510 (fax)
www.newyorkcharters.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT INTRODUCTION	1
RECOMMENDATION	1
SUMMARY DISCUSSION	5
Academic Success	5
Organizational Effectiveness and Viability	13
Fiscal Soundness	18
Prospects for a New Charter Term	21
SCHOOL OVERVIEW	24
ACADEMIC ATTAINMENT AND IMPROVEMENT	27
APPENDIX: SUNY FISCAL DASHBOARD	40

REPORT INTRODUCTION

This report is the primary means by which the SUNY Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) transmits to the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (the “SUNY Trustees”) its findings and recommendations regarding a school’s Application for Charter Renewal, and more broadly, details the merits of a school’s case for renewal. This report has been created and issued pursuant to the *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the Board of Trustees of The State University of New York* (the “SUNY Renewal Policies”).¹ Prior to the finalization of this report, the Institute provided to the school a draft report and solicited factual corrections and comments from the school to ensure accuracy in accordance with the SUNY Renewal Policies.

Information about the SUNY renewal process and an overview of the requirements for renewal under the New York State Charter Schools Act of 1998 (as amended) (the “Act”) are available on the Institute’s website at: www.newyorkcharters.org/schoolsRenewOverview.htm.

RECOMMENDATION: As the data set presented by the UFT Charter School does not present a uniform case for renewal or non-renewal, the Institute cannot make, within the SUNY Renewal Policies, an appropriate recommendation for the Application for Renewal of the UFT Charter School.

When the UFT Charter School (“UFTCS”) applicant applied to SUNY in 2005, they sought two charters. However, the New York legislature had not lifted the cap on the original number of charters in the Act. As such, SUNY had very few charters left to grant. Rather than allowing the applicant to apply for an elementary charter school and a second middle-high school as was the original applicant request, SUNY allowed the applicant only one charter serving all grades K-12.

The UFTCS posts varying evidence of success across all grades K-12. The elementary school, which serves grade K-5 and has grade 3-5 state testing data in English language arts (“ELA”) and mathematics (Academic Performance Summaries aggregated grades 3-8 and disaggregated by elementary and middle school programs begin on page 29) that comes close to meeting the school’s Accountability Plan goals for those grades. The school’s 3rd and 4th grade students outperformed every other grade level on the Institute’s comparative regression analysis in both ELA and math during the 2011-12 school year. Taken separately, the elementary school data could form the basis of a full-term subsequent renewal under the SUNY Renewal Policies.

The UFTCS middle school (grades 6-8) met 1 of 15 mathematics Accountability Plan measures during this charter term. In ELA, the middle school grades met zero of 15 Accountability Plan measures in this charter term. The Institute notes that less than one half of the UFTCS elementary students subsequently attend the school’s middle school. The UFTCS middle school academic outcomes indicate students leaving 8th grade are not prepared to successfully navigate a high school college preparatory curriculum. The overall performance of the middle school, if analyzed

¹ The *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the Board of Trustees of The State University of New York* (revised June 25, 2012) are available at: <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/schoolsRenewOverview.htm>.

separately, would not meet SUNY renewal criteria of having met or come close to meeting a majority of Accountability Plan goals and measures.

The UFTCS operates a high school that has not yet graduated its first cohort of seniors limiting the data available to determine the school's success at meeting the high school accountability plan goals. The UFTCS high school data indicates the school is on track to meet Regents completion and graduation goals with its 2013 graduating class. College preparatory high school Accountability Plan goals require the performance of more than one graduating class to begin to accurately measure the success of the high school program. The high school data is, however, incomplete and indicates that students pass Regents examinations, but with scores that do not meet the college readiness standard identified by the Board of Regents. As such, there is not enough data to indicate whether the school will, or will not, be successful in meeting all or a majority of its high school Accountability Plan goals and measures. This data set is very similar to a charter high school at initial renewal, even though the UFTCS faces subsequent renewal in its 8th year of operation. If the limited and somewhat positive data of the UFTCS's high school was presented to the Institute as a separate school facing initial renewal, the Institute would recommend a short-term renewal in accordance with the SUNY Renewal Policies.

Subsequent to the Institute's renewal visit in October 2012, UFTCS presented a series of amendments to its original charter application. In addition to providing additional language regarding changes to the academic program, UFTCS indicated it was in the process of securing the approval of the New York City Department of Education (the "NYCDOE") to move the school's existing grades 6-8 from their current location at 800 Van Siclen Avenue in Brooklyn to the building currently housing the UFTCS grades K-5 located at 300 Wyona Street. This facilities change is dependent on the outcome of a NYCDOE hearing set for February 27, 2013 and the vote of the NYC Panel for Education Policy on March 11, 2013. The UFTCS high school would remain in its current location in the NYCDOE facility located at 800 Van Siclen Avenue, Brooklyn,

The UFTCS asserts the move to house all grades K-8 at one facility will "create absolute coherence" for the K-8 program. The materials provided by the school detailing plans for a K-8 school at one site lacked specificity and coherence regarding how leadership positions, curriculum, pedagogy and instructional improvement would change. One component submitted indicates the school is reviewing leadership (and faculty) positions in the new structure while another component submitted indicates the school will retain the same leadership structure. The materials acknowledged the school's need to create greater alignment in the K-8 curriculum but provided no specific plans, timelines or strategies to accomplish this task.

As discussed in the Qualitative Education Benchmark section below, at the time of the renewal visit UFTCS presented mixed qualitative educational program indicators and a large number of organizational challenges. The Institute would typically address the latter through appropriate governance, legal and fiscal conditions. In the case of this school, necessary conditions would include the following:

Governance/Legal

- Adopt revised by-laws as approved by the Institute that comply with the New York Education and Not-For-Profit Corporation Laws, and that require the formation of a standing Finance Committee to regularly monitor the education corporation's fiscal health;
- Adopt and implement proper policies and procedures regarding employee and contractor criminal background checks;
- Develop and implement specific plans to meet required statutory enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners ("ELLs") and students who are eligible for the federal Free and Reduced Price Lunch ("FRPL") Program;
- Comply with the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act by either (a) fully implementing the Individualized Education Programs ("IEPs") of all students requiring restrictive settings as written by providing such settings in the school, or (b) requesting the NYCDOE provide such settings for those students, which may result in their discharge from the school;
- Conduct all board of trustees meetings in accordance with the New York Open Meetings Law with respect to entering into, and topics of discussion in, executive session including the keeping and posting of proper minutes of such sessions; and,
- Comply with all elements of the charter contract as well as regulation and statute applying to all charter schools.

Fiscal

- Adopt board level written fiscal policies and procedures and implement procedures related to:
 1. The establishment of a finance committee of the UFTCS board of trustees with relevant financial background;
 2. Budget development and monthly monitoring identifying board and staff monitoring rolls (at the school and at the UFT as applicable) to include budget to actual variances, cash management, receipts & disbursements, payroll, fixed assets, grants/contributions, supply and procurement;
 3. Timely preparation of financial statements, reports and their presentation to the board and/or standing Finance Committee; and,
 4. Proper creation, maintenance and reporting of minutes for all finance committee and other committee meetings.
- Update and provide the Institute a legally binding financial support agreement between the school and the UFT or UFT Foundation, as applicable, indicating a guarantee funding for any fiscal shortfalls such that the education corporation can maintain normal operations; and,
- Segregate in a separate account a minimum of \$75,000 for the dissolution reserve fund required by the education corporation's charter agreement and not reduce the balance throughout the renewal charter term (required for all SUNY charter schools).

The UFTCS submitted additional documentary materials to address the compliance-related deficiencies identified above (discussed in greater detail in the Organizational Effectiveness and Viability section, below). The education corporation has formally initiated the process to modify its by-laws to comply with applicable law and practices currently in place at the school

(e.g., the elimination of campus-level subcommittees that were abandoned when the executive director was hired). The education corporation provided an assurance that it will adopt and implement policies to ensure that it comes into compliance with fingerprint supported background check requirements and to conduct all meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law. While these tasks may be ongoing, the school has yet to provide evidence of consistent implementation. Notably, the school has presented assurances but not a sufficient plan for addressing enrollment and retention targets.

An analysis of each of the programs of the UFT Charter School under the standards of the SUNY Renewal policies follows.

Background and Required Findings

According to the SUNY Renewal Policies (p. 11):

In subsequent renewal reviews, and in contrast to initial renewal reviews, the SUNY Trustees evaluate the strength and effectiveness of a school's academic program almost exclusively by the degree to which the school has succeeded in meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals during the Accountability Period.² This approach is consistent with the greater time that a school has been in operation and a concomitant increase in the quantity and quality of student achievement data that the school has generated. It is also consistent with the Act's purpose of moving from a rules-based to an outcome-based system of accountability in which schools are held accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

The SUNY Trustees granted the charter for UFTCS on June 15, 2005. UFTCS opened its doors in the fall of 2005. At the conclusion of its first charter term in the spring of 2010, the school was serving grades K–9 and had posted a mixed or ambiguous record of meeting its Accountability Plan goals and therefore received a short term renewal in accordance with the SUNY Renewal Policies.

In the school's 8th year of operation, the school must demonstrate that it "has met or come close to meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals" for all of its K-12 program during the charter term; a school in a subsequent charter term unable to demonstrate that it meets the criteria for a full-term renewal is subject to Non-Renewal.³

The UFTCS's current charter, granted for a three year term by the SUNY Trustees on March 16, 2010, expires on July 31, 2013. Based on the Institute's review of the evidence of success posted by the UFTCS including:

- The UFTCS Amended Application for Charter Renewal;
- Evaluation visits, academic data, and reporting throughout the charter term;
- The renewal evaluation visit conducted in the third and last year of the current charter term; and, most importantly,

² For the purpose of reporting student achievement results, the Accountability Period is defined in the SUNY Renewal Policies as the time the Accountability Plan was in effect. In the case of a Subsequent Renewal, the Accountability Plan covers the last year of the previous charter term through the second to last year of the charter term under review.

³ SUNY Renewal Policies, p. 12.

- The school’s record of academic performance in meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals;

the Institute finds that the school has *not* met the criteria for a Full-Term Renewal under the SUNY Renewal Policies in all grades as discussed above. However, the UFTCS posts elementary data that comes close to meeting the required Accountability Plan goals with some early indicators that the high school is on track to meet at least two of its high school Accountability Plan goals.

The Institute makes the following additional findings:

- At the time of the renewal visit, UFTCS did not meet the requirements of the Act and other applicable laws, rules and regulations;
- Subsequent to the renewal visit, the UFTCS board of trustees took steps toward alignment with requirements of the Act and other applicable laws, rules and regulations;
- The education corporation has not demonstrated the ability to operate all grades in an educationally sound manner;
- The school posts strong absolute performance on state assessments in grades 3 and 4 with variable success in grade 5;
- The school’s academic outcomes for grades 6-8 are poor;
- Performance outcome data for the high school grades is incomplete as the school has its first senior class in the current school year;
- The education corporation’s fiscal standing is by secured loans from its partner organization that are not codified in a written agreement leaving the school fiscally vulnerable;
- The education corporation’s board of trustees has provided assurances but not documentary evidence that, subsequent to the renewal visit, it has begun to implement fiscal oversight structures and policies that could increase the likelihood the UFTCS will operate in a fiscally sound manner in the future.

Consideration of School District Comments

In accordance with the Act, the Institute notified the school district in which the charter school is located regarding the school’s Application for Charter Renewal. As of the date of this report, the Institute has received no comments from the district in response.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION

Academic Success

The overall qualitative data for the K-12 program, based on school evaluation and renewal visits, and as measured by the SUNY Charter Renewal Benchmarks⁴ (the “SUNY Renewal Benchmarks”) corroborate these student achievement outcomes. At the time of the renewal visit in the fall of 2012, the secondary academy (grades 6-12) was characterized by a fragmented leadership structure lacking systems and procedures for delivering a consistently effective instructional program. The elementary academy performs strongest in grades 3 and 4. Observations conducted during the

⁴ Available at <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/documents/SUNYRenewalBenchmarks5FINAL5-8-12.pdf>. The Qualitative Education Benchmarks (discussed below) are a subset of the SUNY Charter Renewal Benchmarks (p. 2).

renewal visit as well as outcome data for grades 6-8 indicate the school has not put in place a middle school program that improves student learning and achievement.

Academic Accountability Plan Goals

In the Renewal Report⁵ the Institute issued at the time of the initial UFTCS renewal in March of 2010, the Institute recommended a short-term renewal based on UFTCS's mixed record in meeting its key academic Accountability Plan goals. At the time, the school showed a moderate decline in meeting its ELA Accountability Plan goal after having come close to meeting it the previous year. It met its math Accountability Plan goal at the time of initial renewal.

At the time of the school's initial charter renewal in 2009-10, the key academic Accountability Plan goals for ELA and mathematics were based only on the results of the state's grade 3–8 testing program. UFTCS has since expanded to become a K-12 school, and will graduate its first class in June 2013. The school now also has preliminary data on a few high school ELA and math measures, as well as a few measures for two additional Accountability Plan goals: high school graduation and college preparation. The school is serving 12th grade students for the first time in 2012-2013 making high school outcome data inevitably limited.

The Institute presents UFTCS's attainment of its academic goals under "Academic Attainment and Improvement" at the end of this report on page 27. Specific results for the key Accountability Plan goals in grades 3-8 ELA and mathematics begin on page 29. Results on the high school graduation and college preparation Accountability Plan goals are not yet available as the school's first 12th grade class commenced at the start of the 2012-2013 school year. Preliminary results on high school pass rates for New York State Regents examinations appear on page 35. The NYCDOE's analysis of school performance begins on page 38.

Because of the timing of New York State's 3-8 and Regents testing programs, the Institute's renewal reviews of schools in subsequent charter terms encompass evaluation of attainment of academic goals during a school's *Accountability Period*, which consists of state assessment results from late in the last year of the prior charter term to late in the school year prior to the expiration of its current charter term. As such, UFTCS's Accountability Period is based on assessment results from 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 for all grades 3-11.

UFTCS's absolute ELA performance in the last three years has been lower than it was prior to the school's initial renewal, however the school has met the standard in grades 3 and 4. Its math performance is lower in two of the three years, than in the initial charter period.⁶

⁵ Available at <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/documents/UFTFinalRnwRpt.pdf>.

⁶ Because the state standard changed in 2009-10 and passing scores increased, the actual percent of students passing shows a marked decline starting in that year. This change is the result of a Board of Regents' policy to align 3-8 and high school Regents assessment standards with adequate preparation for college, based on City University of New York and SUNY student performance data. The state has aligned passing scores on the 3-8 tests to this college readiness standard on the high school Regents ELA and math tests. To provide a direct comparison to the absolute results at the time of the previous renewal and prior to the recalibration, the Institute has continued to use the same cut-off in reporting absolute results.

Prior to its initial charter renewal in 2009-10, UFTCS exceeded both the ELA and math Annual Measureable Objectives (“AMOs”) set by the State Education Department (“SED”) under its No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) accountability system for grades 3-8. Through the current charter, the school met the math AMO standard in the first two years. It failed to meet the ELA standard in each year of the current charter term. Based on 2010-11 data, SED identified UFTCS as a School in Need of Improvement (“SINI”) for 2011-2012 under the NCLB accountability system for failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress (“AYP”) in elementary/middle (grades 3-8) ELA. As a result, SED required the school to implement a Supplemental Educational Services program in 2011-12. (The AMO results appear on the ELA and math Performance Summaries under Measure 2.)

In the current three-year period, UFTCS has performed worse than its district of location (New York City Community School District 19 (“CSD 19”) in ELA each year. The school posts mixed results in math, outperforming in two years, one slightly, and under-performing in the third year trending away from achieving Accountability Plan goals. (These results appear on the ELA and math Performance Summaries under Measure 3.)

At the time of its initial renewal in 2009-10, the Institute found that, in comparison to similar public schools state-wide, based on comparable free-lunch statistics, the UFTCS slightly outperformed similar schools in ELA and met the target for the measure in math by performing better than expected to a small degree. From 2010 to the present, UFTCS performed worse than expected compared to similar public schools state-wide without exception each year in all tested grades 3-8 in ELA. In math, the school performed better than expected in grades 3-5 in 2010-2011. The Institute finds this measure to be a significant indicator of a school’s success. (These results appear on the ELA and math Performance Summaries under Measure 4. This result may be attributable to UFTCS enrolling a lower percentage of Free Lunch eligible students as outlined on page 25.)

In keeping with state graduation requirements, the Accountability Plan measures for high school goals are almost all expressed as outcomes for students who have completed their fourth year in high school (12th grade). The UFTCS high school has operated for only three full school years. As students are now just beginning the 12th grade, none has graduated. Consequently, any results for the measures are currently projections of the likelihood of meeting the Accountability Plan’s targets with an additional year of data. The UFTCS Accountability Plan includes high school growth measures in which year-to-year student gains on a standardized national ELA and math exam are compared. While the school indicates that it administered the test in 2010-11, it did not report the results in its 2010-11 Accountability Plan Progress Report. After the school administered the test in the spring of 2012, the student test booklets were lost and the publisher never received them for scoring. The school did not attempt to re-administer the exam in either the spring or the fall of 2012.

Based on the Regents graduation pass-rate standard, the current 12th graders would likely meet UFTCS’s high school ELA and math Accountability Plan measures at the end of the current school year, assuming they perform as well this year as last year; the current 11th graders are also on track to meet these measures. Given the current 12th graders’ record of passing the required Regents for graduation, it would likely come close to meeting the target of a 75-percent graduation rate and outperform CSD 19. However, given the absence of a track record of graduation performance, the

UFTCS high school has generated insufficient data to confirm such projections. Preliminary results on high school pass rates for New York State Regents examinations appear on page 35.

There is also limited data for evaluating UFTCS's college preparation goal. The school administered the PSAT test to three-fourths of the 10th graders in 2011-12. In critical reading, the average score was 37 compared to an average of 45 for 10th graders statewide; in math the average score was 35 compared to 46 for 10th graders statewide. UFTCS indicates that in spring 2012, 14 of the 63 11th grade students took and passed a Saturday course for college credit in CUNY Kingsborough Community College's high school program, College Now. Thirty-five seniors are currently taking a course and the school reports "a large group" are taking a remedial course as prep for the program. While UFTCS has a strong mission statement about its college prep focus -- to "graduate students fully prepared for a demanding college education," only one-third of the 11th graders in ELA and one-tenth in math have met the state's newly established college-readiness performance standard (ELA/Math Aspirational Performance Measures (APM)) on the high school Regents exams.⁷

Conclusion. UFTCS posts its strongest results in grades 3 and 4. High school performance data indicate the school is in line to post success on its Regents exam passing rate and high school graduation goal. The school has not put in place a successful program for middle school grades.

Qualitative Education Benchmarks

Background. The Institute collected qualitative evidence using the SUNY Renewal Benchmarks during three school visits during the current charter period. Conclusions drawn from the evidence substantiate the student achievement data.

The following discussion of the educational program provides aggregate performance toward the SUNY Qualitative Education Benchmarks from the current charter term. In addition, while the school has requested a change should the school be renewed that would move grades 6-8 to the facility currently housing grades K-5 and create a K-8 academy as noted above. The analysis below does not analyze those proposed future plans, but presents the analysis of data collected over the current charter term.

Instructional Leadership. In some grades, the UFTCS does not provide adequate coaching and professional development to enable teachers to refine their pedagogical practice and improve student performance. The academies' leaders, directors, coordinators and coaches are clearly committed to their work and demonstrate competence in carrying out specific responsibilities, but the school does not integrate the instructional leaders' actions into a coherent system of school-wide professional development, teacher evaluations, accountability and individual coaching.

The secondary academy has lacked stability with five principals in seven years. The executive director has charged the current secondary principal, who has been in place for 15 months and is

⁷ The Board of Regents report that it now views a "college and career ready" graduation rate – defined as the percentage of students in a cohort who graduate with a score of 80 or better on a math Regents exam and 75 or better on the English Regents exam as an important indicator of future student success. Based on these findings, the Regents have begun to consider changes to New York's graduation requirements. In the interim, the Regents have established aspirational performance measures (ELA/Math APM) to inform schools on the progress of their students.

the third principal in the current charter period, with instituting a variety of instructional systems that had generally been absent. At the time of the renewal visit, the secondary school leadership lacked a functional reporting structure making it challenging to ensure the delivery of an effective instructional program in a majority of classrooms.

Two of the high school administrators have school-wide responsibilities and report to the executive director limiting their capacity to provide support to the secondary school. The director of faculty manages specific school-wide projects such as test prep as well as development and revision of the school's curriculum. While these are worthwhile activities, she undertakes them at the exclusion of working directly with the principal resulting in a lack of coordination around coaching teachers to improve instruction. The secondary academy has had one or two teacher specialists acting as instructional coaches – an insufficient number given the size of the secondary academy and the number of staff new to teaching. The specialists tend to work on curriculum planning and classroom management with teachers who have initiated a request for assistance rather than as a follow-up to leaders' concerns of specific teacher performance. They are unaware of classes' assessment results and provide limited instructional coaching that is not targeted to improving individual teacher skills in a sustained and coherent manner. While the new principal of the secondary academy provides a consistently articulated set of instructional expectations and a coherent focus on instructional technique at academy-wide professional development meetings, his impact is limited by the disjointed leadership structure.

At the time of the renewal visit, the content and focus of the available evaluations conducted by administrators at the secondary academy were internally inconsistent, with some administrators taking an informal approach to teacher evaluation and others adopting a more formalized systematic approach. Since the first year of the current charter term (the school's 6th year of operation), the executive director indicates that she introduced teacher accountability into the school for the first time. At the end of the second year of the charter period, based on ad hoc observations of classroom structure and order, 30 teachers, mostly from the secondary academy, left the school by mutual agreement. At around the same time, the executive director introduced formal teacher evaluations in the secondary academy for the first time.

In contrast to the secondary academy, the elementary academy with more stable leadership has instituted over the course of the last few years some systems to address instructional concerns. Leaders observe and evaluate all the teachers. Its instructional coaches support teachers to increase instructional effectiveness, but do not evaluate teacher performance. Instructional leaders provide feedback to teachers mostly on the strengths of their day-to-day lessons with limited guidance for pedagogical improvement. Leaders evaluate coaching effectiveness based on inputs (activity logs) rather than on teacher performance or student achievement outcomes. Interviews and analysis of documentation during the renewal visit indicate little follow up on academy-wide professional development workshops by monitoring the implementation of workshop topics in the classroom. While the elementary academy has a clear instructional leadership reporting structure with defined roles for leaders vs. coaches, as implemented at the time of the renewal visit, sustained and systemic support for developing teachers' instructional proficiency was limited.

Professional Development. The two academies' professional development activities consist mostly of topical issues, general training and curriculum planning, rather than on improving the delivery of

instruction. For example, the four-day 2012-13 UFTCS summer institute agenda consisted of a lengthy orientation to the SUNY renewal visit, grade level and departmental curriculum planning, and partnering with parents. From teacher reports and the documented agenda, the summer institute did not devote time to classroom management or other topics directly relevant to inexperienced teachers. Similarly, the school year professional development agenda includes limited, generalized group discussions of effective teaching strategies, implementing the school's intervention program for struggling students, and how to interpret assessment results. The exception is implementation of the new Common Core curriculum as a regular ongoing topic that directly addresses daily practice and that includes a follow-up to professional development by monitoring actual classroom activity.

Curriculum. Based on elementary academy documents, the ELA and math curricula link the new Common Core Standards to the school's selected commercial material; however, the documents do not address any gaps in the existing materials – either in content or in pedagogical approach – to the Common Core. As a result, many lesson plans focus on discrete, low-level skills without embedding those skills in the larger context of the overarching standard. The school has begun to develop a curriculum framework with student performance expectations that provides a fixed, underlying structure, aligned to state standards (but not across grades or between the elementary and secondary academies). In addition to the framework, the school is developing supporting tools (i.e., curriculum maps or scope and sequence documents) that provide a bridge between the curriculum framework and lesson plans.

Use of Assessment Data. The school regularly administers assessments to periodically gauge student progress towards the demands of state standards and assessments and makes data available to teachers in order to enable them to make instructional decisions. However, secondary academy leaders do not monitor teachers' interpretation of the assessment results. In addition, leaders do not regularly use the results for reviewing the quality of school programs, for identifying school-wide professional development topics or opportunities, or for enhancing teacher effectiveness.

The elementary academy's commercial assessments align with the school's textbook publisher's curriculum, but they may not align well with state performance standards insofar as students' apparent success at mastering the in-house and textbook publisher assessments has consistently failed to translate into widespread proficiency on the state exams, as evidenced by the lack of attainment of key academic Accountability Plan goals in some grades.

The secondary academy provides elaborate assessment reports and data binders to teachers, but offers limited training in interpretation and no ongoing training on their uses. The assessment coordinator, who is not an instructional leader, provides a general orientation to using assessment data during summer professional development. Leaders do not provide direct support to teachers on how to use assessment results to adjust or improve instruction. Teachers have the responsibility for identifying academically struggling students for the middle school's small group intervention program. Leaders have provided teachers with limited training in making appropriate selections and interpreting student assessment results.

At Risk Students. The school has general procedures for identifying at-risk students including students with disabilities, ELLs and those struggling academically. Through its Student Support Teams (“SSTs”), (comprised of special education staff, assessment coordinators and counselors), the two academies use a case study approach during regular meetings held to address the needs of students facing acute academic and emotional difficulties; the SSTs also plan one-on-one interventions for students who have not responded to teacher initiated routine small-group interventions. It is not clear how and when they monitor the effectiveness of their previous intervention decisions.

UFTCS has a comprehensive school-wide special education program and an intervention system for addressing the skill deficiencies of academically struggling students in the elementary school. However, in a few cases as discussed below, the school has not provided the required services and settings for some of the students whose IEPs call for more restrictive settings.

The elementary academy introduced its current intervention program in the 1st year of this charter term and refined it in the 2nd year; nevertheless, the elementary academy has not modified the program in the 3rd year of the charter period, despite continued low performance of students struggling academically on the New York State tests. An assigned coach coordinates small group interventions for academically struggling students, based on test scores, consultation with the assessment coordinator and teacher recommendations. The coach meets with teachers regularly to develop strategies for remediating skill deficiencies identified through the assessment program.

In the 3rd year of the charter term and the 8th year of the school’s operation, the secondary academy has revamped the identification of the large number of low performing students in the middle school and the structure of supplementary intervention services for them. Despite these changes, teachers continue to be on their own in developing the content of the interventions and differentiating the small-group instruction from their regular whole-group, class instruction.

Previously, coordinators placed students into homogeneous core classes according to academic achievement; teachers, assigned to the classes, were expected to provide instruction distinct from regular classroom instruction based on the teachers’ own independently chosen supplementary material and with limited support. This year, the secondary academy has given classroom teachers the responsibility for targeting students who are in their regular classes. With a teacher acting as a part-time intervention coordinator (‘coach’), the school is beginning to implement a formal identification and planning process. Despite this change, the content of instruction has remained at the discretion of the individual teacher who continues to develop the remedial activities on his/her own with limited oversight. The coach, who is only available one period a day to carry out coordination responsibilities, monitors teacher procedures for identifying students and for documenting their intervention activities for individual students. Secondary academy teachers have received limited training in interpreting assessment reports for identifying students and limited training in developing their own strategies and approaches for remediation.

UFTCS does not have a comprehensive program for ELL students. While its identification procedures are adequate, the school provided limited English-as-a-Second-Language (“ESL”) services last year. The two academies now have part-time ESL teachers providing small-group support to the ELL students, but school leaders have not integrated ESL instruction into the general

educational program and teachers have received no professional development on how to develop second language acquisition skills.

Pedagogy. Throughout the charter period and at the time of the renewal visit, when the Institute evaluation team scheduled 35 classroom observations, high quality instruction has been evident in a limited number of classrooms. Most instruction K-12 has focused on building students' foundational skills without also developing higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills necessary to meet the demands of state assessments and college readiness performance on Regents examinations.

Inefficient transitions between lessons and low-level and off-task student behavior in many classes significantly diminish learning time. While teachers in a few classrooms maximize every minute of instructional time with prepared materials to start instruction immediately, teachers in many other classrooms use precious instructional time to hand-write lesson aims and Do-Now activities onto white boards while students wait for instruction to commence with no productive learning task. Observations indicate many teachers engage in other instructional preparation activities that should be prepared and ready to deploy at the beginning of a lesson. The minutes lost during an instructional period to prepare for instruction to begin accumulate to significantly take away from learning time. In these classes, a substantial amount of instructional time is lost.

A few notable teachers, especially in high school classes, include opportunities in their lessons to ask challenging open-ended questions. Where this happens, students demonstrate higher order thinking skills. These few teachers make good use of lesson pacing and open-ended questions. They call on students to help complete answers started by their peers and create a learning community in the classroom. In one example, of a high school mathematics class, small groups solved difficult questions with group checking, as part of a class-wide competition.

Notwithstanding these pockets of excellence, in many instances students are not required to defend or expand on low level responses to teachers' questions. The majority of the teaching in core subjects is in whole group, rote lessons, rather than in engaging students in mutually reinforcing inquiry and exploration. For example, in a geography lesson at the time of the renewal visit, rather than making use of technological resources to present the critical economic and political importance of the Nile, the teacher had students color in blank maps of the river.

The school is for the most part orderly with minimal disruptions; a culture of learning exists in some classrooms, where teachers utilize effective classroom management techniques to create a consistent focus on academic achievement; in other classrooms, teachers struggle with behavior management and fail to reinforce behavioral boundaries. As a result, student progress suffers. In a notable number of secondary academy classes, teachers tacitly allow students to engage in side conversations while teaching; some allow students to opt out of instruction, including not admonishing them for listening to portable media devices.

Given the limited sustained support for developing individual pedagogical practice, variation in instructional quality is to be expected. The incidence of effective practice is attributable to the talent and experience of individual teachers, especially in the upper high school grades. On the other hand, given the general absence of direct pedagogical coaching, the prevalence of low-level

rote instruction and of the ongoing loss of instructional time is predictable. Over the course of the charter term, Institute visits indicate the school offers limited individual coaching of teachers to improve overall instructional practice. While the elementary academy offers some ongoing mentoring for new teachers on developing their practice, the secondary academy has relied on informal self-initiated peer-mentoring by fellow classroom teachers with limited time for such support.

Organizational Effectiveness and Viability

Mission and Key Design Elements. UFTCS's mission states that it will prepare all students to achieve academic and personal excellence. Specifically,

... The Elementary Academy of the UFT Charter School will graduate students fully prepared for a demanding secondary education. The Secondary Academy of the UFT Charter School will graduate students fully prepared for a demanding college education ...

Its charter includes a variety of Key Design Elements, centering mostly on organizational structure. From the evidence collected at the time of the renewal visit and from the UFTCS's Application for Charter Renewal, the school implemented a number of the elements. Other elements were not in evidence and not addressed in the Application. The Application also discusses a number of initiatives that are not included in the charter.

Most important, however, given the absence of Accountability Plan goal attainment, UFTCS is not achieving its goal of preparing all students to achieve academic excellence. The school does not fully prepare elementary academy graduates for a demanding secondary education. Academic outcomes in grades 3 and 4 are strong. However, in 2010-11, 37 percent (20 of 54) of 5th grade students scored proficient on the state's ELA test before entering middle school, indicating that they were not fully prepared for a demanding secondary education. In order to demonstrate that these students were prepared for middle school, the UFT submitted data to the Institute stipulating that 12 of 13 students who had left the school continued to score at the proficient level in the 6th grade in 2011-12 at other middle schools. (They presented similar data for the previous year's 5th grade cohort.) While it is commendable that these students continued to do well at the outset of their middle school careers, the remaining 63 percent (34 of 54) of the 5th graders entered middle school at a deficit contrary to the school's mission.

Parent Satisfaction. UFTCS indicates throughout its Application for Charter Renewal that parent engagement and commitment are a key school focus. The school reports that a variety of structures are in place to sustain relationships with parents, to share student performance results, to educate parents on how best to support their children, and to provide leadership opportunities that facilitate parent input and participation. According to the Application, parents demonstrate their satisfaction through their responses to the NYCDOE annual parent surveys. Based on 2011-12 results, parents have positive attitudes about academic expectations, communication, engagement, safety and respect. The

affirmative sentiments, however, are in the context of only one-third of parents having responded.

Based on the NYCDOE Progress Report, the school's attendance rate for grades K-8, 94.3 percent, places UFTCS at the 65th percentile among all elementary/middle schools in the city, which has a 92.9 percent average. In the last two years, half of the 5th graders from the elementary academy have chosen to continue at the school and move to its middle school program located in another facility. The UFTCS indicates the geographic distance, approximately 1.2 miles, is a challenge to the continuing enrollment of students between the elementary and secondary academies. The turnover may also be attributable to student interest in attending a different school or may indicate limited elementary-academy parent satisfaction with the middle school, especially in light of the poor academic performance posted over the last few years.

Organizational Structure. The executive director is responsible for coordinating the two campuses and managing the relationship with the school's partner organization, the United Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation, Inc., a domestic not-for-profit corporation,⁸ and outside contractors (e.g., the National Urban Alliance). The executive director has taken steps to consolidate the elementary and secondary "schools" by instituting a common set of policies, integrating parent activities and merging the administration of the two academies into a single executive team; nevertheless, except for operations and special education, the administrative positions continue to be separate and the two academies have not yet aligned their assessment or curriculum programs.

The two academies, because of lack of proximity, remain disconnected to the extent, as noted earlier, that 25 of 53 (47 percent) of the 5th graders in 2009-10 matriculated into the secondary academy and 29 of 56 (52 percent) matriculated the following year. As noted above, the school's amended application for renewal indicates it has secured space in the NYCDOE facility currently housing grades K-5 that will allow it to move the 6-8 program into that facility. The school indicates the change in geography will increase the matriculation of 5th graders to 6th grade and diminish the drop in academic performance that has characterized the prior 8 years. While geographic distance is not currently an issue between the middle school and high school, which share the same facility, the attrition rate is almost identical: 51.5 percent (48 of 99) of 8th graders matriculated into the 9th grade in 2010-11 and 48.4 percent (47 of 91) matriculated in 2011-12.

The elementary academy has a clear reporting structure with instructional leaders carrying out complementary roles, including staff members dedicated to classroom coaching responsibilities. The secondary academy has lacked continuity and generally been without a functional reporting structure with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The school hired the director of faculty to report directly to the principal and act as an additional instructional supervisor. However, because of internal personnel issues, the director of faculty no longer reports to the principal and the principal no longer directly oversees her activity. Teachers report that they are unclear about school priorities and administration roles and responsibilities weakening the school's ability to

⁸ As originally conceived, the UFTCS partners with the United Federation of Teachers Education Foundation (the "Foundation"). In practice, however, the role of the Foundation is indistinguishable from that of the United Federation of Teachers (e.g., staff performing critical services for the UFTCS were United Federation of Teachers employees, not Foundation employees).

strengthen its academic program.

The school provides sufficient resources to support the two academy's special education programs with clear procedures for their respective Student Support Teams. Notwithstanding this commitment to resources, teachers continue to report that materials and supplies are not available in a timely manner, indicating that the school budgeting and purchasing process do not function well (see Fiscal Soundness below). The staff reports chronic shortages of textbooks and unrepaired equipment. Students have limited access to computers. Last year, teachers reported that smart boards and a copy machine arrived well into the school year; trade books had not been available when needed; some science classrooms had limited lab materials; and the school cancelled student trips.

The school has smaller staff turnover this year compared to previous years: only a handful of teachers left the school for other than personal reasons. This reduction in teacher attrition appears to have contributed to improved collegiality and enhanced team building efforts.

The school reports extensive elementary and middle level waitlists, a measure of organizational capacity identified in SUNY's Renewal Benchmarks. The school reports a low attrition rate aside from the 5th to 6th grade and 8th to 9th grade transitions noted above and has adequate enrollment. Despite this, throughout the charter period, the school has generally struggled to maintain anticipated student enrollment, particularly at the secondary academy. School leaders identify a distinct "middle school transition problem." Operationally, a review of the education corporation's board minutes indicates that representatives from the United Federation of Teachers warned of the fiscal impact of declining enrollment, which has historically contributed to budget shortfalls compensated by the United Federation of Teachers (see Fiscal Soundness below). School personnel report other geographic challenges which have historically impacted student attrition between grades 5 and 6, as well as school safety, being in a co-located school that must fight for access to resources and increased competition from other schools opening in the neighborhood.

The school generally conducts student outreach through mass-mailings to the entire Community School District, but had not at the time of the renewal visit developed plans to specifically target students with disabilities, ELLs, or students eligible for the federal free and/or reduced price lunch program. During the charter term, the school received a formal parent complaint on the school's failure to implement a program designed to meet the needs of ELL students. At that time, the school did not have in place such a program in violation of federal law and failed to reasonably address the parent complaint. However, subsequent to the Institute's investigation of the complaint, the school has implemented an ESL program that is generally consistent and materially compliant with applicable federal law through voluntary compliance with SED regulations. The school has yet to integrate ESL instruction into the general education program diminishing the comprehensive nature of its efforts to serve ELL students.

School safety has impacted student retention over the course of the current charter term. Prior Institute reports have indicated that the school was disorderly and unsafe, again particularly at the secondary academy. However, over the course of this charter term, the school has made marked improvements by focusing on student order and discipline. School deans have designed and effectively implemented a new "ladder of referral" disciplinary system that, with one exception

related to the provision of alternative instruction for suspended students, is generally consistent with due process requirements and is consistently applied. School deans acknowledge that the new disciplinary system has resulted in an increased number of suspensions and some additional attrition for students that did not “fit” into the system. School leaders have also implemented a “zero tolerance” policy against corporal punishment, designed to show respect to the children attending the school. Over the course of the charter term, school leaders reported that staff had been counseled on appropriate interaction with students following approximately ten corporal punishment incidents.

Board Oversight. The composition of the board of UFTCS includes individuals with a diverse set of skills, including educational, management and financial expertise. The education corporation’s board also includes teachers and a school leader as full-voting members.⁹ In addition, several parents of current UFTCS students also sit on the board. As discussed more fully below, the education corporation board has not had an active committee structure during the current charter term.

The board regularly requests, and the executive director and school leaders supply, reports and statements on the academic performance of the school, as well as on student enrollment, discipline and legal compliance. United Federation of Teacher employees generally report to the board on the fiscal status of the education corporation, but the Institute’s analysis indicates the board’s fiscal oversight is weak (as discussed below). The board selects the executive director and school leaders and delegates the recruitment and employment of school-based personnel to the school’s executive director and school leaders, with administrative assistance from United Federation of Teacher personnel. The board establishes goals and objectives for the executive director, but has been inconsistent in evaluating the extent to which the executive director has met the goals. The board does not have in place a formal self-assessment to reflect on and improve its work as the oversight body for the school.

The board communicates with the school community primarily through regular board meetings. It selects parent trustees by virtue of their membership in the school’s parent-teacher association. The parent trustees generally communicate parent and community concerns to the board as a whole. In recent years, the education corporation board has taken a much more active role in managing the parent-teacher association, by approving the association’s by-laws and directing school leaders to be more directly involved in the operation and management of the associations.

Board Governance. At the time of the renewal visit, the education corporation board remained out of compliance with its own by-laws, particularly with respect to board composition and the lack of a formal committee structure. The prior two Institute evaluation reports noted that the education corporation had been operating in violation of its own by-laws and had failed, on numerous occasions, to conduct board meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law (Article 7 of the NY Public Officers Law). The Institute agreed to forego issuing a formal violation letter in exchange for the education corporation board’s commitment to expeditiously rectify all identified compliance

⁹ These *ex officio* board seats were in the school’s by-laws prior to the 2010 Amendments to the Act that made certain provisions of the New York General Municipal Law applicable to charter school education corporations. SUNY has sought a formal opinion from the New York Attorney General’s Office on the ability of such school employees to remain on the board.

issues. Subsequent to the renewal visit in the fall of 2012, the education corporation's board has begun to address these issues.

With respect to the board composition, the board has markedly improved its efforts to recruit members unaffiliated with the United Federation of Teachers to remain in compliance with its charter agreement, which requires that no more than 40 percent of its membership be affiliated with any single entity (other than another charter school). Furthermore, the board is now generally on pace to meet with the frequency called for in the by-laws (past reports had noted that the board was not meeting as often as required). However, the education corporation's by-laws call for the establishment of a complex elementary and secondary committee structure responsible for the governance of each respective academy. In addition, membership on each respective committee would be determinative as to which members would have oversight responsibilities for the entire school. At a prior Institute visit on December 6-8, 2011, the education corporation board reported that it abandoned this committee structure when it hired the executive director, but at the time of the renewal visit, the board had yet to vote to amend its by-laws in an open meeting. The board has not submitted all required materials to the Institute to approve the by-law revisions on behalf of the SUNY Trustees. Notably, the by-laws included in the school's Application for Charter Renewal, meant to govern the school in a subsequent charter term, still included the purportedly abandoned committee structure. Historically, the board has not utilized committees at all, though they report that they are forming a standing finance committee to make budgetary recommendations to the board.

A comprehensive review of the education corporation board minutes including those that the board has produced since the most recent Institute report in April of 2012, indicate numerous, apparently systemic, Open Meetings Law violations. Notably, the education corporation board continues to enter impermissibly into executive session and to deliberate on matters in executive session that are required to be addressed in public (e.g., budgeting, board appointments, school status reports, revisions to school policies).

The education corporation board does not conduct a formal annual evaluation of the school's partner organization, the United Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation, nor does it formally evaluate the quality of services purchased directly from the United Federation of Teachers. It holds the executive director accountable to goals related to student performance data and other goals including her ability to keep the board on task. The board reviews, but does not necessarily set, goals for school leaders. The board delegates formal review of the partner organization, contractors and school leaders to the executive director. As noted above, such reviews were incomplete at the time of the renewal inspection visit.

Notwithstanding the involvement of teaching staff, school leaders and persons affiliated with the United Federation of Teachers on the board, all of which are part of the intended structure of the board, UFTCS's board of trustees has generally avoided creating conflicts of interest where possible, and where conflicts exist, the board has managed those conflicts in a clear and transparent manner through recusal.

Legal Requirements. Except as noted above, as well two significant exceptions below, UFTCS has, based on the evidence available at the time of the renewal visit and throughout the current charter

term, in material respect, been in general compliance with the terms of its charter, by-laws, applicable state and federal law, rules and regulations. At the time of the renewal inspection visit, however, the school was in violation of the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (“IDEA”) in that it had a number of students requiring a more restrictive setting than the school offered, yet failed to follow appropriate procedures to either declassify such students, modify the IEPs to match services provided by the school, or work with the district’s Committee on Special Education to have such students placed in an appropriate district setting. By failing to take such required steps, the school has effectively denied such students and their families their right to a “free appropriate public education” under the IDEA. The school was also in violation of New York State law requiring that school personnel (and certain contractors with direct access to students) be subject to a fingerprint-supported criminal background check prior to appointment at the school. At the time of the renewal inspection visit, the school was unable to produce evidence that five individuals were appropriately cleared for employment, indicating that inadequate controls were in place to verify clearance prior to their appointment.

The education corporation board has generally maintained a relationship with outside counsel for advice on legal, compliance, and real estate matters. The education corporation is not currently involved in litigation and has substantially followed the terms of its monitoring plan. The school’s Application for Charter Renewal contained all necessary elements as required by the Act. The proposed school calendar allots an appropriate amount of instructional time to comply with all necessary requirements.

Fiscal Soundness

Budgeting and Long-Range Planning. Analysis at the time of the renewal visit indicated the UFTCS struggled to implement sound budgeting practices. Several factors contribute to these weaknesses including a lack of purposeful and regular oversight and communication between the United Federation of Teachers’ chief financial officer and general manager, controller, and senior accountant (the “UFT financial team”), school leadership and the board regarding year-to-date budget performance. UFTCS also suffers from a lack of comprehensive and well implemented fiscal policies and practices. In addition, board minutes indicate no regular analysis, consideration or presentation of the school’s financial position by a board treasurer or finance committee. Over the charter term, the United Federation of Teachers has provided substantial financial support and resources to make up for these deficits on an annual basis. While reliance on external contributions to ensure financial viability is not uncommon for startup charter schools, the school’s lack of progress in moving toward a balanced budget over this charter term, despite it being in the 8th year of operation and unburdened by facilities expenses, raises concern.

Generously, the UFT financial team contributes significant administrative financial services to UFTCS. Throughout the charter term the UFT financial team played school-level roles serving as UFTCS’s business manager, chief accountant and, charter school account manager. This team provides guidance to the school in developing budgets to support staffing, enrollment and facility projections and works with the school’s leadership team to develop annual budgets. Interviews during the renewal visit as well as a review of board meeting minutes and materials found no evidence that members of the board are involved during the budget planning and development

process. The prior three years of board minutes include no mention of or reports from a treasurer or finance committee and provide no minutes from any finance committee meetings. While the board has the responsibility to examine the budget and seek clarification before approving the budget, there is no indication of any such deliberation. When asked about this during the renewal visit, the board did identify one board member who would serve as the treasurer going forward.

Despite solid support from the UFT financial team in preparing budgets and submitting required reports to the Institute, the board's oversight, budget policies and cost monitoring for budget variances throughout the fiscal cycle are deficient. For example, during the November 15, 2011 board meeting, the UFT financial team informed the board that the school was over budget by several hundred thousand dollars. It is unclear why it took until November, the 5th month of the fiscal year, for the budget update to be presented to the board. During the March 29, 2012 board meeting, the UFT financial team again presented the board with a budget update, reporting a projected deficit of over \$2.8 million at the end of fiscal year 2012 due to (i) an outstanding debt of \$1.8 million to the UFT and (ii) an enrollment register loss of over 75 students, resulting in an additional loss of approximately \$1 million in fiscal year 2012. At the time of the renewal visit, in Board minutes reviewed through December 2012 and interviews with the UFT financial team failed to indicate board consideration of how to address the deficits, what financial practices required modification, or what effective cost controls the board would put in place to address the variances. In addition, UFTCS has not provided board minutes or documents from the finance committee or the full board that indicate the board required regular budget updates from the school leadership or the UFT financial team indicating it has not independently monitored the school's fiscal status.

UFTCS does not report long-range fiscal goals such as cost containment and contingency plans targeting the rebuilding of financial reserves to eliminate the need for external borrowing. At the time of the renewal visit, the UFTCS's executive director described cost-saving strategies that the school intended to implement in order to meet the budget going forward. These include a reduction in per session activities (teacher compensation for activities that extend beyond the regular contract), reduction in the number of school aides at each campus, reduction in the total teaching staff (including altering the team teaching model), and reduction to the funds available for the school's summer program. Given the school's lack of attainment of its academic Accountability Plan goals, it is unclear how the school will manage to improve student learning and achievement while implementing cost saving strategies affecting the delivery of an academic program.

Until the 2012-2013 school year, UFTCS had not requested variance reports (actual vs. budgeted revenues and expenses) from the UFT financial team to monitor under- or over-spending on budget categories. Interviews during the renewal visit indicate no one on the school's leadership team is regularly responsible for monitoring budgets as the year progresses; hence, over-spending remains unchecked. At the time of the renewal visit, school leaders indicated they were unaware of the quarterly and annual financial reports submitted to SUNY by the UFT financial team. This suggests that over the years, school leaders have been complacent about the fiscal state of the school and required financial reporting even though the charter agreement states that the school corporation shall maintain appropriate governance and managerial and financial controls. This activity also represents a violation of section 5.1 of the school's charter agreement that states "[t]he School Corporation shall at all times maintain appropriate governance and managerial procedures and financial controls," as no effective budgetary controls were in place.

Internal Controls. The accounting resources provided by the United Federation of Teachers in the areas of payroll, budget development, procurement, and financial reporting provide the school consistent and stable financial record-keeping, and protection from fraud. The school itself has poor internal controls in that, at the time of the renewal visit, the school did not follow a set of comprehensive and written fiscal policies and procedures that ensure appropriate internal financial controls. UFTCS's contingency plan in areas of budgetary risk is limited to reliance on the United Federation of Teachers in alleviating cash shortfalls. The school does not have a formal process to monitor costs to maintain fiscal balance and ensure sound financial decisions.

Financial Reporting. The UFT financial team, on behalf of UFTCS, has consistently submitted to the Institute financial reports that include the annual budgets, audited financial statements and unaudited quarterly financial reports in a timely and complete manner. At the time of the renewal visit, the school's leadership was unaware these reports were regularly generated missing critical opportunities to use these as tools to monitor costs and maintain fiscal balance.

Fiscal Condition. The school is in poor fiscal condition. Institute analyses show that its fiscal model is not independently sustainable in either the short or long term without continued action on the part of the UFT to make up shortfalls resulting from low cash levels. The school has incurred operating deficits annually in the last five years, resulting in very weak balance sheet that necessitates ongoing borrowing from the United Federation of Teachers, which has generously funded school deficits based on a non-specific pledge in the school's original charter application. The intent of that pledge was to support the start-up of the school until it could provide its own sources of funds including philanthropy. During the charter term, the school has used the UFT loans to support day-to-day operations. While the UFTCS trustees affiliated with the United Federation of Teachers indicated an ongoing commitment to the school during the renewal visit interview, the school did not produce a binding agreement outlining a long term financial understanding between UFTCS and the United Federation of Teachers. Reliance on the generosity of the United Federation of Teachers may be reasonable under the circumstances but it is far from an ideal fiscal plan, and does not reflect the organizational goal in the original charter of having a school that could sustain itself on public charter school funds.

UFTCS's expenses consistently exceed revenues even with the savings of a no cost co-location in a NYCDOE facility and administrative support services provided by the United Federation of Teachers as contributions to the school. UFTCS has a depleted cash level and negative net assets (total liabilities exceed total assets). Over the life of the school, the United Federation of Teachers has provided the school interest free loans to bridge the school's cash flow gaps. UFTCS's balances due to the United Federation of Teachers at the end of fiscal years 2010, 2011 and 2012 were approximately \$2.6 million, \$1.8 million and \$1.9 million, respectively. The current balance owed to United Federation of Teachers represents 13 percent of the school's 2012 expenses. Without implementing strong long range plans, fiscal policies, oversight practices, and internal controls, the school is unlikely to change its financially weak position or gain the ability to sustain itself independently.

The SUNY Fiscal Dashboard, a multi-year financial data and analysis for SUNY authorized charter schools, is an appendix to this report. As illustrated in the Fiscal Dashboard, located on page 40,

under the school analysis section of this report, the school has averaged a -0.7 or *Fiscally Needs Monitoring* financial responsibility composite score over the past five years including the most recent year of operation, fiscal year 2012. All other SUNY authorized schools' composite scores averaged between 0.9 and 3.0. Generally, the charter schools that the Institute recommends for subsequent renewal fall into either *Fiscally Strong* or *Fiscally Adequate* categories. *Fiscally Needs Monitoring* is the lowest of the Institute's ratings and is based on the blended score of various financial indicators. UFTCS's low score reflects the consistently poor financial health of the school. As the appendix shows, the UFTCS scored poorly in all financial indicators in the past five years. UFTCS's poor ratings on the working capital ratio and quick ratio indicate that the school has had insufficient short-term assets to cover liabilities that are due in the near to medium term. The poor rating on debt-to-asset ratio indicates that the school has a high level of debt relative to its assets. As of fiscal year-end June 30, 2012, UFTCS had total liabilities of \$2.5 million (this included the \$1.9 million owed to the United Federation of Teachers) versus total assets of \$1.2 million. The high level of debt also indicates the risks the school faces in terms of its debt load, i.e., the portion of revenues allocated to repay the debt, thus taking resources away from the educational program and day-to-day operations. The UFTCS's months-of-cash ratio (cash reserves in relation to expenses) has been consistently and extremely low. At fiscal year-end June 30, 2012, the school's \$121,419 cash on-hand was equal to about three days of operating expenses. The school's actual expenses per pupil exceeded actual revenues per pupil by an average of 2.4% in the past five years contributing to the weak balance sheet and lack of cash reserves.

As noted earlier, the board has provided assurances it is working to remedy the fiscal areas identified above. However, at the time of this report the board has not provided any documentary evidence in the form of a written agreement between the school and the UFT, board minutes, or other financial committee documents to indicate the assured changes are being implemented.

Prospects for a New Charter Term

Summary of Instructional Program Changes during the Charter Period. Based on evidence collected during the two school evaluation visits and a renewal visit conducted during the charter period, the Institute identifies the following changes to the instructional program.

- Consolidation of the Organization. The executive director has created an executive team that meets regularly, assigned two administrators to school-wide responsibilities and integrated the two academies' parent associations, but the assessment, curriculum and discipline systems remain separate in the two academies and few students from the elementary academy enroll in the middle school.
- Curriculum Development. The school identified the need to align curricula in all grades with the Common Core State Standards. Teachers developed supporting documents over the summer and leaders continue to work deliberately with grades and departments on developing plans. As in the case of all other New York State schools, the effectiveness of the alignment to new state assessments is yet to be determined. The school has not provided specific, coherent plans regarding the much needed vertical alignment of curriculum from grade to grade and lack of alignment between academies.

- Teacher Accountability. The executive director has established basic expectations for classroom management and structured classroom activities. Many teachers have left the school by mutual agreement; at the time of the renewal visit the school did not have a clear system for determining teacher effectiveness and does not have a system for sustained teacher improvement. Subsequent to the renewal visit, the school indicates it will use the Seven Practices of Effective Learning and will move to a school wide focus on the Danielson framework. The school has yet to identify how these two changes will align.
- Secondary leadership. After five principals in seven years, the school has stabilized the secondary academy leadership to the extent that the current principal has been in place for a year. Notwithstanding his leadership qualities, the reporting structure is fragmented and coaching staff limited.
- Secondary Academy Student Order and Discipline. The academy is much more orderly than two years ago, when hallways tended to be unsafe and transitions between classes lengthy. At present, hallway and classes are more orderly; nevertheless, off-task behavior continues to undermine urgency in instruction and teachers do not maximize learning time.
- Secondary Intervention Program for Academically Struggling Students. This year, the secondary academy has revamped its middle school intervention program and was beginning to implement it at the time of the renewal visit. The most important differences in the new program are the method for selecting students and the smaller size of instructional groups. Notwithstanding these changes, teachers continue for the most part to have independent discretion over the content of their instruction with the part-time intervention coach monitoring procedures and collecting documentation.
- Elementary Academy Grade-Level Planning Meetings. The academy has a cohesive planning system for coaches and grade-level teams to collaborate on using assessment results to adjust instruction and target skill deficiencies; however, perhaps because of poor alignment of the commercial curriculum to state standards, this system has not translated into increased student proficiency.

The school has implemented a number of instructional changes over the term of the current charter period. Despite these changes, the school's performance in the grade 3-8 testing program has remained consistently lower than it was when the SUNY Trustees awarded the school a short-term renewal.

Given the secondary leadership structure and the informal, peer-supported organization of academic departments, the Institute expects the high school to improve student learning and achievement only to the extent that the school can attract talented self-starters to its secondary teaching ranks and then assign them to high school grades. Preliminary high school results indicate that the school is likely to come close to meeting its Accountability Plan graduation goal; however, with a small fraction of students achieving at the state's college-readiness standard in ELA and math, it is unclear if UFTCS graduates will be adequately prepared for success in college, a key component of its mission.

The school's executive director believes that the school will improve student learning and achievement in the future because of the efforts of a vendor that the school recently engaged to deliver professional development to the middle school grades. By raising teacher expectations and improving rigor in classroom instruction, she believes that the National Urban Alliance can change teacher attitudes and their teaching approach, which will enable students to succeed. As in the case of any outside vendor for professional development, the prospects are limited by a lack of continuity and integration with the school's own coaching and evaluation of teaching practices.

Due to limited data at the time of renewal, it is unclear whether or not the school would produce and sustain the performance necessary to meet its accountability goals.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Opening Information

Date Initial Charter Approved by SUNY Trustees	July 15, 2005
Date Initial Charter Approved by Board of Regents	July 21, 2005
School Opening Date	September, 2005

Location

School Year(s)	Location(s)	Grades	District
2005-06	300 Wyona Street Brooklyn, NY	K-1	New York City CSD 19
2006-07 to Present	300 Wyona Street Brooklyn, NY 800 Van Siclen Avenue Brooklyn, NY	K-5 6-12	New York City CSD 19

Partner Organizations

	Partner Name	Partner Type	Dates of Service
Current Partner	United Federation of Teachers Educational Foundation, Inc.	Non-profit Foundation	2005-present

Renewal

Type of Renewal	Date
Initial Short-Term	March 16, 2010

Current Mission Statement

The UFT Charter School will prepare all students to achieve academic and personal excellence. The Elementary Academy of the UFT Charter School will graduate students fully prepared for a demanding secondary education. The Secondary Academy of the UFT Charter School will graduate students fully prepared for a demanding college education. Both academies will help to prepare students for meaningful lives as full democratic citizens in a free society.

Current Key Design Elements

• High academic expectations;
• rigorous college-prep curriculum that includes English, mathematics, science, social studies, foreign language, physical education and the arts;
• two teachers per classroom in Kindergarten through third grades;
• academic-based after school program run by a community based organization;
• high-quality teachers;
• National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification;
• balancing human resources with curriculum and school culture;
• democratic governance;
• professional development;
• three parent seats on the school's board of trustees;
• family-school partnership;
• CREST core values (community, respect, scholarship, trustworthiness); and
• "Habits for Thought" (Analysis, Breadth of Perspective, Connection, Discourse, and Evidence).

School Characteristics

School Year	Original Chartered Enrollment	Revised Charter Enrollment	Actual Enrollment ¹⁰	Original Chartered Grades	Revised Chartered Grades	Actual Grades	Days of Instruction
2005-06	150	N/A	138	K-1	N/A	K-1	180
2006-07	225	350	355	K-2	K-2, 6	K-2, 6	180
2007-08	300	525	547	K-3	K-3, 6-7	K-3, 6-7	180
2008-09	375	735	715	K-4	K-4, 6-8	K-4, 6-8	180
2009-10	450	860	792	K-5	K-9	K-9	180
2010-11	972	N/A	887	K-10	N/A	K-10	180
2011-12	1,074	N/A	926	K-12	N/A	K-11	180
2012-13	1156	N/A	1065 ¹¹	K-12	N/A	K-12	180

Student Demographics

	2008-09 ¹²		2009-10		2010-11	
	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of NYC CSD 19 Enrollment	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of NYC CSD 19 Enrollment	Percent of School Enrollment ¹³	Percent of NYC CSD 19 Enrollment ¹⁴
Race/Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	1	0	1	0	1
Black or African American	84	53	81	53	81	53
Hispanic	14	39	17	40	17	40
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	2	6	2	6	2	6
White	0	1	0	1	0	1
Multiracial	0	0	0	0	0	0
Special Populations						
Students with Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	N/A
Limited English Proficient	2	13	1	13	1	13
Free/Reduced Price Lunch						
Eligible for Free Lunch	48	81	66	83	68	84
Eligible for Reduced-Price Lunch	9	6	10	6	10	5

¹⁰ Source: SUNY Charter School Institute's Official Enrollment Binder. (Figures may differ slightly from New York State Report Cards, depending on date of data collection.)

¹¹ Source: Renewal Visit Data Collection Form

¹² Source: 2008-09, 2009-10, & 2010-11 School Report Cards, New York State Education Department

¹³ The school's statistic is derived from UFTCS's October 2010 student enrollment report to the State Education Department (2010-11 BEDS Report) for K-8 enrollment. Its 2010-11 high school enrollment data were not reported. It is likely to be comparable.

¹⁴ New York State Education Department did not release school specific special education enrollment until spring 2012. Based on these current data, CSD 19's 2011-12 special education enrollment is 15% compared to 9% for UFTCS.

Current Board of Trustees¹⁵

Board Member Name	Position/Committees
Michael Mulgrew	UFT Trustee
Evelyn DeJesus	UFT Trustee, Chairperson
Kelly Nowlin	Staff Trustee
Justin Davis	Staff Trustee
Michelle Boddin-White	School Leader
Burton Sacks	External Trustee
Cali Cole	External Trustee
Sharan Carter	Parent Trustee
H. DeVore Chapman	External Trustee
Zakiyah Shaakir-Ansari	Parent Trustee
Alexandra Salamon	Staff Trustee
Chester Campbell	Parent Trustee

School Leader(s)

School Year	School Leader(s) Name and Title
2005-06	Rita Danis (Elementary)
2006-07	Rita Danis (Elementary) and Drew Goodman (Secondary)
2007-08	Rita Danis (Elementary) and Drew Goodman (Secondary)
2008-09	Michelle Bodden (Elementary) and Drew Goodman/Mary Butz (Secondary)
2009-10	Michelle Bodden (Elementary) and Danny Wilcox (Secondary)
2010-11	Shelia Evans-Tranumn, Superintendent; Michelle Bodden-White, Elementary Principal; and Shep Brown, Interim Secondary Principal
2011-12 to Present	Shelia Evans-Tranumn, Superintendent; Michelle Bodden-White, Elementary Principal; and Martin Weinstein, Secondary Principal

School Visit History

School Year	Visit Type	Evaluator (Institute/External)	Date
2005-06	First-Year Visit	Institute	March 23, 2006
2006-07	Second-Year Visit	Institute	April 12, 2007
2007-08	Third-Year Visit	External (SchoolWorks)	May 5-6, 2008
2009-10	Initial Renewal Visit	Institute	December 8-10, 2009
2010-11	Sixth-Year Visit	Institute	February 9-10, 2011
2011-12	Seventh-Year Visit	Institute	December 6-8, 2011
2012-13	Subsequent Renewal Visit	Institute	October 9-11, 2012

¹⁵ Source: 2012 Application for Charter Renewal.

ACADEMIC ATTAINMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

Background

At the beginning of the charter term, the school developed and adopted an Accountability Plan that set academic goals in the key subjects of ELA and mathematics and high school graduation. The Accountability Plan also includes science, social studies, college prep and NCLB goals. For each goal in the Accountability Plan, specific outcome measures define the level of performance necessary to meet that goal. The required subject-area outcome measures include the following three types: 1) the absolute level of student performance on state examinations; 2) the comparative level of student performance on state examinations; and 3) the growth in student learning according to year-to-year comparisons of grade level cohorts. The following tables show the outcome measures currently required by the Institute in each subject area goal, as well as for the NCLB goal. To the extent that UFTCS has not yet had a class of high school graduates, the school only has limited results for the high school graduation and college prep goals.

Summary of Required Goals and Outcome Measures in Elementary/Middle School (K-8) Accountability Plans					
GOAL	Required Outcome Measures				
	Absolute¹⁶		Comparative		Growth
	75 percent at or above Level 3 on state exam	Performance Index (PI) meets Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)	Percent proficient greater than that of local school district	School exceeds predicted level of performance compared to similar public schools by small Effect Size	Grade-level cohorts reduce by half the gap between prior year's percent at or above Level 3 and 75 percent
English Language Arts	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Mathematics	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Science	◆		◆		
NCLB	School is deemed in "Good Standing" under state's NCLB accountability system				

¹⁶ Note: In 2009-10, 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 the absolute measure, the Institute has adapted SED's "time-adjusted" cut-offs. In the presentation below of ELA and mathematics results, the Institute uses the "time-adjusted" Level 3 cut-offs for 2009-10, 2010-11 and 2011-12.

Summary of Required Goals and Outcome Measures in High School (9-12) Accountability Plans			
GOAL	Required Outcome Measures		
	Absolute		Comparative
	75 percent proficient on Regents exams after four years	Performance Index (PI) meets Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)	Percent proficient after four years greater than that of local school district
English language arts	◆	◆	◆
Mathematics	◆	◆	◆
Science	◆		◆
Social Studies	◆		◆
Graduation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 75 percent of students will score at least 65 on at least three different Regents exams required for graduation by their second year. - 75 percent of students in the high school graduation cohort will graduate after the completion of their fourth year in the cohort. - 95 percent of students will graduate after the completion of their fifth year. - the percent of students graduating after the completion of their fourth year will exceed that of the local school district. 		
College Prep (only for college prep schools)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The school will demonstrate preparation of its students for college through at least one optional measure of its own design. - The school will demonstrate college attendance or achievement through at least one measure of its own design. 		
NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - School is deemed in "Good Standing" under the state's NCLB accountability system 		

The most important criterion for renewal is academic success, which the school demonstrates in large part by meeting the goals in its Accountability Plan. The Institute determines the outcome of a goal by evaluating the multiple measures associated with that goal.

The following presentation indicates the outcome of each of the school's goals. A general analysis of the key academic goals appears above under Academic Accountability Plan Goals in the summary of the school's academic success. The ensuing format divides the data into two sections: 1) the key goals of ELA, mathematics, as well as preliminary high school graduation and college preparation measures to the extent that they are available; and 2) the additional goals of science and NCLB. The analysis consists of the three years of the Accountability Period. Based on the Institute's analysis, some numbers of students differ from those the school reported; these differences do not affect the interpretation of results.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: English Language Arts
UFT Charter School



	2009-10			MET	2010-11			MET	2011-12			MET					
	Grades Served: K-5, 6-8				Grades Served: K-12				Grades Served: K-12								
	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)						
ABSOLUTE MEASURES 1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State exam.	3	59.2 (71)	59.4 (69)		3	59.5 (79)	56.8 (74)		3	64.7 (85)	64.1 (78)						
	4	57.6 (59)	56.9 (58)		4	89.2 (74)	88.2 (68)		4	80.8 (73)	80.6 (72)						
	5	83.0 (53)	82.7 (52)		5	75.9 (54)	75.9 (54)		5	79.4 (68)	78.8 (66)						
	6	46.2 (78)	22.2 (9)		6	50.4 (125)	42.9 (35)		6	59.8 (112)	61.3 (31)						
	7	57.9 (95)	57.5 (94)		7	56.3 (87)	56.3 (64)		7	72.2 (108)	71.4 (105)						
	8	36.8 (106)	36.8 (106)		8	22.2 (90)	34.5 (84)		8	23.2 (82)	21.5 (79)						
	All	54.1 (462)	54.6 (388)	NO	All	56.2 (509)	58.8 (379)	NO	All	62.9 (528)	62.9 (431)	NO					
2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.	Grades	PI	AMO		Grades	PI	AMO		Grades	PI	AMO						
	3-5, 6-8	154	155	NO	3-8	117	122	NO	3-8	124	148	NO					
COMPARATIVE MEASURES 3. Each year the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local district.	Comparison: Brooklyn District 19				Comparison: Brooklyn District 19				Comparison: Brooklyn District 19								
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District						
	3-5, 7-8	29.7	30.0	NO	3-8	28.5	32.1	NO	3-8	32.7	33.0	NO					
4. Each year the school will exceed its predicted percent of students at or above Level 3 on the state exam by at least a small Effect Size (at least 0.3) based on its Free Lunch (FL) rate.	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size		% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size		% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size			
	65.8	34.2	39.3	-0.65	NO	68.2	28.7	39.2	-0.65	NO	74.0	33.2	38.9	-0.37	NO		
GROWTH MEASURE 5. The year-to-year school-wide cohort of students will meet the target of reducing by one-sixth the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam. An asterisk indicates grade-level cohort met target.	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result		Gr	N	Base	Target	Result		Gr	N	Base	Target	Result
	3					NO	3	2	0		0	NO	3	3	0.0		0.0
	4	58	51.7	55.6	56.9 *		4	68	45.6	50.5	55.9 *		4	70	41.4	47.0	50.0 *
	5	53	75.5	75.6	83.0 *		5	53	26.4	34.5	37.7 *		5	65	52.3	56.1	38.5
	6						6	32	18.8	28.1	21.9		6	31	29.0	36.7	22.6
	7	94	77.0	77.1	58.5		7	69	18.8	28.2	10.1		7	106	26.4	34.5	24.5
	8	105	76.0	76.1	37.0		8	84	21.4	30.4	11.9		8	80	12.5	22.9	8.8
	All	310	71.6	72.2	55.0		All	308	26.2	34.3	26.6		All	355	31.0	38.3	28.2

TACS The Institute uses SED's "time adjusted cut scores", or "TACS", for evaluating the designated measures in the respective years. Although a lower standard than that used before 2009-10, TACS provide continuity with the standard used in previous years. Data Sources: SED data; school data workbooks; the Institute's student test database.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: Mathematics

UFT Charter School



	2009-10 Grades Served: K-5, 6-8			MET	2010-11 Grades Served: K-12			MET	2011-12 Grades Served: K-12			MET						
	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)							
ABSOLUTE MEASURES																		
1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State exam.	3	98.6 (71)	98.6 (70)	YES	3	100.0 (81)	100.0 (74)	YES	3	100.0 (85)	100.0 (78)	YES						
	4	84.7 (59)	84.5 (58)		4	94.7 (75)	80.3 (68)		4	91.9 (74)	91.8 (73)							
	5	83.0 (53)	82.7 (52)		5	81.8 (55)	81.5 (54)		5	85.3 (68)	84.8 (66)							
	6	58.0 (81)	25.0 (8)		6	86.5 (126)	91.2 (34)		6	72.6 (113)	67.7 (31)							
	7	74.7 (95)	74.5 (94)		7	69.0 (87)	70.3 (64)		7	75.0 (108)	74.3 (105)							
	8	55.7 (106)	55.7 (106)		8	83.3 (90)	85.7 (84)		8	69.9 (83)	68.8 (80)							
	All	73.3 (465)	75.3 (388)		All	85.8 (514)	87.3 (378)		All	81.4 (531)	82.0 (433)							
2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	YES	Grades	PI	AMO	NO						
	3-5, 6-8	171	135		3-8	142	137		3-8	135	158							
COMPARATIVE MEASURES																		
3. Each year the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local district.	Comparison: Brooklyn District 19			NO	Comparison: Brooklyn District 19			YES	Comparison: Brooklyn District 19			YES						
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District							
	3-5, 7-8	34.5	41.1	3-8	48.1	42.5	3-8	44.6	44.0									
4. Each year the school will exceed its predicted level of students at or above Level 3 on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size (at least 0.3) based on its Free Lunch (FL) rate.	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO			
	65.8	34.2	48.2	-0.64		68.2	47.3	50.9	-0.14		74.0	42.5	50.8	-0.38				
GROWTH MEASURE																		
5. The year-to-year school-wide cohort of students will meet the target of reducing by one-sixth the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam. An asterisk indicates grade-level cohort met target.	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	NO	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	YES	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	NO
	3						3	2	0		100		3	3	0.0		33.3	
	4	58	94.8	94.9	84.5		4	69	59.4	62.0	60.9		4	73	69.9	70.7	63.0	
	5	53	94.3	94.4	83.0		5	54	44.4	49.5	51.9 *		5	66	60.6	63.0	47.0	
	6						6	34	20.6	29.7	47.1 *		6	31	35.5	42.1	25.8	
	7	95	71.6	72.2	74.7 *		7	70	27.1	35.1	25.7		7	106	44.3	49.4	43.4	
	8	106	82.1	82.3	55.7		8	84	35.7	42.3	40.5		8	81	25.9	34.1	27.2	
	All	312	83.3	83.4	71.5		All	313	38.7	44.7	44.7		All	360	47.2	51.9	42.8	

TACS The Institute uses SED's "time adjusted cut scores", or "TACS", for evaluating the designated measures in the respective years. Although a lower standard than that used before 2009-10, TACS provide continuity with the standard used in previous years. Data Sources: SED data; school data workbooks; the Institute's student test database.

UFT Performance Summary Grades 3-5 ELA



	2009-10						MET	2010-11						MET	2011-12						MET
	All			2+				All			2+				All			2+			
	Grades	%	N	%	N		Grades	%	N	%	N		Grades	%	N	%	N				
Each year, 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State Exam.	3	59.2	71	59.4	69		3	59.5	79	56.8	74		3	64.7	85	64.1	78				
	4	57.6	59	56.9	58		4	89.2	74	88.2	68		4	80.8	73	80.6	72				
	5	83	53	82.7	52		5	75.9	54	75.9	54		5	79.4	68	78.8	66				
	6						6						6								
	7						7						7								
	8						8						8								
	3-5	65.6	183	65.4	179	NO	3-5	74.4	207	73.0	196	NO	3-5	74.3	226	74.1	216	NO			
Each year, the school's Performance Index on the State Exam will meet the Annual Measureable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB Accountability System.	Grades	PI		AMO		NO	Grades	PI		AMO		YES	Grades	PI		AMO		YES			
	3-5	132		155			3-5	127		122			3-5	138		135					
Each year, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local school district.	Grades	School		District		YES	Grades	School		District		YES	Grades	School		District		YES			
	3-5	41.5		35.1			3-5	45.4		37.1			3-5	43.7		37.2					
Each year the school will exceed its predicted percent of students at or above Level 3 on the state exam by at least a small effect size (at least 0.3) based on its free lunch (FL) rate.	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO			
	3				0.21		3						-0.29	3						0.53	
	4				-1.24		4						0.67	4						0.2	
	5				0.59		5						-0.35	5						-0.28	
	3-5	65.8	41.5	43.9	-0.15		3-5	68	45.4	44.8	0.04		3-5	74	46.9	44	0.18				
The year-to-year school-wide cohort of students will meet the target of reducing by one-sixth the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam.	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result	YES	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result	YES	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result	NO			
	3						3	2	0		0		3	3	0		0				
	4	58	51.7	55.6	56.9		4	68	45.6	50.5	55.9		4	70	41.4	47	50				
	5	53	75.5	75.6	83		5	53	26.4	34.5	37.7		5	65	52.3	56.1	38.5				
	All	111	63.1	65.1	69.4		All	123	36.6	42.8	47.1		All	138	45.6	50.3	43.5				

**UFT Performance Summary
Grades 3-5 Math**



	2009-10						2010-11						2011-12							
	All			2+			MET	All			2+			MET	All			2+		
Grades	%	N	%	N		Grades		%	N	%	N		Grades		%	N	%	N		
Each year, 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State Exam.	3	98.6	71	98.6	70		3	100	81	100	74		3	100	85	100	78			
	4	84.7	59	84.5	58		4	94.7	75	80.3	68		4	91.9	74	91.8	73			
	5	83	53	82.7	52		5	81.8	55	81.5	54		5	85.3	68	84.8	66			
	6						6						6							
	7						7						7							
	8						8						8							
	3-5	89.6	183	89.5	180	YES	3-5	93.4	211	88.1	196	YES	3-5	93.0	227	92.6	217	YES		
Each year, the school's Performance Index on the State Exam will meet the Annual Measureable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB Accountability System.	Grades	PI		AMO		NO	Grades	PI		AMO		NO	Grades	PI		AMO		NO		
	3-5	147		135			3-5	159		137			3-5	146		148				
Each year, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local school district.	Grades	School		District		YES	Grades	School		District		YES	Grades	School		District		YES		
	3-5	49.8		45.7			3-5	61.1		45.6			3-5	54.9		48.7				
Each year the school will exceed its predicted percent of students at or above Level 3 on the state exam by at least a small effect size (at least 0.3) based on its free lunch (FL) rate.	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	YES	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO		
	3				0.62		3				0.83		3				0.24			
	4				-0.72		4				0.4		4				0.21			
	5				-0.5		5				-0.29		5				-0.46			
	3-5	65.8	49.8	52.5	-0.14	3-5	68	61.1	54.0	0.39	3-5	74	54.6	54.4	0.02					
The year-to-year school-wide cohort of students will meet the target of reducing by one-sixth the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam.	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result	NO	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result	YES	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result	NO		
	3						3	2	0		100		3	3	0		33.3			
	4	58	94.8	94.9	84.5		4	69	59.4	62	60.9		4	73	69.9	70.7	63			
	5	53	94.3	94.4	83		5	54	44.4	49.5	51.9		5	66	60.6	63	47			
	All	111	94.6	94.7	83.8		All	125	52	55.6	57.6		All	142	64.1	65.6	54.9			

**UFT Performance Summary
Grades 6-8 ELA**



	2009-10						MET	2010-11						MET	2011-12						MET
	All			2+				All			2+				All			2+			
	Grades	%	N	%	N		Grades	%	N	%	N		Grades	%	N	%	N				
Each year, 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State Exam.	3						3						3								
	4						4						4								
	5						5						5								
	6	46.2	78	22.2	9		6	50.4	125	42.9	35		6	59.8	112	61.3	31				
	7	57.9	95	57.5	94		7	56.3	87	56.3	64		7	72.2	108	71.4	105				
	8	36.8	106	36.8	106		8	22.2	90	34.5	84		8	23.2	82	21.5	79				
	6-8	46.6	279	45.5	209	NO	6-8	43.7	302	43.7	183	NO	6-8	54.3	302	51.6	215	NO			
Each year, the school's Performance Index on the State Exam will meet the Annual Measureable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB Accountability System.	Grades	PI		AMO			Grades	PI		AMO			Grades	PI		AMO					
	6-8	102		155		NO	6-8	103		122		NO	6-8	113		135		NO			
Each year, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local school district.	Grades	School		District			Grades	School		District			Grades	School		District					
	6-8	19.7		24.4		NO	6-8	17.2		26.5		NO	6-8	18.3		28.4		NO			
Each year the school will exceed its predicted percent of students at or above Level 3 on the state exam by at least a small effect size (at least 0.3) based on its free lunch (FL) rate.	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size		Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size		Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size				
	6				-1.36		6				-1.02		6				-0.48				
	7				-0.87		7				-1.17		7				-0.59				
	8				-0.78		8				-1.2		8				-1.44				
	6-8	65.8	19.7	36.2	-0.97	NO	6-8	68	17.2	35.4	-1.12	NO	6-8	74	22.9	35.07	-0.78	NO			
The year-to-year school-wide cohort of students will meet the target of reducing by one-sixth the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam.	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result		Grade	N	Base	Target	Result		Grade	N	Base	Target	Result				
	6						6	32	18.8	28.1	21.9		6	31	29	36.7	22.6				
	7	94	77	77.1	58.5		7	69	18.8	28.2	10.1		7	106	26.4	34.5	24.5				
	8	105	76	76.1	37		8	84	21.4	30.4	11.9		8	80	12.5	22.9	8.8				
	All	199	75.7	75.8	46.7	NO	All	185	20	29.2	13	NO	All	217	21.6	30.5	18.4	NO			

**UFT Performance Summary
Grades 6-8 Math**



	2009-10						2010-11						2011-12							
	All			2+			MET	All			2+			MET	All			2+		
Grades	%	N	%	N		Grades		%	N	%	N		Grades		%	N	%	N		
Each year, 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above a Level 3 on the New York State Exam.	3						3					3								
	4						4					4								
	5						5					5								
	6	58	81	25	8		6	86.5	126	91.2	34		6	72.6	113	67.7	31			
	7	74.7	95	74.5	94		7	69	87	70.3	64		7	75	108	74.3	105			
	8	55.7	106	55.7	106		8	83.3	90	85.7	84		8	69.9	83	68.8	80			
	6-8	62.8	282	63.0	208	NO	6-8	80.5	303	81.3	182	YES	6-8	72.7	304	71.3	216	NO		
Each year, the school's Performance Index on the State Exam will meet the Annual Measureable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB Accountability System.	Grades	PI		AMO			Grades	PI		AMO			Grades	PI		AMO				
	6-8	106		135		NO	6-8	130		137		NO	6-8	124		148		NO		
Each year, the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local school district.	Grades	School		District			Grades	School		District			Grades	School		District				
	6-8	24.1		36.1		NO	6-8	37.6		39		NO	6-8	34.9		38.2		NO		
Each year the school will exceed its predicted percent of students at or above Level 3 on the state exam by at least a small effect size (at least 0.3) based on its free lunch (FL) rate.	Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size		Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size		Grades	%FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size			
	6				-1.08		6				-0.3		6				-1.11			
	7				-0.65		7				-1.08		7				-0.17			
	8				-1.16		8				-0.25		8				-0.74			
	6-8	65.8	24.1	45.5	-0.97	NO	6-8	68	37.6	48.7	-0.51	NO	6-8	74	33.5	48.2	-0.67	NO		
The year-to-year school-wide cohort of students will meet the target of reducing by one-sixth the difference between the previous year's baseline and 75 percent performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State exam.	Grade	N	Base	Target	Result		Grade	N	Base	Target	Result		Grade	N	Base	Target	Result			
	6						6	34	20.6	29.7	47.1		6	31	35.5	42.1	25.8			
	7	95	71.6	72.2	74.7		7	70	27.1	35.1	25.7		7	106	44.3	49.4	43.4			
	8	106	82.1	82.3	55.7		8	84	35.7	42.3	40.5		8	81	25.9	34.1	27.2			
	All	201	77.1	77.2	64.7	NO	All	188	29.8	37.3	36.2	NO	All	218	36.2	42.7	34.9	NO		

High School Graduation

Accountability Plan Goal: *Students will meet all of New York State graduation requirements.*

Outcome: Preliminary data indicate that UFTCS's first high school graduation cohort is likely to come close to meeting the goal, based on current Regent-exam pass rates.

Analysis of Absolute Measures:

Absolute Measure: <i>Under the Commissioner's Part 100 regulations, students are required to pass a commencement level Regents exam in five distinct content areas in order to graduate high school.</i>			
2011-12 Results (in percents)			
Required Regents Exams Passed	Cohort		
	2009 '11th Grade' (Cohort N: 63)	2010 '10th Grade' (Cohort N: 53)	2011 '9th Grade' (Cohort N: 45)
Five	36.5	0	0
Four	22.2	47.2	0
Three	14.3	24.5	0
Two or Fewer	27.0	28.3	100.0

Students Who Have Passed Required Regents with a Score of 65 by Subject Area			
2011-12 Results (in percents)			
Subject	Cohort		
	2009 '11th Grade' (Cohort N: 63)	2010 '10th Grade' (Cohort N: 53)	2011 '9th Grade' (Cohort N: 45)
English	68.3	83.0	--
Math¹⁷	63.5	62.3	--
Science¹⁸	73.0	73.6	57.8
Global	57.1	75.5	--
US History	79.4	--	--

At the end of the 2011-12 school year, 58 percent of UFTCS's first high school graduation cohort had passed at least four of the five Regents exams required for graduation. About 37 percent of those students had passed the five Regents exams required for graduation.

After three years in the cohort, UFTCS's first high school graduation cohort is coming close to meeting the requirement that 75 percent of the cohort pass a Regents exam in each of the five subjects required for graduation. The school's performance on these necessary conditions indicates

¹⁷ In order to meet this measure, students must have scored a 65 or greater on any one or more of the Science Regents exams offered in New York State, which are Integrated Algebra, Geometry, and Algebra 2/Trigonometry.

¹⁸ In order to meet this measure, students must have scored a 65 or greater on any one or more of the Science Regents exams offered in New York State, which are Living Environment, Earth Science, Chemistry and Physics.

that the cohort is likely to come close to meeting the high school graduation Accountability Plan goal.

REGENTS COLLEGE READY METRICS NOT INCLUDED IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATH GOALS¹⁹

English Language Arts

Absolute Measure: <i>Each high school cohort will meet the college readiness standard by <u>scoring 75 percent</u> on the New York State English Regents exam.</i>		
Results (in percents)		
2011-12 School Year		
Percent Levels 3 & 4	2009 Cohort 11th Grade (N= 63)	2010 Cohort (10th Grade) (N= 53)
	36.5	34.0

By the completion of their third year in high school, about 37 percent of the 2009 Accountability Cohort met or exceeded the college readiness standard by scoring 75 percent on the New York State English Regents Exam. By the completion of their second year in high school, 34 percent of the 2010 Accountability Cohort met or exceeded this college readiness standard.

Mathematics

Absolute Measure: <i>Each high school cohort will meet the college readiness standard by <u>scoring 80 percent</u> on a New York State Mathematics Regents exam.</i>		
Results (in percents)		
2011-12 School Year		
Percent Levels 3 & 4	2009 Cohort 11th Grade (N= 63)	2010 Cohort (10th Grade) (N=53)
	9.5	9.4

By the completion of their third year in high school, only 10 percent of the 2009 Accountability Cohort met or exceeded the college readiness standard by scoring 80 percent on any New York State Mathematics Regents Exam. By the completion of their second year in high school, nine percent of the 2010 Accountability Cohort met or exceeded this college readiness standard.

¹⁹ The Institute will require that all high schools incorporate measures using the college ready metrics into their Accountability Plans starting in 2012-13.

ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY PLAN GOALS

Science

Accountability Plan Goal: *Students will meet and exceed state standards for mastery of skills and content knowledge in the area of science.*

Outcome: UFTCS has not met its science goal.

Analysis of Absolute Measures:

Absolute Measure: <i>Each year, 75 percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State science examination.</i>			
Results (in percents)			
	School Year		
Grade	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
4	95	91	88
8	51	36	29

Analysis of Comparative Measures:

Comparative Measure: <i>Each year, the percent of all tested students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the State science exam will be greater than that of all students in the same tested grades in the local school district.</i>			
Results (in percents)			
	School Year		
Comparison	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
	(Grade 4)	(Grade 4)	(Grade 4)
School	95	91	88
District	76	75	N/A
	(Grade 8)	(Grade 8)	(Grade 8)
School	51	36	29
District	34	34	N/A

Over the course of the charter term, UFTCS's 4th graders have consistently met both the absolute and comparative measures of the science goal, though have shown minor declines each year. The school's 8th grade students, however, are far from meeting the absolute measure and scores have declined sharply during every year of the charter term. The school's 8th graders outperformed students in CSD 19 during the first two years of the charter, ever so slightly in 2010-11. Though district results for 2011-12 have not yet been released, based on past district performance, UFTCS's 8th graders are unlikely to meet the comparative measure this year.

NCLB

In addition to meeting its specific subject area goals, the school is expected under No Child Left Behind to make adequate yearly progress towards enabling all students to score at the proficient level on the state ELA and mathematics exams. In holding charter schools to the same standards as other public schools, the state issues an annual school accountability report that indicates the school's status each year.

Accountability Plan Goal: *The school will make Adequate Yearly Progress.*

Outcome: UFTCS has not met its NCLB goal. The school was not in good standing in 2010-11 according to the state's NCLB accountability system; the state has not yet concluded its 2011-12 analysis.

Absolute Measure: <i>Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.</i>			
Results			
Status	School Year		
	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12
Good Standing	Yes	Yes	No ²⁰

Based on 2010-11 data, SED identified UFTCS as a School in Need of Improvement (SINI) in 2011-12 under its NCLB school accountability system for failing to make Adequate Yearly Progress in 'elementary/middle' (grades 3-8) ELA for two successive years. As a result, SED required the school to implement a Supplemental Educational Services program in 2011-12. Coincidentally, in 2011-12, SED received a waiver from the federal Department of Education to change its accountability system and its method for identifying low performing schools, classifying them instead 'Focus' and 'Priority' schools, rather than SINI. Thus, SED no longer classifies UFTCS as SINI, because of the new accountability system, not because of improved assessment results. Consequently, the school is currently in good standing under the state's revised accountability system.

Analysis of Additional Evidence

NYCDOE Accountability System. In 2008-09, at the time of its charter renewal, UFTCS received a grade of 'B' on the NYCDOE school progress report for elementary/middle schools. In the three subsequent years (the current Accountability Period), the letter grades on the city's progress reports have been 'D', 'C' and 'D', respectively. Because of limited high school data, the city has not issued a UFTCS high school progress report.

UFTCS received a letter grade of "D" on its 2009-10 NYCDOE progress report. The school received the grade based on the composite score of three categories. The school received a "C" in school environment, which measures factors other than student achievement. This category is largely

²⁰ Pending the state's analysis of 2011-12 assessment data for identifying 2012-13 Focus and Priority schools.

based on the results of parent and teacher satisfaction surveys, which measure the conditions necessary for learning. In the category that measures student performance, the school received an “F”, indicating that the school’s absolute performance is lower than its peer schools in New York City. Because of the school demonstrated minimal growth in both ELA and math from the 2010-11 school year, the school received an “F” in Student Progress. UFTCS’s composite performance on these measures placed it in the 4th percentile among New York City’s K-8 schools.

In 2010-11, UFTCS received a letter grade of “C” on its NYCDOE progress report. The school received a “C” in school environment. The school received a “D” in Student Performance because its absolute performance in both ELA and math was significantly lower than its peer school in New York City. The school received a “D” in Student Progress because it posted minimal growth in both ELA and math from the previous school year. UFTCS’s composite performance on these measures placed it in the 10th percentile among New York City’s K-8 schools.

In 2011-12, UFTCS received a letter grade of “D” on its NYCDOE progress report. The school received a “C” in school environment. The school received a “D” in Student Performance because its absolute performance in both ELA and math was significantly lower than its peer school in New York City. The school received a “F” in Student Progress because it posted minimal growth in both ELA and math from the previous school year. UFTCS’s composite performance on these measures placed it in the 5th percentile among New York City’s K-8 schools.

These results are consistent with the Institute’s analysis above.

APPENDIX: FISCAL DASHBOARD

UFT Charter School

