



## **New World Preparatory Charter School**

---

# **School Evaluation Report 2011-2012**

Visit Date: April 4-5, 2012

Report Issued: October 31, 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)**  
<http://www.newyorkcharters.org>

## INTRODUCTION

This School Evaluation Report includes four components. The first section, titled School Overview, provides descriptive information about the school, including enrollment and demographic data, as well as historical information regarding the life of the school. The second section provides background information on the conduct of the evaluation visit, including the date of the visit and information about the evaluation team and puts the visit in the context of the school's current charter cycle. The third section provides the school's 2010-11 Performance Review and Summaries, which gives an analysis of the attainment of the key academic goals in the school's Accountability Plan. Finally, a fourth section entitled School Evaluation Visit presents overall benchmark conclusions (in italics) based on the Qualitative Educational Benchmarks (a component of the Renewal Benchmarks) and an analysis of evidence collected for each of the respective benchmarks. Following these sections, the report includes an appendix containing the Qualitative Educational Benchmarks used during the visit

The Qualitative Educational Benchmarks address the academic success of the school, focusing on teaching and learning (i.e., curriculum, instruction, and assessment), and the effectiveness and viability of the school organization, including board oversight and organizational capacity. The Institute uses the established criteria on a regular and ongoing basis to provide schools with a consistent set of expectations leading up to renewal.

**The report below provides more detailed conclusions, and evidence to support these conclusions, for some benchmarks in order to highlight areas of concern and provide additional feedback. In contrast to the format of reports issued in previous years and in an effort to issue reports in a timelier manner, the Institute now approaches the presentation as an exception report and deliberately emphasizes areas of concern. As such, limited detail and evidence about positive aspects of the program are not an indication that the Institute does not fully recognize evidence of program effectiveness.**

Because of the inherent complexity of a school organization, this School Evaluation Report does not contain a single rating or comprehensive indicator that would specify at a glance the school's prospects for renewal. It does, however, summarize the various strengths of the school and note areas in need of improvement based on the Qualitative Educational Benchmarks.

## SCHOOL OVERVIEW

### Opening Information

Date Initial Charter Approved by SUNY Trustees	September 15, 2009
Date Initial Charter Approved by Operation of Law	February 7, 2010
School Opening Date	September 2010

### Location

School Year(s)	Location(s)	Grades	District
2010-11	26 Sharpe Avenue, Staten Island, NY 10302	All	NYC CSD 31

### Partner Organizations

	Partner Name	Partner Type	Dates of Service
Current Partner	Victory Schools, Inc.	Education Management Organization	2010-Present

### Current Mission Statement

New World Preparatory Charter School (NWP) will provide an exceptional education for students in grades 6-8 by employing research-proven strategies to raise middle school academic achievement including: academic rigor and relevance; personalization; focused professional development; and meaningful engagement of families and the larger community.

### Current Key Design Elements

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Academic rigor and relevance;</li> <li>• Personalization;</li> <li>• Strong Professional Development; and</li> <li>• Engaging families and the larger school community as critical partners.</li> </ul>
--

### School Characteristics

School Year	Original Chartered Enrollment	Actual Enrollment <sup>1</sup>	Original Chartered Grades	Actual Grades	Days of Instruction
2010-11	125	127	6	6	182
2011-12	249	194	6-7	6-7	182

<sup>1</sup> 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.)

## Demographics

	2010-11 <sup>2</sup>	
	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of NYC CSD 31 Enrollment
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>		
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0
Black or African American	57	15
Hispanic	33	24
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	4	8
White	3	53
Multiracial	2	0
<b>Special Populations</b>		
Students with Disabilities <sup>3</sup>	25	N/A
English Language Learner	5	6
<b>Free/Reduced Lunch</b>		
Eligible for Free Lunch	72	45
Eligible for Reduced-Price Lunch	7	8

## Current Board of Trustees<sup>4</sup>

Board Member Name	Position/Committees
Reverend Terry Troia	Secretary
Denis P. Kelleher	Treasurer
Carin Guarsci	Trustee
Jack Minogue	Trustee
Beverly Peterson	Vice Chair
John P. Tobin	Board Chair
Emma Vidals	Trustee
Peter Weinman, Esq.	Trustee
Angleo Aponte (Pending)	Trustee
Miriam Escribano (Pending)	PTO President
Michael Flynn, SJ	Ex-Officio

## School Leader(s)

School Year	School Leader(s) Name and Title
2010 to Present	Jamie Esperon, Principal

## School Visit History

School Year	Visit Type	Evaluator (Institute/External)	Date
2010-11	First Year	Institute	April 14, 2011
2011-12	Annual	Institute	April 4-5, 2012

<sup>2</sup>2010-11 New York State Report Card.

<sup>3</sup> New York State Education Department does not report special education data. School data is self-reported.

<sup>4</sup> Source: Institute board information.

## CONDUCT OF THE SCHOOL EVALUATION VISIT

### Specifications

Date(s) of Visit	Evaluation Team Members	Title
April 4-5, 2012	Ron Miller, Ph.D	Vice President for Accountability
	Jeff Wasbes	Performance and Systems Analyst

### Context of the Visit

Charter Cycle	
Charter Period	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year of 1 <sup>st</sup> Charter Term
Accountability Period <sup>5</sup>	2 Year of 1 <sup>st</sup> Accountability Period
Impending Renewal Visit	Fall 2015

---

<sup>5</sup> Because the Institute makes a renewal decision in the last year of a Charter Period, the Accountability Period ends in the next to last year of the Charter Period. For initial renewals, the Accountability Period is the first four years of the Charter Period. For subsequent renewals, the Accountability Period includes the last year of the previous Charter Period through the next to last year of the current Charter Period.

## 2010-11 School Performance Review

### **Performance Summary**

In 2010-11, the first year of New World Preparatory Charter School's ("New World Prep's") four-year Accountability Period, the school has not yet amassed enough student assessment data to be held accountable for the key goals in its Accountability Plan. The school only has data on two of the five measures included in its English language arts and mathematics goals. The school's science goal will not take effect until it has an eighth grade class in two years. The State Education Department has not yet determined if the school is in good standing with respect to meeting the requirements of its NCLB accountability system.

### **English Language Arts**

In this first year of the Accountability Period, the school did not meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set by the state. In comparison to demographically similar schools statewide, it performed worse than predicted and did not meet the target for the measure. The other three measures did not apply either because the school did not yet have students enrolled in at least their second year or because it could not yet demonstrate year-to-year growth among cohorts of students.

### **Mathematics**

In 2010-11, the first year of the Accountability Period, the school did not meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set by the state. In comparison to demographically similar schools statewide, it performed worse than predicted and did not meet the target for the measure. In their first year of enrollment at the school, the fifth graders did surpass the absolute target of 75 percent proficiency,<sup>6</sup> but the absolute measure examines students who are enrolled in at least their second year. As in ELA, it and the other two measures did not apply.

---

<sup>6</sup> For evaluating the goals' absolute measure, the Institute has again adapted SED's "time-adjusted" math cut score for 2010-11 as it had in 2009-10.

# SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: English Language Arts

## New World Preparatory Charter School



	2008-09			MET	2009-10			MET	2010-11			MET						
	Grades Served:				Grades Served:				Grades Served: 6									
	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)							
<b><u>ABSOLUTE MEASURES</u></b>																		
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	(0)	(0)	--	3	(0)	(0)	--	3	(0)	(0)							
	4	(0)	(0)		4	(0)	(0)		4	(0)	(0)							
	5	(0)	(0)		5	(0)	(0)		5	(0)	(0)							
	6	(0)	(0)		6	(0)	(0)		6	63.0 (216)	(0)							
	7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)							
	8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)							
	All	(0)	(0)		All	(0)	(0)		All	63.0 (216)	(0)	NA						
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	NO						
									6	114	122							
<b><u>COMPARATIVE MEASURES</u></b>																		
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: Staten Island District 31			--	Comparison: Staten Island District 31			--	Comparison: Staten Island District 31			NA						
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District							
									NA		55.9	NA						
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	NO			
											71.5	29.6	39.2	-0.62				
<b><u>GROWTH MEASURE</u></b>																		
5. Each grade level cohort will reduce by one half 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 cohort met target.(§)	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	--	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	--	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	NA
	4	0					4	0					4	0				
	5	0					5	0					5	0				
	6	0					6	0					6	0				
	7	0					7	0					7	0				
	8	0					8	0					8	0				
	All	0					All	0					All	0				

(§) SED's "time adjusted cut scores" are used in the 2009-10 and 2010-11 results for #1 and in the 2009-10 results for #2 and #5. SED's publicly reported cut scores are used for the other results. Data Sources: New York State data; school-submitted workbooks; and the Institute's student performance database.

# SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: Mathematics

## New World Preparatory Charter School



	2008-09			MET	2009-10			MET	2010-11			MET					
	Grades Served:				Grades Served:				Grades Served: 6								
	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)		Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)						
<b>ABSOLUTE MEASURES</b>																	
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	(0)	(0)		3	(0)	(0)		3	(0)	(0)						
	4	(0)	(0)		4	(0)	(0)		4	(0)	(0)						
	5	(0)	(0)		5	(0)	(0)		5	(0)	(0)						
	6	(0)	(0)		6	(0)	(0)		6	78.0 (109)	(0)						
	7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)		7	(0)	(0)						
	8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)		8	(0)	(0)						
	All	(0)	(0)	--	All	(0)	(0)	--	All	78.0 (109)	(0)	NA					
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						
				--				--	6	122	137	NO					
<b>COMPARATIVE MEASURES</b>																	
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: Richmond District 31				Comparison: Richmond District 31				Comparison: Richmond District 31								
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District						
				--				--	NA		64.0	NA					
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		% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size		% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size			
					--					--	71.5	35.8	48.4	-0.60	NO		
<b>GROWTH MEASURE</b>																	
5. Each grade level cohort will reduce by one half 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 cohort met target.(§)	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result		Gr	N	Base	Target	Result		Gr	N	Base	Target	Result
	3					--	3						3				
	4						4						4				
	5						5						5				
	6						6						6				
	7						7						7				
	8						8						8				
	All						All						All				

(§) SED's "time adjusted cut scores" are used in the 2009-10 and 2010-11 results for #1 and in the 2009-10 results for #2 and #5. SED's publicly reported cut scores are used for the other results. Data Sources: New York State data; school-submitted workbooks; and the Institute's student performance database.



## SCHOOL EVALUATION VISIT

### **Benchmark Conclusions and Evidence**

#### **1. B Use of Assessment Data**

***New World Preparatory Charter School (“New World Prep”) has procedures to gather assessment data and is beginning to use them to improve student learning.***

The school administers Acuity interim assessment in mathematics and English language arts and has begun to collect and analyze the resulting data. The principal and data consultant use the results to predict whether the school is achieving its Accountability Plan goals. Teachers and school leaders review the Acuity data with a protocol that guides their analysis and provides strategies for re-teaching. The protocol has a four-step sequence: identifying weaknesses in student learning; brainstorming strategies for addressing the weaknesses; focusing on particular standards; and establishing teaching strategies and developing next steps. Leaders expect teachers to focus on two skill areas for re-teaching; they report that they also re-group students for targeted skills-building. At data meetings, teachers monitor the effectiveness of re-teaching strategies by analyzing student work based on their professional judgment.

Despite these procedures, the Acuity English language arts assessment does not provide a finely detailed analysis of students’ reading comprehension and literacy skills and does not assess writing. Accordingly, the school now administers the Folio assessment, which evaluates on-demand writing tasks. Measurement Inc., the publisher of the Folio assessment system, evaluates student work, ensuring a quick turnaround of data and reliable scoring. The principal reports that the analysis of the Folio assessment provides additional information for adjusting literacy instruction. In addition, English language arts teachers evaluate students’ written work using a common rubric and norm the application of the rubric to ensure consistent scoring. The school provides time for training new teachers on using the rubric, although leaders do not require that they use it.

The school also administers the Test of Silent Word Reading Fluency (TOSWRF) and the AIMSweb Maze assessment to every student. Based on these results, the school enrolls the lowest performing students in an after-school or Saturday program to enhance their reading and literacy skills. The school assesses these students at regular intervals throughout the year to monitor their progress.

Notwithstanding the use of targeted assessments to screen students early in the school year for enrollment in remedial programs, the school does not yet have a comprehensive system to use data regularly to make decisions about student learning interventions. Weekly grade-level meetings provide a forum for teachers to identify and discuss students who are potentially falling behind, but they do so in an *ad hoc* manner. Teachers report that they base the discussion on inconsistent classroom grading procedures and their own professional judgment rather than on a systematic, school-wide data analysis. The principal indicates that teachers have not selected for discussion a number of students who consistently score below proficiency on state and interim assessments.

#### **1. C Curriculum**

***New World Prep has a clearly defined curriculum and uses it to prepare students to meet state performance standards.***

Building on strengths identified last year, the school continues to refine a comprehensive curriculum framework aligned to the Common Core standards. Teachers, school leaders and consultants develop unit plans before the beginning of the school year and use the unit plans to guide the development and pacing of lesson plans throughout the year. Prior to teachers implementing lessons in the classroom, the principal reviews the unit and lesson plans and provides feedback to teachers about learning objectives and pedagogical procedures. During the implementation of lessons, the principal, a curriculum consultant and a special education consultant visit classrooms at least once every two weeks to monitor the fidelity of the lessons to the plans and provide written and verbal feedback to teachers. Teachers report that the feedback they receive is helpful.

Teachers, the principal and consultants spend time during the summer making large scale revisions to the curriculum. The school is preparing for the addition of an 8<sup>th</sup> grade next year and has hired a consultant to coordinate the development of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade curriculum. Teachers report that they work with an instructional consultant to revise curriculum pacing throughout the year. However, teachers and consultants base these decisions on professional judgment rather than on student data.

The school is developing a lesson plan template, by standardizing and refining an existing school-wide template. As an extension of its development, teachers in all content areas emphasize reading and writing. Of particular note, the school imbeds literacy instruction within the mathematics curriculum.

## **1. D Pedagogy**

### ***Quality instruction is evident in some classes.***

Teachers mainly utilize whole-group instruction, followed by co-operative learning opportunities. They elicit student responses in order to check for understanding and ask selected students challenging questions, requiring them to elaborate on their responses. Because the school structures lesson plans to identify students' prior knowledge and what they will know and be able to do as a result of the particular lesson, learning activities are often purposeful.

Notwithstanding this consistent focus, there is limited evidence of students listening to each other: interactions are between teacher and students rather than between students themselves. In one exceptional case, students evaluated the quality of their fellow students' brief presentations to the entire class. In another instance, a teacher leveraged the abilities of her mainstream students to support the learning of her English Language Learners ("ELLs"). The teacher arranged the class so that the ELL students paired with native English speakers. The teacher had the students take turns reading aloud to each other while the native English speakers supported the ELL students in reading and interpreting the material.

Teachers maximize learning time in most classes. The school's use of multiple adults in a classroom is inefficient. Assistant teachers tend to have little interaction with students; special education teachers have more interaction with students in integrated co-teaching classes, but it is still limited. Because there is insufficient classroom coordination of instruction and because of the ongoing challenges of developing a system for consistently assessing student performance and grading student work products, teachers do not meet the needs of all low-performing students during regular classroom activities.

## 1. E Instructional Leadership

***New World Prep's instructional leadership is not adequate to support the development of the inexperienced teaching staff.***

The principal relies on two part-time coaches from the school's education management organization, Victory Schools Inc. ("Victory") and a number of occasional consultants to provide individual coaching, but her coordination of their activity is limited. The principal has an exhaustive evaluation agenda in which teachers work with the principal and consultant coaches to develop a set of personal goals; teachers report that the principal and consultant coaches visit their classrooms frequently. However, the consultants report that they have limited interactions with the principal and that they have a great deal of latitude in carrying out their subject area assignments. While the principal establishes a clear set of annual priorities for developing teachers' pedagogical competencies, the coaches work independently through Victory Schools, addressing teachers' perceived individual needs.

The school sets consistent expectations for the achievement of all students, but teachers do not articulate high expectations themselves for student success. The school sets the same grading and promotional requirements for students with disabilities, as it does for students in the mainstream; nevertheless, teachers do not evidence opportunities for high performing students to excel. The school has hired a counselor to prepare students to apply to high performing high schools, although teachers do not identify attending a desirable high school as a goal.

This year, the school has introduced a focused and cohesive teacher evaluation procedure, with the principal taking sole responsibility to perform formal observations. Consistent with the school's previous practice, both the principal and various consultants provide informal written feedback about informal observations throughout the year. In contrast to last year's practice, the principal reviews the critiques in order to make the message to individual teachers uniform and consistent. These observations focus heavily on classroom processes, focusing on the year's identified professional development priorities. The observations place little emphasis on the outcomes of classroom procedures, on what students have learned and how well they learned it. Teacher evaluation files provide no evidence that the school uses outcomes-based evaluation; the leadership has not linked standardized test results to evaluating teacher effectiveness.

School leaders provide regular opportunities for teachers to plan the delivery of instruction within grade levels and content areas during the weekly common planning time; opportunities for planning instruction across grade levels are limited.

## 1. F At-Risk Students

***New World Prep addresses the needs of special education students, ELLs and students who struggle academically.***

In contrast to last year when New World Prep had limited procedures to identify academically struggling students, the school now has a comprehensive Response to Intervention (RTI) process for identifying students not succeeding in the regular program. To the credit of the school, it initiates the RTI process for all struggling students, including those with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) in order to provide them with various interventions. The school's two grade-level teams hold weekly meetings to discuss concerns about particular students' classroom performance. The school social worker facilitates

the meetings and coordinates the evaluation process by reviewing student assessment data and discussing students of concern with teachers. In addition, she monitors the progress students are making in order to lead follow-up discussions about the effectiveness of the selected interventions. While the school has established regular procedures, it has not provided clearly defined criteria for identifying students. Aside from placing students in a remedial phonics program, the school does not systematically use assessment results for making intervention decisions. The teachers, who initiate the RTI process, rely to a great extent on their own professional judgment, using class grades as the most important factor for identification. Given the staff's inexperience and the absence of a clear school-wide grading policy, identification is unreliable. In contrast to this reliance on teacher judgment, the school now identifies ELLs based on the prescribed ELL assessment criteria.

The school provides sufficient training and support to teachers and specialists with regard to meeting the needs of at-risk students. Both special education teachers and the English-as-a-second-language (ESL) teacher provide training to the classroom teachers who demonstrate a working knowledge of students' Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals and instructional strategies for meeting those goals. The classroom teachers benefit from the specialists' pushing into their classes. Special education teachers report that the school has integrated them well into the mainstream classroom environment. Further, the school provides sufficient time and support for on-going coordination between the general education teachers and the special intervention providers.

With about 25 percent of the students (N=48) having IEPs and five percent (N=11) being classified as ELLs, the school deploys sufficient resources to provide adequate academic interventions to address the range of students' needs. The school has two special education and one ESL full-time teachers, as well as a social worker. In addition to co-teaching with general education teachers, the special education teachers provide a phonics program to the lowest achieving general and special education students. The school offers an after-school reading program as well as a Saturday Academy. Classroom teachers work with selected students in bi-weekly tutorial groups. In pushing into ELA classes and pulling students out during other times of day, the ESL teacher differentiates interventions for beginning and advanced ELL students, as well as for those who have passed the New York State English-as-a-second-language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) but still need skill reinforcement.

### **1. G Student Order and Discipline**

#### ***New World Prep promotes a culture of learning and scholarship.***

Classroom management techniques and daily routines establish a culture in which learning is valued and clearly evident. Students are respectful and generally orderly. The school is safe. The current school-wide emphasis on higher order thinking skills promotes a scholarly environment. In most classrooms, teachers redirect low-level misbehavior, but in some classes, given the current school priority on questioning techniques, teachers become overly focused on encouraging students to elaborate and explain an answer without maintaining classroom management.

The school's discipline policy is a school-wide code of conduct, but teachers continue to generate independent classroom rules and procedures, often linked to class-wide incentives for good behavior.

### **1. H Professional Development**

#### ***New World Prep's professional development program focuses on a consistent set of annual priorities***

***which addresses the needs of an inexperienced teaching staff.***

The school continues to provide a two-week summer professional development session for school staff and teachers. With an early dismissal one afternoon a week, the school now has a regular ongoing professional development schedule. The school has a clear professional development priority for the year: questioning techniques and developing higher order thinking skills. In interviews, teachers discuss current pedagogical issues in terms of this focus. Displays on the topic are prevalent throughout the school. In addition to school-wide meetings to address these topics, time is also allotted to grade team and subject area assessment and curriculum planning. While such planning is an indirect professional development opportunity, the school undertakes the planning as a mutual support effort among peers with limited mentoring or coaching.

During the course of the school year, part-time and occasional professional development consultants work directly with teachers, as they did last year, as subject area coaches. However, the consultants now report to the principal, rather than to Victory. With this change, the principal provides oversight over the consultants. Nevertheless, the consultants still have a great deal of latitude in carrying out their subject area assignments.

Within the parameters of the year's focus, the staff provides substantial input for setting the professional development agenda. Further, the principal follows up in her classroom observations to determine if teachers are more actively engaged in questioning techniques, challenging students to elaborate, etc. She in turn, modifies the upcoming professional agenda based on her observations. Teachers do not report that the consultants focus on these school-wide professional development priorities.

The school provides ongoing support and training tailored to teachers' varying levels of expertise and instructional responsibilities. Teachers report that the school supports their attending outside workshops and specialized training. In addition, the principal provides individualized support by working with teachers to develop individual goals and by beginning to videotape teaching episodes in order to encourage teacher self-reflection.

## ***2. C Organizational Capacity***

***With the development of some instructional systems, New World Prep's organization is beginning to support the delivery of the educational program.***

With a large support staff and Victory's back-office services, the school demonstrates effective management of day-to-day operations. Staff scheduling, especially for special education and ESL teachers is internally consistent. The school's schedule for assessment and curriculum meetings, as well as for RTI, is supportive of the school's program. It establishes clear priorities in curriculum and professional development for achieving its mission. The school continues to put in place equipment and curriculum materials to enhance the academic program.

The school has an inexperienced staff with limited supervisory support to guide their development. The principal regularly hires part-time assistant teachers, who can apprentice during the school year and, if offered a full-time position, begin to plan instruction for the next school year. Five of nine of the school's 6<sup>th</sup> grade teachers returned to the school this year; the 7<sup>th</sup> grade teachers are generally all new to the school. All but three classroom teachers have only one-year's teaching experience; one classroom teacher has three-year's experience. A number of teachers did not return this year by mutual

agreement; the school has not removed any teachers for ineffective performance. In the context of the inexperienced teaching staff and with no other full-time instructional leaders besides the principal, the small number of “experienced” teachers mentor struggling teachers. The consultants do not perform a mentoring role.

New World Prep has faced the challenge of serving a student population which is different from its intent: to serve a high proportion of English language learners. While the school is under-enrolled because of this misalignment, it has instituted promising procedures for recruiting new students to the school. With a staff member dedicated to outreach at local churches and schools, offering open houses and special events, as well as through advertising, the school has a waiting list for next year’s 6<sup>th</sup> grade. In keeping with its mission, the school established an ELL preference for this year’s lottery.

The school has not yet conducted a comprehensive evaluation of its program. The school has begun to use assessment data to evaluate the curriculum. Specifically, based on results from the second administration of the norm-referenced Acuity mathematics test, it modified its pacing calendar and engaged a teaching assistant to work with small groups.

Overall, New World Prep has begun to establish instructional systems in key areas of the program. In response to last year’s Institute report, it has put in place a set of processes and procedures for using assessment data. However, teachers continue to rely on unreliable classroom assessment results and inconsistent grading practices. In addition, the school leadership has not linked standardized assessment results to evaluating teacher effectiveness. The school has a variety of interventions for struggling students, but the identification of students for special interventions is not based on uniform criteria. The principal has consolidated teacher evaluations by taking sole responsibility for implementing a comprehensive evaluative process for developing their professional competence, including a range of checklists, write-ups and observations. Aside from the demands of completing alone the broad set of tasks, the principal has focused on teaching processes rather than on student’s actual learning. While the approach ultimately centers on learning, it again does not yet address teacher effectiveness based on student achievement. Finally, despite consolidating the oversight of consultants, the school model of using part-time coaches limits the support available to the notably inexperienced teaching staff.

## **2. D Board Oversight**

***New World Prep’s school board has worked diligently to achieve the school’s mission.***

The board has adequate skills, structures and procedures with which to govern the school; its members have the experience and expertise required to govern a school, with a noteworthy proportion having public school experience. Their collective expertise includes education, law, finance and community service. The board held a retreat last summer to address the Institute’s first-year report, including oversight of professional development, board training, renegotiating the Victory contract and the monthly board dashboard. The board is self-reflective about its practice and seeks expert advice in evaluating the school program and in developing its own competence.

The school leadership team and Victory provide the board with a monthly “dashboard” which contains a summary of the school’s assessment data, financial statements, student enrollment, information and staff attendance data. The Academic Committee meets monthly to discuss operational issues and the continued implementation of the instructional program, including the school’s bullying policy, special

reading programs, common core standards, summer programs, recruitment and lottery issues and professional development training.

A principal performance sub-committee evaluates the principal, considering expectations, self-assessment and performance goals. They consult with a senior consultant who also mentors the principal. The board reports that the principal focuses on instruction, spending most of her time in the classrooms. Members believe that the board cannot fully evaluate the school program and hold the school leader accountable for student achievement until after it has two data points of test assessment results. Board members state that they have evaluated Victory's service from the outset and have sought contract changes when they realized that the implemented services did not meet their requirements. The board is now considering which specific Victory services to continue to use. The board is actively reviewing various facility options, including installing pre-fabricated classrooms in the schoolyard and leasing a building at another location. In either case, they report that they have adequate funds to absorb the additional costs.

**APPENDIX A: RENEWAL BENCHMARKS USED DURING THE VISIT**

An excerpt of the State University Charter Renewal Benchmarks follows. Visit the Institute’s website at <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/documents/renewalBenchmarks.doc> to see the complete listing of Benchmarks.

Benchmarks 1B – 1H, and Benchmarks 2A – 2E were using in conducting this evaluation visit.

	<b>Renewal Question 1 Is the School an Academic Success?</b>
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>State University Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<b>State University Renewal Benchmark 1B</b>  <b>Use of Assessment Data</b>	<p><b>The school has a system to gather assessment and evaluation data and uses it to improve instructional effectiveness and student learning.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school regularly uses standardized and other assessments that are aligned to the school’s curriculum framework and state performance standards;</li> <li>the school systematically collects and analyzes data from diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments, and makes it accessible to teachers, school leaders and the school board;</li> <li>the school uses protocols, procedures and rubrics that ensure that the scoring of assessments and evaluation of student work is reliable and trustworthy;</li> <li>the school uses assessment data to predict whether the school’s Accountability Plan goals are being achieved;</li> <li>the school’s leaders use assessment data to monitor, change and improve the school’s academic program, including curriculum and instruction, professional development, staffing and intervention services;</li> <li>the school’s teachers use assessment data to adjust and improve instruction to meet the identified needs of students;</li> <li>a common understanding exists between and among teachers and administrators of the meaning and consequences of assessment results, e.g., changes to the instructional program, access to remediation, promotion to the next grade;</li> <li>the school regularly communicates each student’s progress and growth to his or her parents/guardians; and</li> <li>the school regularly communicates to the school community overall academic performance as well as the school’s progress toward meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals.</li> </ul>
<b>State University Renewal Benchmark 1C</b>  <b>Curriculum</b>	<p><b>The school has a clearly defined curriculum and uses it to prepare students to meet state performance standards.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school has a well-defined curriculum framework for each grade and core academic subject, which includes the knowledge and skills that all students are expected to achieve as specified by New York State standards and performance indicators;</li> <li>the school has carefully analyzed all curriculum resources (including commercial materials) currently in use in relation to the school’s curriculum framework, identified areas of deficiency and/or misalignment, and addressed them in the instructional program;</li> <li>the curriculum <i>as implemented</i> is organized, cohesive, and aligned from grade to</li> </ul>



	<p>grade;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• teachers are fully aware of the curricula that they are responsible to teach and have access to curricular documents such as scope and sequence documents, pacing charts, and/or curriculum maps that guide the development of their lesson plans;</li> <li>• teachers develop and use lesson plans with objectives that are in alignment with the school’s curriculum;</li> <li>• the school has defined a procedure, allocated time and resources, and included teachers in ongoing review and revision of the curriculum; and</li> <li>• the curriculum supports the school’s stated mission.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 1D</b></p> <p><b>Pedagogy</b></p>	<p><b>High quality instruction is evident in all classes throughout the school.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• teachers demonstrate subject-matter and grade-level competency in the subjects and grades they teach;</li> <li>• instruction is rigorous and focused on learning objectives that specify clear expectations for what students must know and be able to do in each lesson;</li> <li>• lesson plans and instruction are aligned to the school’s curriculum framework and New York State standards and performance indicators;</li> <li>• instruction is differentiated to meet the range of learning needs represented in the school’s student population, e.g. flexible student grouping, differentiated materials, pedagogical techniques, and/or assessments;</li> <li>• all students are cognitively engaged in focused, purposeful learning activities during instructional time;</li> <li>• learning time is maximized (e.g., appropriate pacing, high on-task student behavior, clear lesson focus and clear directions to students), transitions are efficient, and there is day-to-day instructional continuity; and</li> <li>• teachers challenge students with questions and assignments that promote academic rigor, depth of understanding, and development of higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 1E</b></p> <p><b>Instructional Leadership</b></p>	<p><b>The school has strong instructional leadership.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the school’s leadership establishes an environment of high expectations for student achievement;</li> <li>• the school’s leadership establishes an environment of high expectations for teacher performance (in content knowledge, pedagogical skills and student achievement);</li> <li>• the school’s instructional leaders have in place a comprehensive and on-going system for evaluating teacher quality and effectiveness;</li> <li>• the school’s instructional leaders, based on classroom visits and other available data, provide direct ongoing support, such as critical feedback, coaching and/or modeling, to teachers in their classrooms;</li> <li>• the school’s leadership provides structured opportunities, resources and guidance for teachers to plan the delivery of the instructional program within and across grade levels as well as within disciplines or content areas;</li> <li>• the school’s instructional leaders organize a coherent and sustained professional development program that meets the needs of both the school and individual teachers;</li> <li>• the school’s leadership ensures that the school is responding to the needs of at-risk students and maximizing their achievement to the greatest extent possible in the regular education program using in-class resources and/or pull-out services and programs where necessary ; and</li> <li>• the school’s leadership conducts regular reviews and evaluations of the school’s</li> </ul>

<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 1F</b></p> <p><b>At-Risk Students</b></p>	<p>academic program and makes necessary changes to ensure that the school is effectively working to achieve academic standards defined by the State University Renewal Benchmarks in the areas of assessment, curriculum, pedagogy, student order and discipline, and professional development.</p> <p><b>The school is demonstrably effective in helping students who are struggling academically.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school deploys sufficient resources to provide academic interventions that address the range of students’ needs;</li> <li>all regular education teachers, as well as specialists, utilize effective strategies to support students within the regular education program;</li> <li>the school provides sufficient training, resources, and support to all teachers and specialists with regard to meeting the needs of at-risk students;</li> <li>the school has clearly defined screening procedures for identifying at-risk students and providing them with the appropriate interventions, and a common understanding among all teachers of these procedures;</li> <li>all regular education teachers demonstrate a working knowledge of students’ Individualized Education Program goals and instructional strategies for meeting those goals;</li> <li>the school provides sufficient time and support for on-going coordination between regular and special education teachers, as well as other program specialists and service providers; and</li> <li>the school monitors the performance of student participation in support services using well-defined school-wide criteria, and regularly evaluates the effectiveness of its intervention programs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 1G</b></p> <p><b>Student Order &amp; Discipline</b></p>	<p><b>The school promotes a culture of learning and scholarship.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school has a documented discipline policy that is consistently applied;</li> <li>classroom management techniques and daily routines have established a culture in which learning is valued and clearly evident;</li> <li>low-level misbehavior is not being tolerated, e.g., students are not being allowed to disrupt or opt-out of learning during class time; and</li> <li>throughout the school, a safe and orderly environment has been established.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 1H</b></p> <p><b>Professional Development</b></p>	<p><b>The school’s professional development program assists teachers in meeting student academic needs and school goals by addressing identified shortcomings in teachers’ pedagogical skills and content knowledge.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school provides sufficient time, personnel, materials and funding to support a comprehensive and sustained professional development program;</li> <li>the content of the professional development program dovetails with the school’s mission, curriculum, and instructional programs;</li> <li>annual professional development plans derive from a data-driven needs-assessment and staff interests;</li> <li>professional development places a high priority on achieving the State University Renewal Benchmarks and the school’s Accountability Plan goals;</li> <li>teachers are involved in setting short-term and long-term goals for their own professional development activities;</li> <li>the school provides effective, ongoing support and training tailored to teachers’</li> </ul>

	<p>varying levels of expertise and instructional responsibilities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school provides training to assist all teachers to meet the needs of students with disabilities, English language learners and other students at-risk of academic failure; and</li> <li>the professional development program is systematically evaluated to determine its effectiveness at meeting stated goals.</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>Renewal Question 2</b> <b>Is the School an Effective, Viable Organization?</b>	
<u>Evidence Category</u>	<u>State University Renewal Benchmarks</u>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 2A</b></p> <p><b>Mission &amp; Key Design Elements</b></p>	<p><b>The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stakeholders are aware of the mission;</li> <li>the school has implemented its key design elements in pursuit of its mission; and</li> <li>the school meets or comes close to meeting any non-academic goals contained in its Accountability Plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 2B</b></p> <p><b>Parents &amp; Students</b></p>	<p><b>Parents/guardians and students are satisfied with the school.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school has a process and procedures for evaluation of parent satisfaction with the school;</li> <li>the great majority of parents with students enrolled at the school have strong positive attitudes about it;</li> <li>few parents pursue grievances at the school board level or outside the school;</li> <li>a large number of parents seek entrance to the school;</li> <li>parents with students enrolled keep their children enrolled year-to-year; and</li> <li>the school maintains a high rate of daily student attendance.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 2C</b></p> <p><b>Organizational Capacity</b></p>	<p><b>The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure with staff, systems, and procedures that allow the school to carry out its academic program.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school demonstrates effective management of day-to-day operations;</li> <li>staff scheduling is internally consistent and supportive of the school’s mission;</li> <li>the school has established clear priorities, objectives and benchmarks for achieving its mission and Accountability Plan goals, and a process for their regular review and revision;</li> <li>the school has allocated sufficient resources in support of achieving its goals;</li> <li>the roles and responsibilities of the school’s leadership and staff members are clearly defined;</li> <li>the school has an organizational structure that provides clear lines for accountability;</li> <li>the school’s management has successfully recruited, hired and retained key personnel, and made appropriate decisions about removing ineffective staff members</li> </ul>

	<p>when warranted;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school maintains an adequate student enrollment and has effective procedures for recruiting new students to the school; and</li> <li>the school’s management and board have demonstrated effective communication practices with the school community including school staff, parents/guardians and students.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 2D</b></p> <p><b>Board Oversight</b></p>	<p><b>The school board has worked effectively to achieve the school’s mission and provide oversight to the total educational program.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school board has adequate skills and expertise, as well as adequate meeting time to provide rigorous oversight of the school;</li> <li>the school board (or a committee thereof) understands the core business of the school—student achievement—in sufficient depth to permit the board to provide effective oversight;</li> <li>the school board has set clear long-term and short-term goals and expectations for meeting those goals, and communicates them to the school’s management and leaders;</li> <li>the school board has received regular written reports from the school leadership on academic performance and progress, financial stability and organizational capacity;</li> <li>the school board has conducted regular evaluations of the school’s management (including school leaders who report to the board, supervisors from management organization(s), and/or partner organizations that provide services to the school), and has acted on the results where such evaluations demonstrated shortcomings in performance;</li> <li>where there have been demonstrable deficiencies in the school’s academic, organizational or fiscal performance, the school board has taken effective action to correct those deficiencies and put in place benchmarks for determining if the deficiencies are being corrected in a timely fashion;</li> <li>the school board has not made financial or organizational decisions that have materially impeded the school in fulfilling its mission; and</li> <li>the school board conducts on-going assessment and evaluation of its own effectiveness in providing adequate school oversight, and pursues opportunities for further governance training and development.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 2E</b></p> <p><b>Governance</b></p>	<p><b>The board has implemented and maintained appropriate policies, systems and processes, and has abided by them.</b></p> <p>Elements that are generally present include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the school board has established a set of priorities that are in line with the school’s goals and mission and has effectively worked to design and implement a system to achieve those priorities;</li> <li>the school board has in place a process for recruiting and selecting new members in order to maintain adequate skill sets and expertise for effective governance and structural continuity;</li> <li>the school board has implemented a comprehensive and strict conflict of interest policy (and/or code of ethics)—consistent with those set forth in the charter—and consistently abided by them through the term of the charter;</li> <li>the school board has generally avoided creating conflicts of interest where possible;</li> </ul>

	<p>where not possible, the school has managed those conflicts of interest in a clear and transparent manner;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the school board has instituted a process for dealing with complaints (and such policy is consistent with that set forth in the charter), has made that policy clear to all stakeholders, and has followed that policy including acting in a timely fashion on any such complaints;</li> <li>• the school board has abided by its by-laws including, but not limited to, provisions regarding trustee elections, removals and filling of vacancies;</li> <li>• the school board and its committees hold meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law, and minutes are recorded for all meetings including executive sessions and, as appropriate, committee meetings; and</li> <li>• the school board has in place a set of board and school policies that are reviewed regularly and updated as needed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>State University Renewal Benchmark 2F</b></p> <p><b>Legal Requirements</b></p>	<p><b>The school has substantially complied with applicable laws, rules and regulations and the provisions of its charter.</b></p> <p><b>Elements that are generally present include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• during its charter period, the school has compiled a record of substantial compliance with the terms of its charter and applicable state and federal laws, rules and regulations including, but not limited to, submitting items to the Institute in a timely manner, and meeting teacher certification (including NCLB highly qualified status) and background check requirements, FOIL, and Open Meetings Law;</li> <li>• at the time of renewal, the school is in substantial compliance with the terms of its charter and applicable laws, rules and regulations;</li> <li>• over the charter period, the school has abided by the terms of its monitoring plan;</li> <li>• the school has designed and put in place effective systems and controls to ensure that legal and charter requirements were and are met; and</li> <li>• the school has an active and ongoing relationship with in-house or independent legal counsel that reviews relevant policies, documents, transactions and incidents and makes recommendations and handles other legal matters as needed.</li> </ul>