



University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men

School Evaluation Report 2012-13

Visit Date: March 7-8, 2013

Report Issued: August 14, 2013

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 2011-12 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 an analysis of evidence collected during the school visit. Following these sections, an appendix provides the State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks (the "Renewal Benchmarks").

While the Institute conducts a comprehensive review of evidence related to all Renewal Benchmarks near the end of a charter term, most mid-cycle evaluation visits focus on a subset of these benchmarks. These Qualitative Education Benchmarks address the academic success of the school and the effectiveness and viability of the school organization. They provide a framework for examining the quality of the educational program, focusing on teaching and learning (i.e., curriculum, instruction, and assessment), as well as organizational capacity, board oversight and governance. The SUNY Charter Schools Institute (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 benchmark conclusions and evidence to support these conclusions in order to highlight areas of concern and provide additional feedback. The Institute intends this selection of information to be an exception report, which deliberately emphasizes areas of concern. As such, limited detail and evidence about positive elements of the educational program are not an indication that the Institute does not fully recognize evidence of program effectiveness.

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 Education Benchmarks.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Opening Information

Date Initial Charter Approved by SUNY Trustees	June 16, 2009
Date Initial Charter Approved by Board of Regents	February 17, 2010
School Opening Date	September 2010

Location

School Year(s)	Location(s)	Grades	District
2010-11 to Present	180 Raines Park Rochester, NY	7-10	Rochester City School District

Mission Statement

<p>The mission of University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men is to establish a single-sex education option in the City of Rochester with an engaging learning environment and informed practices that are effective for young men. The school will be available to all city residents who choose to have their children educated in a single-sex education environment, regardless of their ability to meet high tuition costs.</p>
--

Key Design Elements

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single-sex education; • individualized learning; • substantive content; • daily advisory; and • continuous relationship building.

School Characteristics

School Year	Original Chartered Enrollment	Actual Enrollment ¹	Original Chartered Grades	Actual Grades
2010-11	150	157	7-8	7-8
2011-12	225	237	7-9	7-9
2012-13	300	303 ²	7-10	7-10

¹ Source: SUNY Charter Schools Institute's Official Enrollment Binder. (Figures may differ slightly from New York State Report Cards, depending on date of data collection.)

² Annual Visit Data Collection Form, February 2013.

Student Demographics³

	2010-11		2011-12	
	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of Rochester City School District Enrollment	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of Rochester City School District Enrollment
Race/Ethnicity				
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	0	0
Black or African American	76	63	77	62
Hispanic	11	23	10	24
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	5	3	3	3
White	9	10	10	10
Multiracial	0	0	0	0
Special Populations				
Students with Disabilities	N/A ⁴	N/A ⁵	18 ⁶	22 ⁷
English Language Learners	4	11	3	11
Free/Reduced Lunch				
Eligible for Free Lunch	72	79	86	83
Eligible for Reduced-Price Lunch	14	5	13	5

Board of Trustees⁸

Board Member Name	Position/Committees
Dr. Edward Yansen	President
Dr. Michael Robinson	Vice President- Policy Development
Vincent Carfagna	Treasurer
Elizabeth Speares	Secretary
Maria Scalise	Vice President- Community Relations
Dr. Marie Cianca	Chair- Program Development
Dr. Jeanette Silvers	Trustee
Sam Valleriani	Trustee
Dr. Sequetta Sweet	Trustee

³ Source: 2010-11 School Report Cards, State Education Department (“SED”).

⁴ Source: The 2010-11 Students with Disabilities statistic is derived from the school’s October 2010 student enrollment report to SED (2010-11 BEDS Report).

⁵ Source: District-level Students with Disabilities enrollment data are not available for 2010-11. SED released these district data for the first time in spring 2012. Please note that SED releases data up to a full year after the conclusion of any one school year. As such, the data presented in this table may differ from current information reported by the school and included in this report.

⁶ Based on the state’s Empirical Analysis of Enrollment Targets.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Source: Institute board information.

School Leader(s)

School Year	School Leader(s) Name and Title
2010-11 to Present	Joseph Munno, Principal

School Visit History

School Year	Visit Type	Evaluator (Institute/External)	Date
2010-11	First Year	Institute	February 3, 2011
2011-12	Annual Visit	Institute	October 13, 2011
2012-13	Annual Visit	Institute	March 7-8, 2013

CONDUCT OF THE SCHOOL EVALUATION VISIT**Specifications**

Date(s) of Visit	Evaluation Team Members	Title
March 7-8, 2013	Sean Fitzsimons	Director of School Applications
	Jeff Wasbes	Director of Performance and Systems
	Elizabeth Genco	Director of Charter School Information
	Eileen Coppola, Ed.D	External Consultant

Context of the Visit

Charter Cycle	
Charter Term	3 rd Year of Charter Term
Accountability Period ⁹	3 rd Year of Four-Year Accountability Period
Anticipated Renewal Visit	Fall 2014

⁹ Because the SUNY Trustees make a renewal decision in the last year of a Charter Term, the Accountability Period ends in the next to last year of the Charter Term. For initial renewals, the Accountability Period is the first four years of the Charter Term. For subsequent renewals, the Accountability Period includes the last year of the previous Charter Term through the next to last year of the current Charter Term.

2011-12 School Performance Review

Performance Summary

In 2011-12, the second year of University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men's ("University Prep's") five-year Accountability Period, and the first year during which all five measures of the Accountability Plan apply, the school is meeting neither its English language arts ("ELA") nor its math goal. University Prep is meeting its NCLB goal; however, it is not meeting its science goal.

In its first year instructing 9th graders, students who sat for Regents exams showed promising results; however, as University Prep's high school Accountability Plan requires that it report on a variety of measures mostly after four years of high school, including graduation, college preparation and Regents exams performance, these preliminary results are insufficient evidence to draw definitive conclusions about its high school performance.

ELA

Based on the results of the five measures in its Accountability Plan, University Prep did not meet its ELA goal in 2011-12. The school has only met one of the applicable ELA measures since first administering the state testing program in 2010-11. In 2011-12 the school fell far short of meeting its absolute target of 75 percent of students enrolled in at least their second year testing proficient, with only 34 percent meeting this bar. The school did not meet the Annual Measurable Objective ("AMO") set by the state, a similar outcome to that of 2010-11. It did, however, outperform the Rochester City Schools by a narrow margin. In comparison to demographically similar schools statewide, University Prep also failed to meet its target, performing worse than expected, though the school did show some improvement on this measure from the previous year. In the first year that the cohort growth measure was applicable, the school did not meet the target with the 8th graders showing a year-to-year decline.

Math

Based on the results of the five measures in its Accountability Plan, University Prep has not met its Accountability Plan goal in math. The school met the absolute target in 2011-12, with 86 percent of students enrolled in at least their second year achieving proficiency; however, the school did not meet the state's AMO. University Prep outperformed the Rochester City Schools by 22 percentage points. In comparison to demographically similar schools state-wide, the school did not meet the target, though it performed better than expected and showed substantial improvement from the previous year. The school met its cohort growth target in 2011-12, with the 8th grade cohort showing year-to-year gains from when they were in the 7th grade.

Science

In both years the school administered the 8th grade state exam in science, the school failed to meet its science goal, with only 45 percent of students showing proficiency in 2010-11 and 65 percent in 2011-12.

No Child Left Behind

University Prep has met its NCLB goal.

SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: English Language Arts
University Preparatory Charter School For Young Men



	2009-10 Grades Served:			MET	2010-11 Grades Served: 7-8			MET	2011-12 Grades Served: 7-9			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	(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	(0)	(0)							
	7	(0)	(0)		7	58.6 (87)	(0)		7	61.1 (72)	50.0 (2)							
	8	(0)	(0)		8	13.1 (18)	(0)		8	30.7 (101)	33.3 (75)							
	All	(0)	(0)	--	All	41.9 (148)	(0)	NA	All	43.4 (173)	33.8 (77)	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	NO	Grades	PI	AMO	NO						
					7-8	105	122		7-8	110	135							
COMPARATIVE MEASURES	Comparison: Rochester City Schools				Comparison: Rochester City Schools				Comparison: Rochester City Schools									
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.	Grades	School	District	--	Grades	School	District	NA	Grades	School	District	YES						
									8	22.1	17.4							
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				
						72.0	20.2	29.3	-0.61		85.7	22.4	26.6	-0.29				
GROWTH MEASURE	Gr	N	Base	Target	Result		Gr	N	Base	Target	Result		Gr	N	Base	Target	Result	
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.	3	0				--	3	0				NA	3					NO
	4	0					4	0					4					
	5	0					5	0					5					
	6	0					6	0					6					
	7	0					7	0					7	2	0.0	12.5	0.0	
	8	0					8	0					8	71	31.0	38.3	23.9	
	All	0					All	0					All	73	30.1	37.6	23.3	

TACSThe 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

University Preparatory Charter School for Young Men



	2009-10 Grades Served:			MET	2010-11 Grades Served: 7-8			MET	2011-12 Grades Served: 7-9			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	(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	(0)	(0)				
	7	(0)	(0)		7	70.2 (94)	(0)		7	73.6 (72)	100.0 (2)				
	8	(0)	(0)		8	55.7 (61)	(0)		8	82.0 (100)	85.3 (75)				
	All	(0)	(0)	--	All	64.5 (155)	(0)	NA	All	78.5 (172)	85.7 (77)	YES			
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	NO	Grades	PI	AMO	NO			
	7-8	106	137		7-8	134	148		7-8	134	148				
COMPARATIVE MEASURES	Comparison: Rochester City Schools				Comparison: Rochester City Schools				Comparison: Rochester City Schools						
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.	Grades	School	District	--	Grades	School	District	NA	Grades	School	District	YES			
	8	42.9	21.4		8	42.9	21.4		8	42.9	21.4				
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	NO	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	NO
	72.0	24.6	46.3	-1.01		72.0	24.6	46.3	-1.01		85.7	42.2	41.0	0.05	
GROWTH MEASURE	Gr N Base Target Result				Gr N Base Target Result				Gr N Base Target Result						
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.	3	0			3	0		NA	3						YES
	4	0			4	0			4						
	5	0			5	0			5						
	6	0			6	0			6						
	7	0			7	0			7	2	0.0	12.5	0.0		
	8	0			8	0			8	77	35.1	41.7	42.9	*	
	All	0			All	0			All	79	34.2	41.0	41.8		

TACSThe 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 EVALUATION VISIT

Benchmark Conclusions and Evidence

1. B Use of Assessment Data

University Prep’s assessment program supports the development of teacher effectiveness, but it has limited effect on improving student achievement, especially in ELA , to the extent that teachers identify student skill deficiencies on their own without leaders’ oversight and coordination.

- The school administers Scholastic Reading and Math Inventories (“SRI” and “SMI”) twice per year. The school also administers the Scholastic Phonics Inventory twice per year to English language learners (“ELLs”). The school’s instructional leaders use the results primarily to group students by ability and to identify those in need of intervention.
- The school administers benchmark assessments three times per year. The school’s literacy specialist creates ELA assessments using items from commercial sources and the state’s sample Common Core aligned test. The school administers the MAP PLUS (Continental Press) assessment system for mathematics.
- Teachers use procedures to analyze benchmark assessment data that include item and standards analysis with little oversight from instructional leaders and without a set of school-wide procedures. Teachers meet with instructional leaders to develop classroom strategies for small group instruction based on assessment results; however, they do not check teachers’ data analyses for validity before engaging in this work. Teachers then administer self-developed assessments to determine the effectiveness of their strategies, again without any scrutiny from leadership.
- Instructional leaders use the teachers’ own data analyses to identify areas for individual growth and to develop coaching strategies to address these concerns. They also use these analyses to inform classroom observations and look for indicators that teachers are addressing weaknesses as determined by the data.
- Math teachers grade assessments as a group and discuss the level of rigor that they expect in responses in order to ensure inter-rater reliability. ELA teachers also grade assessments as a group, using the state’s common core aligned rubrics. However, ELA teachers do not trade papers to ensure inter-rater reliability.
- Teachers use benchmark and unit assessment data to identify students requiring special academic intervention. Teachers discuss students scoring below standard at team meetings where they determine which students may need more intense interventions.

1. C Curriculum

University Prep’s curriculum supports teachers in their instructional planning.

- The school uses the New York State Standards as a framework for further curriculum development. During the summer, teachers, with oversight from the school’s director of instruction, create curriculum maps that establish a foundation for lesson planning by

providing a basic sense of pacing, school-developed objectives and essential questions. They detail the knowledge and skills that school leaders expect all students to master over the course of the school year.

- The school uses a common unit-plan template based on the Understanding by Design model. Teachers create unit plans during the course of the school year with oversight from instructional leaders, who provide feedback when necessary.
- Teachers create lessons using a school-wide common lesson planning template. Teachers submit these plans to instructional leaders on a weekly basis. The leaders again provide feedback as needed.
- Teachers design most lessons with purpose and focus. The school visit team observed core subject classroom teachers implementing lessons with fidelity.

1. D Pedagogy

Quality instruction is evident in most classes, with some exceptions. In Academic Intervention Service (“AIS”) classes, instruction often lacks clear purpose and rigor.

- In 71 percent (17 out of 24) of the classrooms observed by the visit team, teachers in the core subjects delivered purposeful lessons with clear objectives aligned to the school’s curriculum. Core teachers generally communicate learning objectives clearly to students either verbally or in writing. In some classrooms, teachers ask students to analyze daily objectives and essential questions to ensure student awareness of lesson goals.
- Across the school, AIS classrooms vary in purposeful focus. While some of these interventions provide deliberate instruction rooted in one-on-one conferencing, observed student-teacher interactions in other AIS classrooms occur primarily when students seek teacher assistance while completing independent work; in these instances, the AIS classrooms resemble tutoring sessions rather than planned classes.
- University Prep teachers usually check for student understanding by calling on students and circulating throughout their classrooms. However, they often do not follow through on this information by modifying instruction or taking advantage of teaching opportunities by correcting the errors that they observe. In 13 observations, the team found an adequate level of continual assessment; however, in the remaining cases, teachers did not adequately assess students’ progress toward meeting learning objectives.
- A substantial number of core teachers attempt to challenge students with a range of opportunities to develop depth of understanding and higher order thinking. The visit team observed 13 classrooms where teachers challenged students to engage in higher order thinking. Some teachers are masterful at engaging students in higher order activities, while others appear to be in the early stages of developing teaching techniques to help students effectively engage in challenging tasks. In math classes, for example, students write conceptually about modeling; a persuasive writing class helps students to carefully structure arguments utilizing data. In other classes, however, teachers posed higher order questions, but lacked the techniques to deepen students’ thinking by challenging students to elaborate on or debate their answers.

- Most teachers at University Prep maximize learning time through appropriate pacing, on-task student behavior, clear lesson focus and clear directions to students. In a minority of classes, pacing was too slow, directions were unclear or students were unfocused to the extent that learning time was lost. Transitions are efficient throughout the school.
- Teachers have effective classroom management techniques and routines that create a consistent focus on academic achievement. In 17 observations, strong classroom management was evident. However, in the remaining classrooms, management was less effective, reducing time spent on learning.
- This year, the school has implemented a co-teaching model with two certified teachers in each core classroom in addition to other adults such as student teachers and intervention staff. The school has paired English and social studies teachers and paired science and math teachers. While the co-teaching pairs do not always fully integrate their curriculum, they generally support one another by addressing student questions during group activities, enhancing student focus during teacher directed activities.

1. E Instructional Leadership

University Prep has recently expanded its leadership team and is beginning to develop a consistent instructional leadership structure.

- At the start of the current school year, in response to University Prep's low performance on the state's 2012 ELA assessment, the board hired two additional instructional leaders in order to strengthen the school's ELA instruction. The school now has an additional full-time literacy coach and a second assistant principal responsible only for instruction as well as a second assistant principal devoted to student order and discipline.
- At the time of the visit, the school had not defined all leadership roles. For example, the school has not yet delineated which instructional leader is responsible for the social studies department.
- Teachers understand the role of instructional leaders in coaching them to develop their individual pedagogical competencies; however, they do not have a clear, shared understanding of school-wide instructional priorities.
- The school's leadership establishes a climate of high expectations for both teachers and students that University Prep is a college preparatory school. Even though the school only has students in grades 7-10, it has a counselor focused on college preparation specifically with students in grades 9 and 10.
- Instructional leaders provide considerable coaching for teachers to help them develop their instructional skills. Coaching is detailed and intensive, but is not based on a set of school-wide priorities. Further, in the absence of 2012-13 state ELA assessment results, the actual effectiveness of additional literacy coaching is yet to be determined.
- Professional development sessions, which take place weekly, serve a variety of purposes, depending on the subject areas and needs of the teachers. Some sessions emphasize school-wide priorities, such as the lesson planning format. These school-wide professional development activities are interrelated with the leaders' observations of classroom practice,

but leaders do not link them to assessment data either to identify school-wide topics or to ascertain the effectiveness of previous training.

- Instructional leaders conduct teacher evaluations yearly, with more frequent observations conducted for many teachers. Nevertheless, leaders use several different evaluation models, such that teachers are unclear about the overall, school-wide criteria used to evaluate teachers. Leaders hold teachers accountable for student success on standardized assessments; however, because they do not adequately and consistently communicate to teachers the student achievement priorities, teachers are not fully aware of the performance goals.

1. F At-Risk Students

University Prep provides a number of services for students with disabilities, ELLs and students at-risk of academic failure; however, the school lacks a consistent process of identifying ELLs and clear system for monitoring the progress of students who are struggling academically in order to adjust their intervention strategies.

- All students, except those designated as advanced, receive AIS services, which consist of online math and reading intervention programs; 9th grade students also receive a writing AIS block. University Prep uses results from the previous year's state assessments as well as the SRI and SMI to create student groupings for AIS classes. Notwithstanding this clear identification process at the start of the school year, University Prep's AIS program does not sufficiently address the needs of students at-risk of academic failure. Teachers plan most AIS activities based on the needs of an entire AIS class instead of individual student needs. Despite the school's at-risk staff monitoring the progress of at-risk students' performance on the SRI, SMI and benchmark tests, student grouping in AIS classes is generally static and not responsive to student growth throughout the year. The school's at-risk staff does not share information about SRI and MRI results with general education staff, limiting the usefulness of this data.
- University Prep has a procedure for identifying students with disabilities. While the school's special education staff can explain the three-tiered response to intervention ("RTI") program, the procedures are not clear to all general education teachers. Teachers are unaware of how the RTI process works, but report that they can discuss students who may require services during team meetings.
- The school has adequate programs to address the needs of students requiring special education services, including inclusion special education teachers at each grade and uses the services of the district to provide resource room and related services. Staff and school leaders report that district providers regularly communicate and coordinate with school staff.
- The school uses an ad hoc approach to identifying students as ELLs. It administers the Home Language Survey to all students during the student enrollment process, but has an inadequate follow through to the survey results, relying on the school's principal to determine if a student may be an ELL student. The school's process does not meet requirements for ELL identification. The Institute is working with the school to address this concern.

- The school has adequate staffing and resources to serve its current identified English language learner population. It has a staff member with training in English-as-a-second-language (“ESL”) strategies who provides one block of small group instruction to ELL students per day, by focusing on vocabulary instruction and strategies to help students access academic material. Teachers are aware of their students’ IEP goals and accommodations and their students’ ELL proficiency levels. Teachers meet informally, but frequently, with the school’s inclusion and ESL staff to discuss strategies and the needs of individual students.

2. C Organizational Capacity

University Prep does not yet have a well-defined and stable organizational structure.

- With the addition of leadership positions and shifting assignments at the beginning of the school year, the school continues to change its administrative structure and responsibilities to address the school’s needs. The school does not yet have clear lines of accountability with clearly defined roles and responsibilities for all staff. While the organization has a clear reporting structure, teachers indicate that various members of the leadership team evaluate them and that there is no consistent school-wide evaluation protocol.
- The school has a clear student discipline system in place that is consistently applied. This year, the school has added an assistant principal of student management who has implemented a program to reduce student suspensions and lost learning time. The new program uses redirection as a first line of defense (non-verbal/visual redirect, small verbal redirect) and then social/emotional support before taking disciplinary actions. Through the work of the new assistant principal, there are few instances of student disruptions in the classroom and halls are generally orderly.
- The school appears to have sufficient resources to support the achievement of its goals. Teachers report that they have the necessary materials to execute their lessons. The school puts ample resources into supporting the co-teaching model. The school facility is adequate to support the current program; however, the school seeks to move to a new facility next year as the program expands. The school maintains adequate enrollment with a wait list at all grades except 10th grade.
- The school is not yet subject to enrollment and retention targets; however, school leaders and the board are aware that they will have to address these targets during any possible subsequent renewal and that they must address deficiencies in their approach to identifying English language learners.
- The school regularly monitors and evaluates its programs and makes changes as necessary. As indicated above, because of the school’s ELA assessment performance last year, the board and school leaders have added an experienced literacy coach and an assistant principal to increase teachers support.

2. D Board Oversight

University Prep's board actively oversees the school's attainment of its Accountability Plan goals.

- Though the University Prep board of trustees has had significant turnover in its membership since its founding year, University Prep's current board members appear to possess the skills necessary to govern the school and have put in place structures and procedures with which to do so. Board members have skills in a variety of areas including school accountability, law, K-12 administration, higher education, finance, information technology and student outreach. The board has developed a structure with specialized committees including a program and accountability committee, policy and by-laws committee, and personnel and finance committee. The board meets monthly with committees meeting as necessary.
- The board requests and receives sufficient information to provide rigorous oversight of the school's program and finances, as well as updates on student performance on school-administered assessments and information on school culture such as attendance, the number of suspensions, and updates on school staff. The board recently recruited a new member with experience in school accountability who has helped to redesign the dashboard to make it more user friendly and better capture information that supports the school in executing its governance responsibilities.
- The board holds school leaders accountable for student achievement, for example in response to the school's low student achievement on the state's ELA assessment, the board required the leadership to develop an action plan to improve the English program. School leaders regularly report on the progress of the action plan, with board members providing feedback and support as necessary. This action plan resulted in a comprehensive revamping of the school's literacy program including the addition of two new school leaders primarily tasked with supporting the literacy program.