



**NEW YORK FRENCH AMERICAN CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
MAY 2014**

Table of Contents

Summary of Renewal Recommendation	2
I. Charter School Overview	2
II. Overview of School-Specific Data	2
III. Rationale for Recommendation	4
School Overview and History	7
Renewal Process Overview	9
Findings	11
Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success	11
Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization.....	16
Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?	21
Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?	23
Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview	24
Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework	25
Appendix A: School Performance Data.....	34
Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data	36

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Name of Charter School	New York French American Charter School
Current Board Chair(s)	Richard Ortoli
School Leader	Edith Boncompain
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 3
Physical Address	311 West 120th Street, New York, NY 10027
Facility	Non DOE-Operated
School Opened For Instruction	2010-2011
Current Charter Term Expiry Date	9/14/2014
Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at Expiry Date	K-5 / 183
Proposed Charter Term	Short Term
Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at New Expiry Date	K-5/ 183

II. Overview of School-Specific Data:

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	-	C	B
Student Progress	-	-	F	B
Student Performance	-	-	C	B
School Environment	-	-	F	C
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	-	2.1	1.8

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	56.4%	27.6%
CSD 3	-	-	61.7%	46.8%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-5.3	-19.2
NYC	-	-	49.0%	27.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	7.4	-0.1
New York State	-	-	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-	-	1.2	-3.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	42.9%	30.6%
CSD 3	-	-	66.9%	52.0%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-24.0	-21.4
NYC	-	-	57.0%	34.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-14.1	-3.6
New York State	-	-	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-	-	-22.8	1.7

*All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Academic Goal Analysis (based on school's submission)					
	1st Year 2009-2010	2nd Year 2010-2011	3rd year 2011-2012	4th Year 2012-2013	Cumulative 4 Year Total
Total Achievable Academic Goals	0	0	3	4	7
# Met	0	0	1	0	1
# Partially Met	0	0	0	1	1
# Not Met	0	0	2	3	5
% Met	N/A	N/A	33%	0%	14%
% Partially Met	N/A	N/A	0%	25%	14%
% Not Met	N/A	N/A	67%	75%	71%

III. Rationale for Recommendation

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, New York French American Charter School (NYFACS) has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress. While NYFACS has a mixed track record of academic success, the school has demonstrated significant growth in progress, raising their New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Progress Report Student Progress section grade from an F to a B from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013.

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include, "(a) Improve student learning and achievement;" and "(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure." Data available for New York French American Charter School indicate that the school has partially made progress towards meeting these objectives.

NYFACS's mission is to develop global citizens who are well-prepared to assume leadership in a multicultural society. The school blends the rigorous standards of learning that are characteristic of the French educational system with American approaches that value individuality and critical thinking. NYFACS is the only bilingual/bi-literate French dual language immersion charter school in New York City. In addition to receiving instruction in English and French, in additional English and Math course in grades three – five, the school provides a French and English teacher in each class. The school blends two national educational standards, the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) and those of the French Ministry of Education, entitled the Common Base.

The school entered its fifth year of operation with the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. The school opened with grades kindergarten through second in their first year, thus, the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has two years of New York State (NYS) assessment data to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at NYFACS. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and are based on Student Progress, Student Performance, and School Environment with additional points for Closing the Achievement Gap. Scores are based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to all schools citywide.

New York French American Charter School has a mixed record of academic performance, but is demonstrating an upward trajectory. NYFACS received an overall B grade on the 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, as well as a B grade on the Student Progress section of the report; this represents a significant three grade improvement in its Student Progress section and one grade increase in its overall grade from 2011-2012.

Contributing to this improvement is the school's math growth, specifically with the school's subgroup population. Schools receive additional credit on the NYC DOE Progress Report for progress and performance of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. On the 2012-2013 state assessments, 64% of NYFACS's Black/Hispanic Males in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This places NYFACS in the top 25% of elementary schools citywide. Similarly, 60% of students at NYFACS in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores; placing NYFACS in the top half of elementary schools citywide.

The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report is the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constitutes 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section is based primarily on

median adjusted growth percentiles¹, which are a measure of how much a school's students perform on state tests relative to other students with the same prior score. NYFACS fared well in this section; moving from an F in 2011-2012 to a B in 2012-2013.

In 2012-2013, NYFACS's English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile was 71%, an adjusted growth greater than 79% of elementary schools citywide and within Community School District (CSD) 3. In this same category, the school ranked in the top 12% of their peer group. NYFACS's Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile was 84%, an adjusted growth greater than 99% of elementary schools citywide and an adjusted growth greater than 100% within CSD 3 and peer group.

The Student Performance grade is based on results on the state tests in English Language Arts (ELA) and math, representing 25% of a school's total Progress Report score. Over the charter term, NYFACS's Student Performance section grades were a C and a B for the years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, respectively. In 2011-2012, the school's students outperformed the city in ELA proficiency by 7.4 percentage points and NYS by 1.2 percentage points. In 2012-2013, the school's ELA proficiency was comparable to the citywide average, with a difference of less than 1%. In 2012-2013, the school outperformed New York State by 1.7 percentage points in math proficiency and was a mere 3.6 percentage points shy of the city.

Over the two years that data is available for the charter term, NYFACS has met only 20% of its academic charter goals.² No applicable charter goals were met in the first two years of the charter, as there were no attainable goals. In year three of the charter, the school met 20% of its academic goals. In the fourth year of the charter, the school met none of its applicable academic charter goals.

NYFACS offers Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETTS), Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) and English as a Second Language (ESL) programs. SETTTS services are provided in the form of small group, pull out or push in. The school's Special Education teachers also serve as Student Support Team (SST) members. Additional related services, such as speech and language services, occupational therapy and physical therapy are provided.

The school has shown only mixed evidence of a developed responsive education program and supportive learning environment. Reports from past NYC DOE visits to the school and NYC DOE School Surveys indicate that in the first years of the charter, there were concerns about the school's ability to provide a stable, environment that is conducive to learning. The school was plagued with leadership and board turnover, but has since stabilized within the last two years of the charter. The board and school leadership have implemented necessary programs and oversight mechanisms to ensure the school meets all the academic and non-academic goals.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has partially developed its governance structure and organizational design. After being placed on and removed from probation, the Board has worked on facilitating its own development. The Board continues to develop the tools and understanding needed to manage the school and monitor school leadership.

¹ A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the Progress Report uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect average differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The Progress Report evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

² It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture. As evidenced by the NYC DOE School Survey, throughout the charter term, the school has mixed satisfaction results from both parents and teachers. However, the school and board have actively worked on re-establishing the Francophone community many parents and teachers were first attracted to.

Overall, the school is in a weak position to meet near-term financial obligations. There are concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices. There were material weaknesses noted in the FY 2013 and FY 2011 independent financial audits.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, New York French American Charter School has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations, but not others.

On August 12, 2011 NYFACS was placed on a Notice of Concern by the NYC DOE. The Notice of Concern was issued to address concerns related to operations and instruction, particularly but not limited to school governance, certified staff, its proposed academic program and financial stability. These concerns arose from the school's annual site visit in May, 2011.

On December 7, 2011 NYFACS was placed on probation by the NYC DOE for a period beginning from the date of notice through August 31, 2012. During the probationary period the school was charged to address a series of concerns related to material and substantial violations, particularly but not limited to school policies and procedures, compliance, teacher certification, financial stability and violation of N. Y. Education Law § 2853, N.Y. Education Law § 2854 (3) and N.Y. Education Law § 2855 (e) .

On October 18, 2012, NYFACS was notified of extended probation by the NYC DOE for a period beginning from the date of original probationary notice through August 31, 2013. During the extended probation period the school was charged to address continued concerns and violations related to operations and management, including teacher certification and Board governance.

As a result of success in meeting the terms of probation and remedial action plan, NYFACS was removed from its Notice of Probation on December 3, 2013. Though the school has shown improvement in some financial indicators, there are still concerns regarding its ongoing financial stability.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

The school's original charter application included plans to serve grades kindergarten through twelfth grades. The Board of Trustees of the New York French American Charter School has decided to delay planned expansion to start serving sixth grade in the Fall of 2014 and will remain serving grades kindergarten through five. This decision was made in order to concentrate on their current grade configuration.

For the aforementioned reasons, the NYCDOE recommends a short term charter renewal of 3 years (through June 30 of 2017).

Part 2: School Overview and History

New York French American Charter School (NYFACS) is an elementary school serving approximately 244 students³ in kindergarten through fifth grades during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in the 2010-2011 school year, with kindergarten through second grades and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's intended authorized full grade span is kindergarten through twelve. The school has decided to defer growth and continue serving kindergarten through fifth grades for the future charter term. The school is located in private⁴ facilities in Manhattan within CSD 3.⁵

NYFACS is the only bilingual/bi-literate French dual language immersion charter school in New York City. The school blends two national educational standards, the Common Core Learning Standards and those of the French Ministry of Education, entitled the Common Base. The school sets out to develop global citizens who are well-prepared to assume leadership in a multicultural society. The school blends the rigorous standards of learning that are characteristic of the French educational system with American approaches that value individuality and critical thinking. In addition to receiving instruction in English and French, in additional English and Math course in grades three – five, the school provides a French and English teacher in each class.

The school enrolls new students in grades kindergarten through four. There were 63 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.⁶

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students⁷:

Special Populations⁸

Year	Free Reduced Lunch				Students with Disabilities				English Language Learners			
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
School	-	39.4%	37.8%	53.5%	-	4.8%	6.7%	12.1%	-	2.4%	9.3%	17.7%
CSD	-	49.5%	50.1%	52.2%	-	16.0%	16.0%	15.9%	-	8.6%	7.6%	7.1%
NYC	-	65.3%	68.1%	69.8%	-	15.9%	15.7%	16.1%	-	16.1%	15.5%	15.0%

While NYFACS has consistently served a lower percentage of FRL students compared to CSD 3 and citywide averages, the school has shown growth. The school had significant growth from the 2011-12 to 2012-13 school year for FRL, SWD and ELL students, including an increase of 15.7% for students qualifying for Free/ Reduced Lunch. The school has maintained a steady increase in percentages for both SWD and ELL over their charter term. In 2012-13, the school had a significantly higher percentage of ELL students compared to CSD 3 and 2.7% higher than the city.

As it pertains to increasing the percentage of SWD students, the school is taking action (as described in Essential Question 4 on page 24) to address these low percentages and is aware that the school will be accountable to state-set targets.

³ ATS data from October 31, 2013.

⁴ NYC DOE internal data.

⁵ NYC DOE Location Code Generating System database.

⁶ Self-reported on Data Sheet Submitted with Renewal Application dated 2/2014

⁷ Special Populations data based on ATS snapshot as of October 31 of the given school year, with the exception of data for 2012-2013, which is based on an ATS snapshots as of October 26, 2012.

⁸ Comparisons to both the CSD and City are made against students in Grades K-8. This is determined by the grades the school served in the 2012-2013 school year. Special population figures are as of October 31st for each given school year with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year which is as of October 26th, 2012.

On August 12, 2011 NYFACS was placed on a Notice of Concern by the NYC DOE. The Notice of Concern was issued to address concerns related to operations and instruction, particularly but not limited to school governance, certified staff, its proposed academic program and financial stability. These concerns arose from the school's annual site visit in May, 2011.

On December 7, 2011 NYFACS was placed on probation by the NYC DOE for a period beginning from the date of notice through August 31, 2012. During the probationary period the school was charged to address a series of concerns related to material and substantial violations, particularly but not limited to school policies and procedures, compliance, teacher certification, financial stability and violation of N. Y. Education Law § 2853, N.Y. Education Law § 2854 (3) and N.Y. Education Law § 2855 (e) .

On October 18, 2012, NYFACS was notified of extended probation by the NYC DOE for a period beginning from the date of original probationary notice through August 31, 2013. During the extended probation period the school was charged to address continued concerns and violations related to operations and management. In particular but not limited to teacher certification and Board governance.

As a result of success in meeting the terms of probation remedial action plan, NYFACS was removed from its Notice of Probation on December 3, 2013. Though the school has shown improvement in some financial indicators, there are still concerns regarding its ongoing financial stability.

New York French American Charter School has had four Board of Trustee chairpersons in the school's four years of operation. Johnny Celestin led the board from the school's inception in 2010 through December 2011, followed by Fabrice Rouah who served as chair from December 2011 through March 2012. Andrew Srulevitch served as board chair from March 2012 through June 2012. The Board of Trustees has been led by Richard Ortoli from June 2012 to present. The school has had five school leaders in the school's four years of operation. Katrine Watkins was the school's founding principal, followed by Marie-Jose Bernard who served as interim principal from the summer of 2011 through January 2012. Vanessa Handal-Ghenania served as interim principal from January of 2012 to February 2012. Stephen Peters served as principal from February 2012 to June 2012. Edith Boncompain has been serving as principal since the summer of 2012. Ms. Boncompain has been with the school for two years.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

Renewal Process

In the final year of its charter, a Chancellor-authorized charter school seeking renewal must demonstrate its success during the current charter term and establish goals and objectives for the next charter term. Ultimately, the renewal process offers an opportunity for the school community to reflect on its experiences during its first term, to make a compelling, evidence-based case that it has earned the privilege of an additional charter term, and, if renewed, to carry out an ambitious plan for the future.

As the school is approaching the end of its charter term, the NYC DOE performs a comprehensive review of the school's performance over the course of the charter. This renewal process is conducted through analyzing student performance data and collecting and evaluating school-submitted documents during the charter term. Evidence of a school's success is organized around the four essential questions that comprise the NYC DOE's Accountability Framework:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?
3. Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
4. What are the school's plans for its next charter term?

A school will answer these overarching questions by demonstrating that its students have made significant academic progress and that the school has met the goals and objectives pledged in its initial charter. In addition, the school will describe challenges it has faced during its charter term, the strategies that were used to address those challenges and the lessons learned.

Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding a school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during its charter term, including but not limited to oversight visits, annual reports, and formal correspondence between the school and its authorizer, the NYC DOE, all of which are conducted in order to identify areas of weakness and to help the school to address them. Additionally, the NYC DOE incorporates into this report its findings from the renewal application process, which includes a written application, a report on student achievement data and a school visit by staff from the Charter Schools Accountability and Support (CSAS) team and other staff from the NYC DOE.

Upon review of all the relevant materials, a recommendation is made to the Chancellor. The Chancellor's determination, and the findings on which that decision is based, is then submitted to the New York State Board of Regents.

Is the school an academic success?

To assess whether a school is an academic success, the NYC DOE considers performance measures, including, but not limited to the following:

- Overall NYC DOE Progress Report score,
- New York State ELA and Math results and/or New York State Regents exams,
- ELA and Math proficiency compared to the district for elementary and middle schools, and graduation rates compared to the city for high schools,
- New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) or other approved alternate assessments, and
- Performance data pertaining to college and career readiness.

Academic success is rated as **Demonstrated, Partially Demonstrated, or Not Yet Demonstrated.**

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally sound, viable organization, CSAS focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and

Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the NACSA (National Association of Charter School Authorizers) Financial Framework⁹.

The NYC DOE considers a variety of supporting materials and data, including but not limited to the following:

- Board of Trustee bylaws,
- Board of Trustee meeting minutes,
- Annual Reports submitted by schools to New York State Education Department (NYSED),
- NYC DOE School Surveys,
- Data collection sheets provided by schools,
- Student, staff, and Board turnover rates,
- Audits of authorized enrollment numbers, and
- Annual financial audits.

A school's Governance Structure & Organizational Design and Climate & Community Engagement are rated as **Developed, Partially Developed, or Not Yet Developed**. A school's Financial Health is rated to indicate whether there are concerns about the near-term financial obligations and the financial sustainability of the school.

Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?

As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Staff Representatives

The following NYC DOE staff representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on March 10th and 11th, 2014:

- Sonya Hooks, Senior Director, Charter Schools Accountability and Support, NYC DOE
- Andrea McLean, Director of Oversight, Charter Schools Accountability and Support, NYC DOE
- Maria Campo, Director of Oversight, Charter Schools Accountability and Support, NYC DOE
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, Charter Schools Accountability and Support, NYC DOE
- Taniel Chan, Education Pioneer Fellow

⁹http://www.qualitycharters.org/assets/files/images/stories/pdfs/publications/Performance_Framework_Fall_2012_Draft.pdf, page 38-59

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

Over the charter term New York French American Charter School has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

Academic Attainment

The school has received two NYC DOE Progress Reports and has two years of New York State (NYS) assessment data at the time of this report. (For detailed information on the progress reports and grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A)

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	-	C	B
Student Progress	-	-	F	B
Student Performance	-	-	C	B
School Environment	-	-	F	C
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	-	2.1	1.8

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	56.4%	27.6%
CSD 3	-	-	61.7%	46.8%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-5.3	-19.2
NYC	-	-	49.0%	27.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	7.4	-0.1
New York State	-	-	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-	-	1.2	-3.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	42.9%	30.6%
CSD 3	-	-	66.9%	52.0%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-24.0	-21.4
NYC	-	-	57.0%	34.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-14.1	-3.6
New York State	-	-	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-	-	-22.8	1.7

*All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Mission and Academic Goals

Over the charter term, the school achieved: no applicable charter goals in the first and second year of the charter as there were no attainable goals, 1 of 5 in the third year and met no applicable charter goals in the fourth year, as there were no attainable goals.¹⁰

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

	Met in 2009-10?	Met in 2010-11?	Met in 2011-12?	Met in 2012-13?
Each year, 75% percent of all 3rd -5th graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
For years 2 through 5 of the proposed charter, grade-level cohorts of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam. For schools in which the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75 percent on the previous year's ELA exam, the school is expected to demonstrate growth (above 75 percent) in the current year.	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of 3rd-5th graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
For years 2 through 5 of the proposed charter, grade-level cohorts of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Mathematics exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Mathematics exam. For schools in which the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75 percent on the previous year's mathematics exam, the school is expected to demonstrate growth (above 75 percent) in the current year.	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
SCIENCE Each year, 75 percent of 4th graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
Beginning year 2010, and each year thereafter, all Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 students will take NYFACS teacher-designed tests aligned to NYS standards in English Language Arts and 75% of them will receive a score of 75 out of 100.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Beginning year 2010, and each year thereafter, all Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 students will take NYFACS teacher-designed tests aligned to NYS standard in Math and 75% of them will receive a score of 75 out of 100.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Beginning year 2010, and each year thereafter, all Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 students will take NYFACS teacher-designed tests aligned to NYS standards in Social Studies and 75% of them will receive a score of 75 out of 100.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹⁰ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

Beginning year 2010, and each year thereafter, all Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 students will take NYFACS teacher-designed tests aligned to NYS standards in Science and 75% of them will receive a score of 75 out of 100.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Beginning year 2010, and each year thereafter, all Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 students will take NYFACS teacher-designed test in French Language Arts and 75% of them will receive a score of 75 out of 100.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Beginning year 2010, and each year thereafter, all Kindergarten, grade 1 and grade 2 students will take NYFACS teacher-designed test in Histoire/Geo and 75% of them will receive a score of 75 out of 100.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Responsive Education Program

The school administers multiple assessments throughout the year to monitor student progress for both French and English skill attainment. These are:

- Fountas and Pinnell reading level assessments, administered three times a year to all grade levels.
 - The school reports 68% of third graders were reading on or above Level P and 83% of fourth graders were reading on Level S by June 2013.
- The DELF French proficiency test, administered in the Fall and Spring to all grade levels. The school reports the following:
 - Seventy-nine percent of students in grades one through four achieved proficiency in reading with an average percentile growth of 30.3.
 - Seventy-eight percent of students in grades one through four achieved proficiency in writing with an average percentile growth of 24.6.
- Data from interim assessments are analyzed by both English and French teachers. Data is then utilized to inform lesson planning for both English and French classroom instruction.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited the school on March 10th and 11th, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core Learning Standards
 - The school is developing its existing monitors of student performance data with internal assessments aligned to (CCLS) and the French Ministry of National Education's Common Base.
 - The school reinforces the key learning standards embodied in the Common Core curriculum through aligning key standards to those of France's Common Base. The school reports this practice ensures that students gain critical thinking skills necessary for academic achievement for both measured standards.
 - Throughout the 2012-2013 school year, the school administered interim assessments to students in grades 3 and 4. Upon evaluation of changes made to state testing, the school revamped existing internal assessments to incorporate necessary CCLS.
 - The school administered English language arts interim assessments three times during the year 2013-2014.
 - School leadership reported curricular programs, curriculum maps and pacing calendars have been established in alignment to the CCLS.
 - In preparation for grade 5 the school carefully selected and built curriculum to align with CCLS.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
 - In the school's Special Education Program, students are provided Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETTS) and Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) in grades 1-5. SETTTS services are provided in the form of small group, pull out or push in.

- The school has five Special Education/Student Support Team (SST) members and one ESL teacher.
 - The school is working towards a co-teaching model for every grade across all classrooms.
 - The school's Response to Intervention (RTI) process works to provide support to struggling learners. The school reports the program utilizes differentiation, pull outs, an afterschool program and Saturday Academy.
 - RTI consist of three tiers, scaffolding strategies and services for each child, as determined by the SST team.
 - Saturday Academy is designed to help struggling learners prepare for standardized exams based on CCLS. Students receive one hour each of math, English and science.
 - The school reports all teachers receive professional development in both RTI and Individualized Education Programs.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
 - On the day of the visit, representatives from the DOE observed thirty-two classrooms, across grades kindergarten through five, along with the school leadership.
 - In most observed rooms, two teachers, French and English, were present and/or a French intern.
 - Students receive English language arts (reading and writing) and math instruction four times a day; once in English and once in French.
 - Class sizes ranged from 14 to 24 students in size.
 - In most observed rooms, forms of questioning included a combination of basic fact recall and some which challenged students to demonstrate understanding.
 - In most rooms, teachers used a variety of methods to check for understanding, including questioning, teacher observation, and frequent use of classwork.
 - In some rooms, differentiation of materials such as products and independent practice, were observed. These were inconsistent with the school model.
 - In all observed rooms, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
 - In all observed rooms, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were off task for only a short duration.
 - Based on debriefs with the school leadership after classroom visits, most classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted team and one-on-one interviews with twenty teachers, which included the Student Support Team. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received school-based professional development during the school year, with the administration providing resources.
 - Some teachers reported receiving professional development outside of the school.
- All interviewed teachers reported receiving mandatory two-hour fifteen minute school-wide professional development bi-monthly on Tuesday. Professional development covers topics such as differentiation, IEPs, data analysis and RTI.
- All interviewed teachers reported being observed once informally and once formally, receiving both verbal and written feedback based on a modified version of the Danielson Framework.
 - Use of a modified Danielson Framework is consistent with school leadership reports.
 - Inconsistencies were found with school leadership's reports of "Snap Shot" observations, conducted three times as year, at fifteen minute intervals.
- Some interviewed teachers mentioned receiving common planning time, but most reported independently finding time to plan and/or modify lessons.

- Most interviewed teachers reported using data analysis and CCLS to inform classroom instruction and differentiation.
 - Most teachers identified the schools' encouragement, support and training on data analysis. All teachers reported the school's increase of data analysis across all grade levels.

Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has partially developed its governance structure and organizational design.

The school was issued a Notice of Probation on December 7, 2011 after a Notice of Concern from August 12, 2011 due to concerns related to material and substantial violations, particularly but not limited to school policies and procedures, compliance, teacher certification, financial stability and violation of N. Y. Education Law § 2853, N.Y. Education Law § 2854 (3) and N.Y. Education Law § 2855 (e). The school had not abided by the conditions of the Charter Agreement and the School Monitoring Plan in failing to establish and comply with internal policies and procedures, notably regarding performing required background checks, discipline, and hiring of personnel.

- **Background Checks.** The school had no stated policy on volunteers and had not issued background checks on volunteers, violating section D.8 of the Monitoring Plan and section 4.4 Criminal History Checks of the school's Charter Agreement, which states that background checks are required for "*all other individuals who have regular access to the students enrolled in the school*" including volunteers.
- **Personnel.** The school did not adhere to Section 4.2 Personnel Policies of its Charter Agreement. The school's published Employee Handbook (2010-2011, the most recent available at the time) did not contain hiring and personnel policies and procedures; the qualifications required by the Board in the hiring of teachers, school administrators and other school employees, as well as a description of staff responsibilities. With the policies that did exist, the school was inconsistent following them, especially in regards to hiring employees. It had been reported that employees had been hired without adequate vetting and process.
- **Discipline Code.** The school was non-compliant with section 2.8 Discipline Code of its Charter Agreement and Section D.15 of the Monitoring Plan. The school's published code of discipline, as delineated in the Parent Handbook (2010-2011, the most recent available at the time) did not contain guidelines for suspension and expulsion, requirements of due process, and provisions of alternative instruction with federal laws and regulations governing the placement of students with disabilities and implement the provisions of 34 CFR Part 300 relating to the discipline of students with disabilities. It was not clear if parents, staff, and school leadership were aware of students' rights to due process and alternate instructions.
- **Annual Audit.** The school had not complied with section 5.3 Audits of its Charter Agreement by providing its Annual Audit as required. As of December 5, 2011, the audit for 2010-2011 had not yet been provided to CSO.
- **Accurate Recordkeeping.** During the CSO's review of the school's unaudited 2010-2011 financial statements, inconsistencies emerged with the school's daily attendance procedures. According to NYFACS, teachers were inconsistently reporting on the daily attendance of students at the school. As a result, there were inaccurate and missing records of student daily attendance from the 2010-2011 school year. These inconsistencies jeopardized the quality of the school's financial audit and violated section 5.6 Funding Procedure of the Charter Agreement because they had caused the school to not maintain accurate enrollment data and daily records of student attendance.
- **Teacher Certification.** Site visits in the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years revealed problems with recruitment of fully certified teachers at NYFACS. At the time of the site visit in June 2011, the school reported that 7 of 12 teachers (58.3 %) were not state-certified. However, this apparent improvement was offset by the departure of 3 certified teachers. For the 2011-2012 school year, the school reported that 6 of its 17 teachers (or 35%) were not certified. This represented the second year in a row of continued non-compliance with charter law concerning teacher certification.
- **Parent Association.** The school was in material and substantial violation of Education Law sections 2590-h(15)(a) and 414(1)(c). The provisions require that all schools located in New York City establish Parent Associations and that parent association meetings are, among other things,

open to the general public. NYFACS had not demonstrated to NYC DOE's satisfaction that it is meeting those requirements.

The school was then placed on extended probation on October 18, 2012. During the extended probation period the school was charged to address continued concerns and violations related to operations and management –in particular but not limited to teacher certification and Board governance. In response, the Board reported the following:

- The Board has worked with external consultants to assist in training and to facilitate its own development.
- The Board continues to develop the tools and understanding needed to manage the school and monitor school leadership.
- The Board has managed necessary changes to oversight and management of the school's operational and fiscal health and in supporting the school's upward trajectory.
 - The school now requires two signatures for purchases above \$500 until the school resolves its short-term obligations.
 - The school requires all cash disbursements be approved by the Principal before issuing checks.
 - The school is working with Charter School Business Management (CSBM) who vets payroll processing and performs all reconciliations.
- The school came into compliance with the NY State Charter Schools Act regarding teacher certification. A school can have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower.

On March 11, as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE interviewed the school's board of trustees. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has nine active members. Although the Board has no founding members and two trustees have resigned during the current school year, they managed the attrition by steadily adding new members, and have kept membership between a 5 member minimum and maximum of 15 members, established in the Board's bylaws.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organization chart and school leadership's monthly administrative dashboard updates to the Board and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.
- The Board has active and functioning committees, as required by its bylaws, including a Finance and Facilities Committee, Leadership Review Committee, and Fundraising Committee, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The Board has most positions filled according to the bylaws, with the exception of the Treasury position, which is currently vacant.
- The Board has not consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes.
 - Quorum was not met during the November 2013 and January 2014 meetings. Further demonstration of quorum is unclear based on lack of evidence.
- New York French American Charter School has had four Board of Trustee chairpersons in the school's four years of operation. Johnny Celestin led the board from the school's inception in 2010 through December 2011, followed by Fabrice Rouah who served as chair from December 2011 through March 2012. Andrew Srulevitch served as board chair from March 2012 through June 2012. The Board of Trustees has been led by Richard Ortoli from June 2012 to present. The school has had five school leaders in the school's four years of operation. Katrine Watkins was the school's founding principal, followed by Marie-Jose Bernard who served as interim principal from the summer of 2011 through January 2012. Vanessa Handal-Ghenania served as interim principal from January of 2012 to February 2012. Stephen Peters served as principal from February 2012 to June 2012. Edith Boncompain has been serving as principal since the summer of 2012. Ms. Boncompain has been with the school for two years.
 - Claire Zagaluer resigned from her position as Assistant Principal in August 2013, being replaced by Shanita Williams. Shanita Williams, promoted from within, was appointed in September 2013, having worked closely with Claire Zagaluer for a seamless transition.

School Climate & Community Engagement

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture.

- To date, the school has not met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95%.

Average Daily Attendance	2009-10	2010-11 ¹¹	2011-12	2012-13
	-	-	94%	94%

- Staff turnover was 37% of instructional staff not returning, by choice or request, at the start of the 2012-2013¹² school year. Staff turnover has steadily decreased through the charter term.
 - In its first year of operation, 2010-2011, staff turnover was 60%.
 - In 2011-2012, staff turnover dropped to 50%.
- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey results and response rates were:

New York French American Charter School NYC School Survey Results

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Academic Expectations	-	-	Below Average	Well Below Average	Well Below Average
Communication	-	-	Below Average	Well Below Average	Well Below Average
Engagement	-	-	Below Average	Well Below Average	Well Below Average
Safety & Respect	-	-	Below Average	Well Below Average	Well Below Average

New York French American Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

	Parents	Citywide	Teachers	Citywide	Students ¹³	Citywide
2010-11	37%	52%	55%	82%	-	-
2011-12	50%	53%	62%	82%	-	82%
2012-13	51%	54%	88%	83%	-	83%

- The school's charter goals include, "parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on a Survey in which at least 80% of all parents express satisfaction with the learning environment as determined by the NYCDOE Learning Environment Survey."¹⁴ The school has mixed results on meeting this goal in each year of the charter.
- The school's charter goals include, "teachers will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the NYCDOE Learning Environment Survey."¹⁵ The school had not met this goal in any year of the charter.
- The school's charter goals include, "at least 80% of the students will express satisfaction with the learning environment at the school as determined by the NYCDOE Learning Environment

¹¹ The school did not collect or maintain attendance data in 2010-2011, their first year of operation.

¹² Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 2/2014.

¹³ Student Response Rates on the NYC School Survey have not been applicable for this school over the course of the current charter term.

¹⁴ New York French American Charter School Statistics:
<http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/03/M483/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm>

¹⁵ New York French American Charter School Statistics:
<http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/03/M483/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm>

Survey.”¹⁶ This goal was not applicable during the current charter term as the school does not serve grade six, to whom the survey is administered.

As part of the renewal process, representatives of the NYC DOE have collected evidence relevant to the school's climate and community engagement over the school's charter term. Based on discussion, document collection and review, and observation, the following was noted:

- The school works with community partners to bring various extracurricular activities to students such as Super Soccer Stars and Chess NYC.
- Over the course of the charter, the school has increased its support of parents by hosting events specific to the Francophone community, such as *Journée Internationale de la Francophonie* sponsored by *Organisation Internationale la Francophonie* and an immigration attorney from African Services Committee.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. About 59 participants attended the hearing, 20 speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by NYFACS for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 95% provided positive feedback and 5% provided neutral feedback regarding the school.

¹⁶ New York French American Charter School Statistics:
<http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/03/M483/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm>

Financial Health

Overall, New York French American Charter School is in a weak position to meet near-term financial obligations.

- Based on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 financial audit and follow up, the school's current ratio indicated a risk that the school may be unable to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY 2013 financial audit and follow up, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover its operating expenses for more than two months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-2014 budget to the actual enrollment as of October 5, 2013 revealed that the school was 10% below its enrollment target, indicating a deviation from its projected revenue.
- The school is meeting its debt obligation.

Overall, there are concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices.

- The school is operating at a deficit, indicating an inability to create a strong reserve to support ongoing growth.
- Based on the FY 2013 financial audit and follow up, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school still had more total liabilities than it had total assets.
- Based on the financial audits from FY 2011 through FY 2013 and follow up, the school had overall negative cash flow from FY 2011 to FY 2013. However monthly unaudited financial statements show positive cash flow for FY 2014.

There were material weaknesses noted in the FY 2013 and FY 2011 independent financial audits.

- Payroll Process and Withholding Taxes
 - The school's financial consultants identified employees who were paid by direct disbursement and not processed through the payroll processing company.
- Cash – Escrow Account
 - The school withdrew cash in the cash escrow account to fund current year operations.
- Government Grant Reimbursements – Charter School Program
 - The school submitted its final expenditure report based on the grant budget not on actual expenses incurred.

Based on document review and interviews during the visit to the school, the following was noted:

- The school hired an operations manager who has been made aware of payroll processing and reporting requirement and is assisted by the finance consultants.
- The school used the escrow funds to cover expenses while waiting on per pupil funding from the NYC Department of Education. The school transferred funds in August 2013 to bring the escrow balance into compliance and has not used the funds since.
- The school engaged financial consultants to prepare the government grant reports mid-year and as a result the remaining grant contracts for the fiscal year were managed appropriately.
- The school entered into a collective bargaining agreement with the UFT in June 2013. Some teachers have received a significant salary increase and employee benefits are more expensive. The school has made changes to offset the expense increases by eliminating the a position and using in house teachers as substitutes instead of hiring substitutes from an outside agency.
- The school has received a temporary rent decrease from their landlord. They will resume paying full rent once they are at full enrollment. They will also repay the difference from the rent reduction and full rent amount.
- The school reports considerably reducing its deficit from over \$400,000 at the beginning of the 2013 academic year to \$100,000.

Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?

Over the charter term, New York French American Charter School has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations, but not others.

The school was placed on Notice of Concern on August 12, 2011, due to concerns and violations related to operations and instruction, particularly but not limited to school governance, certified staff, its proposed academic program, and financial stability.

The school was placed on Notice of Probation on December 7, 2011, due to concerns related to material and substantial violations, particularly but not limited to school policies and procedures, compliance, teacher certification, financial stability and violation of N. Y. Education Law § 2853, N.Y. Education Law § 2854 (3) and N.Y. Education Law § 2855 (e).

The school was given a corrective action plan on December 7, 2011 which included the following items:

- Revise parent, employee and student handbook for 2011-2012.
- Produce verification that all employees of the school have received fingerprinting clearance.
- Assess the need to implement stronger fingerprinting requirements for parents or volunteers who spend a significant amount of time at the school.
- Conduct an in-depth review of contracts and agreements with the School's landlord and vendors (i.e. accounting firm, janitorial services provider, etc.) to ensure that business partnerships are providing maximal value to the school.
- Identify and retain a licensed janitorial services provider
- Develop a plan to improve the teachers' certification rate. Sixty-five percent of teachers were properly certified at the time. Charter law requires at least 70% of charter school staff to be fully certified (no more than 30% or no greater than 5 teachers may be uncertified at the school).
- Produce audited financial statements for 2010-2011 academic year. The NYC DOE granted a 30-day extension, which, as of Nov. 30, had been exceeded.
- Revise school access and key distribution policy to restrict key access to school employees.
- Submit Board of Trustees meeting agenda, information packets, and minutes to NYC DOE on a monthly basis.
- Develop a more robust system of internal communications and notifications amongst school personnel throughout the school day (e.g. public announcement system, walkie-talkies, classroom telephones, etc.).
- Define a more cohesive and systematic behavior management system for use in classroom and the school.
- Define and implement a more consistent performance evaluation and rewards system for teachers, assistants, interns, and non-instructional staff.
- Establish a plan to improve the quality of special education services provided by the school (e.g. including program development, hiring of certified instructors, improved testing, communication to parents, etc.).
- Implement an attendance policy that meets appropriate levels of control, checks and balance, and promotes accurate record-keeping.
- Develop a strategy for standardized test preparation.

On October 18, 2012, NYFACS was notified of an extended period of probation by the NYC DOE, beginning from the date of original probationary notice through August 31, 2013. During the extended probation period the school was charged to address continued concerns and violations related to operations and management –in particular but not limited to teacher certification and Board governance.

The school responded on November 14, 2012 with a remedial action plan that included the following items:

- Develop and implement a standards-based evaluation tool to assess the performance of the School leadership.

- Contact area colleges and universities with education accreditation programs to inform them of teaching vacancies.
- Assist school leadership in assessing the teaching and non-teaching staff.
- In conjunction with the School's auditors and financial advisors, prepare a financial plan addressing the short term and long-term financial and premises needs of the School.
- Set up Board subcommittees to address all areas of school management including finance, charter renewal and leadership review.
- Actively recruit outside Board members with experience in education, finance and fundraising.
- Improve communication with parents by facilitating access to Board and school information and by the periodical publishing of Board newsletters highlighting the Board's work.
- Engage a charter school turnaround specialist to work with School leadership and the Board.

The Board and school leadership successfully addressed the items listed in the corrective action plan and remedial action plan. As a result, the school was removed from probation on December 3, 2013. During the school year, the DOE has continued to monitor the school.

The Board is in compliance with:

- Membership size. The Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, which is no less than five, but not greater than fifteen.
- Required number of Board meetings. The school's bylaws indicate that the Board hold a minimum of 10 meetings a year. The Board has held the required number of meetings, between ten and eleven each year of the charter term.
- Submission of all required documents. All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms and do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.¹⁷
- Timely submission of documents. The Board has provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the DOE.

The Board is out of compliance with:

- Availability of minutes and agendas. The Board has not made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to, at, or after Board meetings by posting materials on the school's website. At that time of this report, board minutes were available up until May 2013, board agendas were available up until February 2014.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of required documents. The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Fingerprint clearance. Over the charter term, all staff have the required fingerprint clearance.
- Certification of instructional staff: Staff is now certified or highly qualified, and those that are not, fall under the requirements outlined in the NY State Charter Schools Act. A school can have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower.
- Insurance requirements. The school has submitted all appropriate insurance documents.

¹⁷ Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report. Newly appointed member(s) materials are reviewed by the NYC DOE, however materials are not submitted to New York State Education Department until the next annual reporting deadline.

Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term?

As reported by school leadership and the school's Board, the following was noted:

- The school will delay planned expansion to kindergarten through twelve and continue serving grades kindergarten through five until further notice.

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.
 - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
- In response to these amendments, the school is planning the following efforts to attract and retain these students.
 - Focus on recruitment:
 - The school currently and will continue with a mass marketing campaign leveraging social media platforms such as Facebook and Twitter. The school also has a comprehensive website that will be updated frequently. The school plans to expand initiatives by reaching into homes of all eligible families within walking distance by utilizing direct-mail services such as Vanguard.
 - The school plans to canvass and reach out to the Francophone community to develop a pipeline of students. The school plans to establish relationships with local community-based organizations that provide key sources of students, especially those that may contact students with disabilities. In addition, the school plans on building rapport and connections with Head Starts, Pre-K and day care programs.
 - The school plans to hold information sessions in conjunction with child welfare service providers and community organizations in the area. The school will also connect with schools that traditionally serve higher numbers of populations with students of limited language proficiency and local publications that specifically target the diverse cultures represented in Harlem.
 - Staff will also target outreach locations and providers of other services to low-income communities, including libraries, medical offices, WICs, shelters, and day cares. The school will reach out to homeless shelters with its outreach, and distribute applications at those sites.
 - The school will contact the Offices of English Language Learners, the Committees on Special Education (CSE), the Committees on Preschool Education and the Borough Enrollment Office and send applications. During regular visits to all offices, NYFACS's special education and ELL staff will provide information on our services to these populations.
 - Special Education recruitment:
 - The school's promotional literature will include information on the school's Special Education Program. It will be emphasized that special programs exist to make learning and progress possible.
 - Meetings will be established with local CSEs to introduce the NYFACS program, to assist in locating students with disabilities who will excel in a dual language setting.
 - The school's principal will designate a staff member to track the rate of enrollment of students with disabilities and compare this to neighboring schools.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Statutory Basis for Renewal

The Charter Schools Act of 1998 (“the Act”) authorizes the creation of charter schools to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently of existing schools and school districts in order to accomplish the following objectives:

- Improve student learning and achievement;
- Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system;
- Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.¹⁸

When granted, a charter is valid for up to five years. For a school chartered under the Act to operate beyond the initial charter term, the school must seek and obtain renewal of its charter.¹⁹

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.²⁰ As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act’s renewal standards:

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;
- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction.

Where the NYC DOE approves a renewal application, it is required under the Act to submit the application and a proposed charter to the Board of Regents for its review and approval.²¹

¹⁸ See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.

¹⁹ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

²⁰ See §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

²¹ See § 2852(5)

Part 6: Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework

The New York State Charter Schools Act (“the Act”) states the following regarding the renewal of a school’s charter:

§2851.4: Charters may be renewed, upon application, for a term of up to five years in accordance with the provisions of this article for the issuance of such charters pursuant to section twenty-eight hundred fifty-two of this article; provided, however, that a renewal application shall [also] include:

- (a) A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in the charter.
- (b) A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private. Such statement shall be in a form prescribed by the Board of Regents.
- (c) Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school required by subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty-seven of this article, including the charter school report cards and the certified financial statements.
- (d) Indications of parent and student satisfaction. Such renewal application shall be submitted to the charter entity no later than six months prior to the expiration of the charter; provided, however, that the charter entity may waive such deadline for good cause shown.
- (e) The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents or the board of trustees of the state university of New York, as applicable, of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal. When developing such targets, the board of regents and the board of trustees of the state university of New York shall ensure (1) that such enrollment targets are comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the charter school is located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.

The NYC DOE may recommend four potential outcomes for charter schools applying for renewal: full-term renewal, renewal with conditions, short-term renewal, or non-renewal.

Full-Term Renewal

In cases where a school has demonstrated exceptional results with its students, a five-year renewal will be granted. A school must show that its program has yielded strong student performance and progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

Renewal with Conditions

In cases where a school has demonstrated mixed academic results or concerns about organizational viability, renewal is contingent upon changes to the prospective application or new charter, new performance measures, or both. These may include changes to curriculum, leadership, or board governance structure that are intended to yield improved academic outcomes during the next chartering period.

Short-Term Renewal

In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has fewer than two years of state-assessment results, a renewal of three-years or fewer may be considered. In limited circumstances, a

school not in its initial charter or in its initial charter with more than three years of state assessment data, may be considered for a short-term renewal.

Non-Renewal

Schools that have not demonstrated significant progress or high levels of student achievement and/or are in violation of their charter will not be renewed.

The CSAS Accountability Framework

To help NYC DOE authorized charter schools better understand what we mean by success for charter schools, the NYC DOE's Charter Schools Accountability & Support (CSAS) has developed an Accountability Framework build around four essential questions for charter school renewal:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?
3. Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
4. What are the school's plans for its next charter term?

1. Is the School an Academic Success?
1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement
Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Meet absolute performance goals• Meet student progress goals• Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students• Are surpassing performance of DOE identified peer-schools• Are surpassing performance district and city proficiency or better averages• Are meeting other rigorous academic and non-academic goals as stated in school's charter
Evidence for success might include, but not be limited to, the following depending on school configurations: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations)• Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations)• Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations)• Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results• When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results• HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates (absolute and progress, overall, for at-risk student populations)• Grades 8-12 College Readiness Credit Accumulation• Percentage of Students Applying to and Being Admitted to College• Percentage of Students Taking AP Courses and/or Percentage of Students Passing AP Courses• Results on state accountability measures• Charter School Academic and Non-Academic Goals• NYC Progress Reports
1b. Mission and Academic Goals
Schools with successful missions and goals have many of the characteristics below: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Have an animating mission statement that staff, students and community embrace• Set ambitious academic and non-academic goals that entire school community knows and embraces• Have processes for regular monitoring and reporting on progress toward school goals• Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data

Evidence for successful missions and goals might include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Mission statement, charter, external documents (parent and family handbooks, school website, etc.)
- Annual reports, school improvement plans, leadership board reports
- Board agendas and minutes
- Parent, student, and teacher satisfaction surveys
- Participation at parent-teacher conferences, school advocacy events, participation in academic goal related programs

1c. Responsive Education Program

Schools with successful education programs have many of the characteristics below:

- Are self-reflective and examine practice based on outcomes against goals
- Have well-thought out curricular programs that are aligned with NYS learning outcomes as described by state standards and the new Common Core Curriculum.
- Use instructional models and resources consistent with school mission and that are flexible in addressing the needs of all learners
- Have defined strategies that they can measure and monitor for closing the achievement gap
- Offer defined opportunities for remediation and acceleration
- Implement a coherent and effective interim assessment system (e.g., use of formative, interim, and summative assessment data) for monitoring progress, predicting performance, and adjusting instruction
- Have an effective process for supporting improved classroom instruction, including frequent observation and feedback
- Have effective strategies and quality instructional programs for addressing students with special needs and ELLs
- Use a defined process for evaluating curricular tasks, programs and resources for effectiveness and fit with school mission and goals

Evidence for successful education programs, in addition to positive results, may include, but not be limited to, many of the following:

- Instructional planning documents (alignments, scope and sequences, curriculum maps, unit and lesson plans, etc)
- Student/teacher schedules
- Classroom observations
- Student Intervention / Response to Intervention program description and resources
- Interim assessment results
- Student and teacher portfolios
- Data findings; adjusted lesson plans
- Self-assessment documentation
- Professional development plans and resources

1d. Learning Environment

Schools with successful learning environments have many of the characteristics below:

- Have a strong culture that connects high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to give their best effort academically and socially
- Use a comprehensive approach to student management, including positive behavioral expectations and a clear discipline policy to build and sustain a safe, orderly, and supportive classroom environment
- Provide for safe, respectful, efficient transitions, hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.
- Have classrooms where academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Provide opportunities for students to actively engage in their own learning and in the life of the school

- Have a formal or informal character education, social development, or citizenship program that provides opportunities to develop as individuals and citizens

Evidence for successful learning environments may include, but not be limited to, many of the following:

- School mission and articulated values
- Student management plan (code of conduct, school values, discipline policy, positive incentive system, etc.)
- Student attendance and retention rates
- Student discipline data
- DOE School Survey student results
- DOE School Survey parent and teacher safety and respect results
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, student interviews
- Classroom observations
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)

2. Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization?

2a. Governance Structure and Organizational Design

Schools with successful governance and organizational design structures have many of the characteristics below:

- Operate with a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter
- Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly but not limited to open-meeting laws and conflict of interest regulations
- Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time and despite circumstance
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals; it also has clear lines of accountability for leadership roles, accountability to Board, and, if applicable, relationship with a charter management organization
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Implemented a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's organization and leadership structure
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provide regular feedback on instruction to teachers

Evidence for school governance and organizational design may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- School charter
- Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, meeting agenda and minutes
- Annual conflict of interest forms
- Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook, operations manual
- School calendar, professional development plan

2b. School Climate and Community Engagement

Schools with a sustaining school climate and engaged parent and community support have many of the characteristics below:

- A healthy professional school climate that is collaborative, student centered, and open to parents and community support
- An effective process for recruiting, hiring, supporting, and evaluating leadership and staff
- A flexible, data-driven approach to professional development for all staff
- An effective way of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including the DOE School Survey
- Effective home-school communication practices to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children
- Strong community-based partnerships and advocacy for the school

Evidence for school climate and community engagement may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results
- Student retention and wait list data
- Staff retention data
- Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews
- Student and staff attendance rates
- Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences
- Parent association meeting calendar and minutes
- Community partnerships and sponsored programs

2c. Financial and Operational Health

Schools that are responsible stewards of public funds and effective, sustaining organizations have many of the characteristics below:

- Consistently meet its student enrollment and retention targets
- Annual budgets that meets all short- and long-term financial responsibilities with available revenues
- School leadership and Board that oversee financial and operational responsibilities in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to decision-making
- Boards and school leadership that maintain effective internal controls of finances to ensure integrity of financial management and a proactive approach to mitigating risk
- Consistently clean financial audits
- If applicable, strong, accountable partnerships with management organizations and other partners and significant vendors to support delivery of chartered school design and academic program
- A safe, clean and appropriately resourced educational facility with all appropriate services specified in charter and mandated by appropriate law and regulations

Evidence for a financially sound, viable organization may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School budget, P&Ls, and monthly/quarterly cash-flow reports
- Appropriate insurance documents
- Required facility documents (lease, certificate of occupancy, fire and safety inspections, etc.)
- Financial audits
- Financial leader(s) resume and accountability documents
- Operational policies and procedures
- Operational org chart
- Secure storage areas for student and staff records
- Policies/protocols for maintaining secure records
- School safety plan

3. Is the School in Compliance with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with their charter and agreement have:

- Implemented the key features of their charter as described in the original charter and as modified in approved revisions to their charter, including but not limited to mission, academic program, school organization, grade configuration, enrollment, goals, etc.
- Ensure that update-to-date charter is publicly available to staff, parents, and school community
- Implemented comprehensive academic, behavioral, oversight, management, and operational policies and procedures that are substantially aligned with the charter and the school's stated mission and vision

Evidence for a school's compliance with the terms of its charter and charter agreement may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Authorized charter and signed agreement
- Charter revision request approval and documentation
- School mission
- School policies and procedures
- Site visits
- Board meetings, agendas and minutes
- Leadership/board interviews

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have:

- Met all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Comparable enrollment of FRL, ELL and Special Education students to those of their district of location or are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages
- Implemented school policies related to student discipline and promotion and retention that are fully compliant with laws and regulations related to students with disabilities and due process regulations
- Conducted independently verified fair and open lottery and manage with integrity enrollment process and annual waiting lists
- Employed instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and certification requirements

Evidence for compliance with applicable federal and state law may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School reporting documents
- School's Annual Report
- Student recruitment plan and resources
- Student management policies and promotion and retention policies
- Student discipline records
- Lottery policy, resources, and records; enrollment procedures and records
- Staff roster, fingerprint clearance for all staff, certification status of all instructional staff

3c. Applicable Regulations

<p>Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns with applicable regulations • Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and have completed all other financial reporting as required • Boards that meet requirements for size, meeting frequency, public notice, applicable open-meeting and conflict of interest regulations, as well as complying with NYC DOE CSAS’s requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members. • Informed NYCDOE CSAS, and where required, received CSAS approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization • Effectively engaged parent associations
<p>Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School or building safety plan; appropriate inspection documents • Annual audits, escrow accounts, other financial reporting documents • Board roster, calendar, agenda and minutes, conflict of interest documents, notification of changes/approval of new member request documents • Charter revision requests, revised or new contracts • Parent association calendar of meetings, identified officers, parent association agenda and minutes, parent satisfaction survey results • Interviews

4. What Are the School’s Plans for its Next Charter Term?

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

In anticipation of a new charter term schools may be considering various growth options: replication, expansion to new grades or increased enrollment or altering their model in some significant way. Successful schools generally have processes for:

- Conducting needs/opportunity assessments
- Forming Board and leadership committees or subcommittees to investigate options, develop action plans, ensure capacity and resources are aligned, etc.
- Engaging school community in articulating charter revisions (or a new charter in cases of replication) to address the proposed growth plans
- Ensuring that the final proposal is ambitious but realistic in its plans
- Creating a well-reasoned and documented prospective for the school’s new charter term and, if applicable, a new charter proposal (for replication)

Evidence for likely success in planning for school growth in a new charter term may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and Board interviews

4b. Organizational Sustainability

Successful schools consistently perform despite change. While there is no single path for ensuring sustainability, successful schools often have the following features:

- School anticipates organizational opportunities/needs and plans for resource development (human resource policies for growing your own talent, for example, or fundraising or budget management to take care of anticipated capital needs and to mitigate risks for the unexpected, or board development to bring new talent or specific needs-based expertise to the school)

Evidence for organizational sustainability may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organization chart
- Staff rosters
- Staff handbook
- Leadership and staff interviews
- Budget

4c. School or Model Improvements

Successful schools are thoughtful about the continued appropriateness of school design features and elements of their models. They:

- Review performance carefully and even if they don't make major changes through expansion or replication, they are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success.
- Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission.

Evidence for successful improvements to a school's program or model may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and board interviews
- MOUs or contracts with partners

Appendix A: School Performance Data

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	56.4%	27.6%
CSD 3	-	-	61.7%	46.8%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-5.3	-19.2
NYC	-	-	49.0%	27.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	7.4	-0.1
New York State	-	-	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-	-	1.2	-3.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	42.9%	30.6%
CSD 3	-	-	66.9%	52.0%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-24.0	-21.4
NYC	-	-	57.0%	34.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-14.1	-3.6
New York State	-	-	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-	-	-22.8	1.7

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

% of Third Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	56.4%	18.2%
CSD 3	54.4%	61.0%	61.7%	48.7%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-5.3	-30.5
NYC	46.5%	48.1%	49.0%	28.1%
Difference from NYC	-	-	7.4	-9.9

% of Third Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	42.9%	20.0%
CSD 3	56.0%	64.0%	66.9%	52.1%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-24.0	-32.1
NYC	54.3%	54.8%	57.0%	33.1%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-14.1	-13.1

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	-	33.3%
CSD 3	54.5%	59.1%	65.3%	44.6%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-	-11.3
NYC	45.6%	51.0%	52.4%	27.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	6.1

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
New York French American Charter School	-	-	-	37.8%
CSD 3	63.1%	68.9%	73.6%	51.9%
Difference from CSD 3	-	-	-	-14.1
NYC	58.4%	62.3%	65.7%	35.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	2.6

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Progress Reports

[2012 – 2013 Academic Year](#)

[2011 – 2012 Academic Year](#)

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Site Visit Report 2011-2012](#)

[Annual Site Visit Report 2010-2011](#)