



**Charter Schools Institute**  
The State University of New York

## **2013-14 School Evaluation Report**

---

### **Icahn Charter School 1**

**VISIT DATE: DECEMBER 3-4, 2013**

**REPORT ISSUED: MARCH 30, 2015**

Charter Schools Institute  
State University of New York  
41 State Street, Suite 700  
Albany, New York 12207  
(518) 445-4250  
(518) 427-6510 (fax)  
[www.newyorkcharters.org](http://www.newyorkcharters.org)

## INTRODUCTION

This School Evaluation Report presents the school's 2013-14 Performance Review, which provides an analysis of the attainment of the key academic goals in the school's Accountability Plan. Following these achievement results, the report offers an analysis of evidence collected during the school visit on December 3-4, 2013. While the SUNY Charter Schools Institute (the "Institute") conducts a comprehensive review of evidence related to all the State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks (the "SUNY Renewal Benchmarks") near the end of a charter term, most mid-cycle school evaluation visits focus on a subset of these benchmarks. This subset, the Qualitative Education Benchmarks, addresses the academic success of the school and the effectiveness and viability of the school organization. They provide a framework for examining the quality of the educational program, focusing on teaching and learning (i.e., curriculum, instruction, and assessment), as well as leadership, organizational capacity and board oversight. The Institute uses the established criteria on a regular basis to provide schools with a consistent set of expectations leading up to renewal.

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

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

## **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The Carl C. Icahn Charter School opened in 2001 serving students in Kindergarten through 2<sup>nd</sup> grades. Now the Icahn Charter School 1 (“Icahn 1”), the school has a current enrollment of 331 students and provides instruction in Kindergarten through 8<sup>th</sup> grade. Icahn 1 operates in two private facilities located in New York City’s Community School District (“CSD”) 9. Kindergarten through 4<sup>th</sup> grades are at 1525 Brook Avenue, Bronx, NY while the upper grades are nearby at 1506 Brook Avenue.

Icahn 1 is the flagship school of the Icahn Charter Schools network<sup>1</sup> (“Icahn network” or the “network”). The network now operates seven SUNY authorized schools in the Bronx. Icahn 1 remains an independent education corporation.<sup>2</sup> The Icahn schools share a common mission:

The mission of Icahn Charter Schools is to use the Core Knowledge curriculum, developed by E.D. Hirsch, to provide students with a rigorous academic program offered in an extended day/year setting. Students will graduate armed with the skills and knowledge to participate successfully in the most rigorous academic environments and will have a sense of personal and community responsibility.

---

<sup>1</sup> The school partners with the Foundation for a Greater Opportunity (the “Foundation”), a not-for-profit corporation that formally employs network-based staff. Each school in the network contributes a pro-rata share of Foundation staff salaries. In addition to key academic supports, the Foundation has grown to provide back office, financial and human resources support to network schools.

<sup>2</sup> Legally, charter schools in New York are not-for-profit education corporations. Throughout this report, the Institute uses both “education corporation” and “charter school” to indicate the same legal entity.

## 2013-14 School Performance Review

### **Performance Summary**

In 2013-14, the fourth year of Icahn Charter School 1's ("Icahn 1's") five-year Accountability Period, the school continued to meet both of its key Accountability Plan goals of English language arts ("ELA") and mathematics, as it has in previous years during the Accountability Period. The school has met its science goal and is in good standing under the state's No Child Left Behind ("NCLB") accountability system.

**Note: This year, the Institute is not using absolute measure #1 under the ELA and math goals when evaluating goal attainment. Because of the high standards in the new state testing program only a handful of schools statewide met the absolute proficiency target. The Institute will resume the use of this measure during 2014-15. This year, the Institute is resuming the use of absolute measure #2 because the state has recalibrated the absolute Annual Measurable Objective.**

### ***ELA***

Based on results of the four available measures in its Accountability Plan, Icahn 1 continued to meet its ELA goal. The school outperformed Community School District 9 (the "district") by a significant margin as in previous years. In comparison to demographically similar schools based on the percentage of economically disadvantaged students statewide, Icahn 1 again performed higher than expected to a large degree. Icahn 1 met its growth measure, surpassing the target of the statewide median of the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile.

### ***Math***

Based on results of the one absolute measure, the two comparative measures, and the growth measure in its Accountability Plan, Icahn 1 again met its math goal. The school outperformed the district as it has throughout the Accountability Period. In comparison to demographically similar schools based on the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, Icahn 1 continued to perform higher than expected to a large degree. Icahn 1 also met its overall growth measure in 2013-14, surpassing the target of the statewide median of the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile. Notably, growth in the 4<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> grades was particularly laudable.

### ***Science***

Icahn 1 continued to meet its science goal as it has throughout the Accountability Period. The school exceeded the district's performance and its performance benchmark of 75 percent of students scoring at or above proficiency.

### ***NCLB***

Icahn 1 has consistently met its NCLB goal by remaining in good standing under the state's accountability system.

# SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: English Language Arts

## Icahn Charter School 1



	2011-12				2012-13				2013-14			
	Grades Served: K-8				Grades Served: K-8				Grades Served: K-8			
	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	MET	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	MET	Grades	All Students % (N)	2+ Years Students % (N)	MET
<b>ABSOLUTE MEASURES</b> 1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State exam.	3	78.9 (38)	79.4 (34)		3	38.2 (34)	39.4 (33)		3	37.8 (37)	37.1 (35)	
	4	88.9 (36)	88.2 (34)		4	40.0 (40)	42.1 (38)		4	64.7 (34)	65.6 (32)	
	5	73.5 (34)	72.7 (33)		5	63.6 (33)	65.6 (32)		5	37.8 (37)	38.9 (36)	
	6	86.5 (37)	86.1 (36)		6	40.0 (35)	38.2 (34)		6	56.3 (32)	58.1 (31)	
	7	45.9 (37)	45.9 (37)		7	8.3 (36)	8.3 (36)		7	27.8 (36)	25.7 (35)	
	8	74.3 (35)	74.3 (35)	NO	8	16.7 (30)	16.7 (30)		8	16.7 (36)	16.7 (36)	
	All	74.7 (217)	74.2 (209)	NO	All	34.6 (208)	35.0 (203)	NA	All	39.6 (212)	39.5 (205)	NA
<b>COMPARATIVE MEASURES</b> 2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Level Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.	Grades	PI	AMO		Grades	PLI	AMO		Grades	PLI	AMO	
	3-8	174	135	YES	3-8	123			3-8	126	89	YES
	Comparison:	Bronx District 9			Comparison:	Bronx District 9			Comparison:	Bronx District 9		
	Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District		Grades	School	District	
	3-8	74.2	27.6	YES	3-8	35.0	10.5	YES	3-8	39.5	11.9	YES
<b>COMPARATIVE MEASURES</b> 3. Each year the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local district.	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	% ED	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	% ED	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size
	70.6	74.7	41.2	2.12	82.2	34.6	19.1	1.36	82.2	39.6	20.2	1.43
	YES				YES				YES			
	Grades	School	State		Grades	School	State		Grades	School	State	
	4				4	55.4			4	65.4		
5				5	54.9			5	50.7			
6				6	58.3			6	50.8			
7				7	35.8			7	45.7			
8				8	37.3			8	45.3			
	All	58.3	50.0	YES	All	48.7	50.0	NO	All	51.5	50.0	YES
<b>GROWTH MEASURE</b> 5. Each year, the school's unadjusted mean growth percentile will meet or exceed the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Grades	School	State		Grades	School	State		Grades	School	State	
	4				4	55.4			4	65.4		
	5				5	54.9			5	50.7		
	6				6	58.3			6	50.8		
	7				7	35.8			7	45.7		
8				8	37.3			8	45.3			
	All	58.3	50.0	YES	All	48.7	50.0	NO	All	51.5	50.0	YES

# SCHOOL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY: Mathematics

## Icahn Charter School 1



	2011-12 Grades Served: K-8				2012-13 Grades Served: K-8				2013-14 Grades Served: K-8				MET
	All Students		2+ Years Students		All Students		2+ Years Students		All Students		2+ Years Students		
	Grades	% (N)	Grades	% (N)	Grades	% (N)	Grades	% (N)	Grades	% (N)	Grades	% (N)	
<b>ABSOLUTE MEASURES</b> 1. Each year 75 percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at proficiency on the New York State exam.	3	76.3 (38)	73.5 (34)		55.9 (34)	57.6 (33)		43.2 (37)	40.0 (35)				
	4	94.4 (36)	94.1 (34)		50.0 (40)	52.6 (38)		91.2 (34)	90.6 (32)				
	5	97.1 (34)	97.0 (33)		72.7 (33)	75.0 (32)		54.1 (37)	52.8 (36)				
	6	89.2 (37)	88.9 (36)		77.1 (35)	76.5 (34)		90.6 (32)	93.5 (31)				
	7	89.2 (37)	89.2 (37)		44.4 (36)	44.4 (36)		36.1 (36)	37.1 (35)				
	8	100.0 (35)	100.0 (35)		46.7 (30)	46.7 (30)		30.6 (36)	30.6 (36)				
	All	90.8 (217)	90.4 (209)	YES	57.7 (208)	58.6 (203)	NA	56.6 (212)	56.1 (205)	NA			
2. Each year the school's aggregate Performance Level Index on the State exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State's NCLB accountability system.	Grades	PI	AMO		PLI	AMO		PLI	AMO				
	3-8	191	148	YES	154			149	86	YES			
<b>COMPARATIVE MEASURES</b> 3. Each year the percent of students enrolled in at least their second year and performing at proficiency will be greater than that of students in the same grades in the local district.	Comparison: Bronx District 9				Comparison: Bronx District 9				Comparison: Bronx District 9				
	Grades	School	District		School	District		School	District				
4. Each year the school will exceed its predicted percent of students at proficiency on the State exam by at least a small Effect Size (at least 0.3) based on its percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students.	3-8	90.4	41.6	YES	58.6	12.6	YES	56.1	15.9	YES			
	% FL	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	% ED	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	% ED	Actual	Predicted	Effect Size	
	70.6	90.8	52.7	1.85	82.1	57.7	20.4	2.34	82.2	56.6	25.3	1.64	YES
<b>GROWTH MEASURE</b> 5. Each year, the school's unadjusted mean growth percentile will meet or exceed the state's unadjusted median growth percentile.	Grades	School	State		School	State		School	State				
	4				68.9			77.3					
	5				73.3			55.0					
	6				85.9			81.8					
	7				63.9			22.9					
	8			68.5			29.5						
	All	66.9	50.0	YES	72.2	50.0	YES	52.5	50.0	YES			YES

## **Benchmark Conclusions and Evidence**

**Instructional Leadership.** Icahn 1 had adequate instructional leadership to support its academic program in place at the time of the school evaluation visit.

- Following several transitions, the school's leadership continued to build an environment of high expectations for teacher performance.
- The instructional leadership, consisting of the school principal and staff developer at the time of the visit, continued to provide adequate support in the development of teaching staff.
- With frequent observations and feedback, the instructional leaders consistently provided coaching and supervision of staff that improved teachers' instructional effectiveness. The school's staff developer provided targeted coaching to new teachers once a week to ensure instructional strength. Icahn 1 also participated in network-wide inter-visitation days. These inter-visitation days consisted of teachers conducting observations of highly effective instructors across network schools. School leadership often encouraged teachers to focus on one or two specific areas of practice that teachers then incorporated into their own classroom practice.
- Through common prep periods for teachers, grade level teams took advantage of ongoing opportunities to plan curriculum and instruction.
- The Icahn network provided 12 days of pre-service training for all teachers and provided additional training differentiated for new teachers. The school also participated in network-wide professional development once a month with all other Icahn schools. These professional development sessions, along with those provided by school leadership and external consultants, were effective in developing the competencies and instructional practices of teachers.
- Consistent with network practice, Icahn 1 implemented a systematic teacher evaluation process with clear criteria that identified teachers' strengths and weaknesses. Teachers were well aware of the criteria and reported consistency in the leaders' observation and evaluation feedback.
- School leadership held teachers accountable for high quality performance and student achievement. Student assessment data informed teacher evaluations and bonuses.

**Curriculum & Assessment.** The curriculum and the systematic use of assessment data in place at the time of the evaluation visit supported the implementation of Icahn 1's academic program and teachers' ability to plan instruction to meet student needs.

- Icahn 1 continued to use a coherent curriculum framework with clear student performance standards across grades.

- At the time of the visit, Icahn 1 relied on commercial curriculum materials as a bridge between the curriculum framework and teachers' daily lesson plans. These materials provided teachers with the necessary scope and sequences and other guidance documents to create monthly syllabi and daily lesson plans. Across the school, teachers knew what to teach and when to teach it.
- Icahn network staff consulted school leaders and relied on student performance data to evaluate the effectiveness of curriculum materials. Network staff and school principals studied a plethora of commercial curriculum materials to determine which supplements align best to state performance standards.
- Teachers used curriculum materials to create purposeful and focused daily lesson plans. Teachers at all grade levels received an outline of each skill and concept to teach throughout the year. Teachers submitted lesson plans to the school principal and staff developer for review on a weekly basis.
- In addition to regularly administering network-created assessments, Icahn 1 teachers administered weekly tests aligned to the commercial curricula. In grades 3-8, Icahn 1 administered practice tests five times per year in preparation for state assessments in ELA and math. The school continued to use the Iowa Test of Basic Skills ("ITBS") to identify individual student skill deficiencies and to identify students for academic intervention services through its targeted assistance ("TA") program.
- Based on weekly assessment results and informal classroom observations of student performance, teachers adjusted classroom instruction and modified student ability groupings.
- Network staff compiled assessment data from all seven Icahn schools and created detailed analyses at the school, classroom and student level. The principal met with grade teams to discuss student achievement data on a weekly basis. In addition to identifying student skill deficiencies, these data meetings served as an opportunity to build teachers' professional skills.
- The principal used both absolute and comparative student achievement results to inform teacher evaluations. Network staff also reviewed data to determine focus areas for professional development.
- Icahn 1 provided parents with progress reports six times per year and held formal parent-teacher conferences twice per year. The principal and network staff provided school board members with detailed reports of assessment results.

**Pedagogy.** Institute visit team members found that high quality instruction remained evident throughout Icahn 1. As shown in the chart below, during the evaluation visit, Institute team members conducted 18 classroom observations with a defined protocol used in all school evaluation visits.



**Classroom Observation Methodology: Number of Observations**

		Grade									Total
		K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Content Area	ELA				1	1	1		1	1	5
	Math	1			1	1			1	1	5
	Science						2	2			4
	Soc Stu			1							1
	Writing					1		2			3
	Total	1	0	1	2	3	3	4	2	2	18

- Teachers delivered purposeful lessons with clear objectives that aligned to the school’s curriculum (17 of 18 classrooms observed) and state performance standards. Teachers presented objectives and material with accuracy and clarity using age-appropriate language, and often related concepts to students’ own lives. In a social studies lesson for example, students made detailed connections between the creation of laws and the rules that keep them safe within their own classroom community.
- The majority of teachers regularly used a variety of techniques to check for student understanding during lessons (15 of 18 classrooms observed). Teachers evaluated student learning in a variety of ways such as cold calling, checking written work, and one-to-one conferencing. In several classes, teachers monitored peer sharing and posed questions as necessary to focus student discussion in small groups.
- Throughout the school, most teachers included opportunities in their lessons to challenge students with questions and activities that fostered depth of understanding and higher-order thinking skills (13 of 18 classrooms observed). In addition, many lessons included multiple opportunities for authentic and purposeful student interaction, which often involved students utilizing newly acquired knowledge to make connections to their own lives. In one outstanding example, students wrote persuasive letters on topics personally important to them then completed research to support their arguments with relevant facts and statistics. Peer editors used a checklist and rubric to provide constructive feedback on final drafts.
- Most teachers established and maintained classroom environments with a consistent focus on academic achievement (13 of 18 observations).

**At-Risk Students.** Icahn 1 effectively identified and served at-risk students with robust intervention programs at the time of the visit.

- Icahn 1 had adequate procedures to identify at-risk students. Teachers used classroom performance data, results of benchmark assessments and state test scores to identify students for intervention services through the school’s Targeted Assistance (“TA”) program. If a student failed to make academic progress through the TA program, the school referred

that student for special education evaluation but did so only after exhausting all other options. Icahn 1 administered the Home Language Survey and the New York State Identification Test for English Language Learners (“NYSITELL”) to identify students in need of support to reach English proficiency.

- At the time of the visit, Icahn 1 provided robust supports for at-risk students. General education students receiving additional academic supports participated in small groups of up to six students five times per week through the school’s TA program. The TA program staff, which comprised two ELA and two math teachers, assessed students formally and informally on a weekly basis in order to monitor progress. Students with Individualized Education Programs (“IEPs”) mandating academic supports received pull-out special education teacher support services (“SETSS”). ELLs received pull-out support for English language acquisition, both individually and in-small groups, based on English proficiency level. Teachers referred ELLs to the TA program for additional support when necessary. Icahn 1 also provided a Saturday Academy and after school programs for additional instruction and remediation.
- Both special education and general education teachers were well aware of students’ IEP goals and used assessments to monitor progress toward meeting those goals effectively. The ELL teacher was aware of student progress and adequately monitored the classroom and benchmark assessment data of each ELL.
- Icahn 1 provided time in teachers’ schedules for at-risk and general education staff to collaborate on instructional planning. TA teachers met weekly with classroom teachers and the principal to discuss planning and student progress. Special education teachers continually shared data on progress towards meeting IEP goals with classroom teachers to inform general education classroom instructional plans.

**Organizational Capacity.** At the time of the visit, the Institute found that Icahn 1, with assistance from the network, effectively supported the delivery of the educational program.

- Icahn 1 had an effective administrative structure, with staff, systems, and procedures that allowed the school to carry out its academic program. The principal and staff developer continued to develop the teaching staff while the principal performed additional administrative duties with considerable network support.
- Network and school-based staff maintained distinct lines of accountability with clearly defined roles and responsibilities; teachers reported knowing to whom to turn for assistance. At the network level, the superintendent, deputy superintendent and director of operations also supported its operations. The network’s director of assessment was responsible for identifying and distributing all curriculum and assessment materials and for data analysis.
- Icahn 1, bolstered by effective professional development opportunities and other incentives, continued to retain high quality staff. Almost 90 percent of 2012-13 teachers

returned for the 2013-14 school year. The Icahn network maintained a clear career ladder for teachers and administrators, thereby positively influencing staff retention. Previous school leaders have transitioned to leadership roles at the network level.

- Demand for the school continued to exceed Icahn 1's enrollment capacity. At the time of the evaluation visit, the school reported a waitlist of 2128 prospective students.

**APPENDIX**  
**SCHOOL OVERVIEW**

**Mission Statement**

Icahn Charter School 1, using the Core Knowledge curriculum developed by E. D. Hirsch, will provide its students with a rigorous academic program offered in an extended day/year setting. Students will graduate armed with the skills and knowledge to participate successfully in the most rigorous academic environments, and will have a sense of personal and community responsibility.

**School Characteristics**

School Year	Proposed Chartered Enrollment	Actual Enrollment	Original Chartered Grades	Actual Grades
2001-2002	108	105	K-2	K-2
2002-2003	144	143	K-3	K-3
2003-2004	180	180	K-4	K-4
2004-2005	216	216	K-5	K-5
2005-2006	252	252	K-6	K-6
2006-2007	288	280	K-7	K-7
2007-2008	324	317	K-8	K-8
2008-2009	324	314	K-8	K-8
2009-2010	324	328	K-8	K-8
2010-2011	324	338	K-8	K-8
2011-2012	324	332	K-8	K-8
2012-2013	324	331	K-8	K-8
2013-2014	324	331	K-8	K-8

## Student Demographics

	2011-12 <sup>3</sup>		2012-13 <sup>4</sup>		2013-14 <sup>5</sup>
	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of CSD 9 Enrollment	Percent of School Enrollment	Percent of CSD 9 Enrollment	Percent of School Enrollment
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>					
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0		0	0
Black or African American	55	31	55	31	52
Hispanic	44	65	44	66	46
Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	1	0	1	1
White	1	1	1	1	1
Multiracial	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Students with Disabilities</b>					
Students with Disabilities	6	--	8	18	9
<b>English Language Learners</b>					
English Language Learners	1	25	1	25	2
<b>Eligible for Free Lunch</b>					
Eligible for Free Lunch	71	86	--	85	--
<b>Eligible for Reduced-Price Lunch</b>					
Eligible for Reduced-Price Lunch	10	4	--	4	--
<b>Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	--	--	82	96	82

## Board of Trustees<sup>6</sup>

Board Member Name	Position
Gail Golden	Chair
Julie Goodyear	Secretary
Seymour Fliegel	Trustee
Karen Mandelbaum	Trustee
Robert Sancho	Trustee
Edward J. Shanahan	Trustee
Robin Williams	Parent-Guardian Association President

<sup>3</sup> Source: 2011-12 School Report Card, New York State Education Department.

<sup>4</sup> Source: 2012-13 School Report Card, New York State Education Department.

<sup>5</sup> The Institute derived the 2013-14 statistics from the school's October 2013 student enrollment report to SED (2013-14 BEDS Report). District data are not yet available.

<sup>6</sup> Source: Institute board records.

**School Leader(s)**

School Year(s)	School Leader(s) Name and Title
2001-02 to 2006-07	Jeffrey Litt, Principal
2007-08 to 2012-13	Daniel Garcia, Principal
2013-14	Sandra Lugo, Principal

**School Visit History**

School Year	Visit Type	Evaluator (Institute/External)	Date
2001-02	First Year Visit	Institute	May 29, 2002
2002-03	Evaluation Visit	Institute	May 19, 2003
2003-04	Evaluation Visit	External	February 24-25, 2004
2005-06	Initial Renewal Visit	Institute	September 27-28, 2005
2008-09	Evaluation Visit	Institute	April 23, 2009
2010-11	Subsequent Renewal Visit	Institute	October 28, 2010
2013-14	Evaluation Visit	Institute	December 3-4, 2013

## CONDUCT OF THE SCHOOL EVALUATION VISIT

### Specifications

Date(s) of Visit	Evaluation Team Members	Title
December 3-4, 2013	Natasha Howard, Ph.D.	Director of School Evaluation
	Aaron Campbell	Senior Analyst
	Heather Wendling	Senior Analyst

### Context of the Visit

Charter Cycle	
Charter Term	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year of Five-Year Charter Term
Accountability Period <sup>7</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup> Year of Five-Year Accountability Period
Anticipated Renewal Visit	Fall 2015

<sup>7</sup> Because the SUNY Trustees make a renewal decision in the last year of a charter term, the Accountability Period ends in the next to last year of the charter term. For schools in initial charter terms, the Accountability Period is the first four years of the charter term. For schools in subsequent charter terms, the Accountability Period includes the last year of the previous charter term through the next to last year of the current charter term.



Charter Schools Institute  
The State University of New York

## State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks

Version 5.0, May 2012

---

### Introduction

The State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks<sup>1</sup> (the "SUNY Renewal Benchmarks") serve two primary functions at renewal:

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

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

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

---

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

- Revised May 2012 -



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

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

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

## State University of New York Charter Renewal Benchmarks

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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