



Subsequent Renewal Report

Harbor Science and Arts Charter School

1/10/2012

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REPORT INTRODUCTION	1
RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY DISCUSSION	1
SCHOOL OVERVIEW	9
ACADEMIC ATTAINMENT AND IMPROVEMENT	12
APPENDIX: FISCAL DASHBOARD	19

The final version of Institute renewal reports should be broadly shared by the school with the entire school community. This report will be posted on the Institute's website at: www.newyorkcharters.org/pubsReportsRenewals.htm.

REPORT INTRODUCTION

This report is the primary means by which the Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) transmits to the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (the “SUNY Trustees”) its findings and recommendations regarding a school’s Application for Renewal, and more broadly, details the merits of a school’s case for renewal. This report has been created and issued pursuant to the *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees* (the “SUNY Renewal Practices”).¹

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

RECOMMENDATION AND SUMMARY DISCUSSION

Recommendation

Full Term Renewal

The Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the Application for Subsequent Renewal of the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School and renew its charter for a period of five years with authority to provide instruction to students in Kindergarten through 8th grade in such configuration as set forth in its Application for Renewal, with a maximum projected enrollment of 244 students.

Background and Required Findings

According to the SUNY Renewal Practices:

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

Harbor Science and Arts Charter School (“Harbor”) has applied for a subsequent, Full-Term Renewal of five years. In Harbor’s twelfth year of operation and at the end of its third charter period, the SUNY Renewal Practices provide only two possible outcomes for Harbor: Full-Term Renewal or Non-Renewal. In order to earn a Full-Term Renewal, Harbor must demonstrate that it has met the criteria for such a renewal as described in the SUNY Renewal Practices. Specifically, the school “must have been previously renewed and met or come close to meeting its academic Accountability

¹ The *Practices, Policies and Procedures for the Renewal of Charter Schools Authorized by the State University Board of Trustees* (revised September 15, 2009) are available at: <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/documents/renewalPractices.doc>.

² For the purpose of reporting student achievement results, the Accountability Period is defined in the SUNY Renewal Practices as the time the Accountability Plan was in effect. In the case of a Subsequent Renewal, the plan covers the last year of the previous charter period and the first four years of the current charter period.

Plan goals during the Accountability Period.” Given that SUNY previously renewed and based on the Institute’s review of the evidence that it gathered and that Harbor has provided including, but not limited to, the school’s Application for Subsequent Renewal, evaluation visits conducted during the charter period, a renewal evaluation visit conducted in the final year of the current charter period, and the school’s record of academic performance determined by the extent to which it has met its academic Accountability Plan goals, the Institute finds that the school has consistently met or come close to meeting its academic Accountability Plan goals during the Accountability Period.

Based on all the evidence submitted in the current charter term and as described in, or submitted with, the Application for Renewal, the Institute makes the following findings required by the Act. Harbor as described in the Application for Subsequent Renewal meets the requirements of the Act and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations. The school has demonstrated the ability to operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner in the next charter period. Finally, given the programs it will offer, its structure and its purpose, approving the school to operate for another five years is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in Education Law subdivision 2850(2).

Therefore, in accordance with the standard for Subsequent Renewal found in the SUNY Renewal Practices, the Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve Harbor’s Application for Renewal and renew the school’s charter for a full term of five years.

Consideration of School District Comments

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

Summary Discussion

Academic Success

During Harbor’s five-year Accountability Period, the school met its Accountability Plan mathematics and English language arts goals. Specifically, the school met its mathematics goal in all five years and met the English Language Arts goal in all but the first year of the Accountability Period. Harbor outperformed its local community district in both subjects throughout the period. In comparison to similar schools statewide, the school was at least close to meeting its English Language Arts target each year and far exceeded its math target in all five years. The school is meeting its science and No Child Left Behind (“NCLB”) goals.

Based on results of the five measures in its Accountability Plan, Harbor has met its English Language Arts goal in the last four years of the Accountability Period. After the first year, the school has exceeded the absolute target of 75 percent proficiency each year. Harbor has exceeded the NCLB Annual Measureable Objective (AMO) set by the state during each of the five years. It has outperformed the local community school district by at least ten percent each year. In comparison to demographically similar schools, the school met the target in all but one year when it performed better than similar schools, but did not meet the target. The school showed overall cohort growth in two years, but did not meet its target. Nevertheless, about half the individual grade levels met their growth targets throughout the Accountability Period.

Based on the results of the five measures in its Accountability Plan, Harbor has continually met its mathematics goal. The school has consistently far exceeded the absolute target of 75 percent proficiency, with essentially 90 percent of students achieving proficiency throughout the Accountability Period. The school has consistently exceeded the state's AMO and outperformed the local community school district each year with a margin of greater than 20 percent in all but one year. In comparison to demographically similar schools, the school met its target each year of the Accountability Period, performing better than expected to a large degree in four of the five years. Harbor had overall year-to-year increase in cohort performance during four of the five years and most of the individual grade levels met their respective targets during the five year period.

Harbor has strong instructional leadership that holds teachers accountable for quality instruction and student achievement. The leadership team sets high expectations for student and teacher performance and has systems in place to retain high quality teachers. With a relatively small teaching staff, the four-person team provides sustained and systematic teacher supervision by annually conducting 10-12 observations of each teacher. The team provides timely verbal and written feedback on these observations as well as monthly performance feedback sessions with each teacher. In addition, the leadership offers weekly coaching and professional development aligned to teachers' individual needs.

Quality instruction has been evident in the school throughout the charter period. Teachers generally implement purposeful, well-paced lessons with clear, measurable objectives. Teachers engage students who consistently remain on task with grade appropriate instruction. Most teachers monitor learning by checking for student understanding through the use of probing questions, checking student work and delivering frequent classroom assessments such as do now's and exit slips. Teachers also use effective classroom management techniques to maximize learning time.

During this charter period, Harbor has continued to deliver a comprehensive professional development program. At the time of renewal, teachers received professional development through one-on-one coaching which targets individual needs and through whole school training sessions during staff meetings which target school level needs. Additionally, teachers continue to receive three days a year to attend external professional development sessions and to provide turn-key training to other teachers during staff and child study meetings.

Harbor has an assessment system that improves instructional effectiveness. At the start of the charter period, the school was using assessment and evaluation data to inform instruction, determine re-teaching opportunities and identify at-risk students. Harbor also uses this data to evaluate teacher effectiveness and develop professional development and coaching strategies. Additionally, during this charter period the school developed interim assessments for all grades and subjects including writing.

During the current charter period, Harbor revised its curriculum framework for English Language Arts and math based on a new curriculum review and evaluation process. The new framework, utilizing purchased curricula, is comprehensive and organized; teachers have aligned it to the Common Core standards. Curriculum quality is now consistent across content areas and aligned across grades. Additionally, the school has in place strong scope and sequence and pacing guides, which instructional leaders use as one of many levers to hold teachers accountable.

Harbor has clear procedures for identifying students with disabilities, English language learners and academically struggling students. The school provides them with sufficient support, including

tutoring, remediation and push-in services. Over the course of the charter period, the school's procedures for monitoring the progress of students receiving services and those potentially at-risk have been more consistently implemented. Additionally, because of opportunities at regular, ongoing child study team meetings for classroom teachers and intervention specialists to coordinate instructional planning, the classroom teachers have become more aware of individual student Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals.

Overall, the school has established a safe and orderly environment. Teachers establish classroom settings that foster learning and scholarship. During the charter period, the school has implemented a clear behavior management system developed by classroom teachers under the auspices of the dean of students.

Organizational Effectiveness and Viability

Harbor has been faithful to its mission over the course of the charter period, most notably demonstrated by the extent to which it has met its Accountability Plan goals in support of its intent to "provide students with a quality education through a rigorous academic program." In addition, the school has effectively implemented the key design elements contained in its charter including having two teachers in all lower grade classrooms, devoting 60 percent of instructional time to literacy and numeracy in the lower grades and providing a summer readiness program for 1st and 3rd grades.

Parental satisfaction is extremely important to Harbor to the extent that the school has chosen to include a parent satisfaction goal in its Accountability Plan. The school has set annual parental satisfaction targets including student attendance, annual student persistence as well as reported parent satisfaction. Harbor has met its student attendance and annual student persistence goals by achieving a 95 percent daily student attendance rate and a 95 percent student persistence rate. Harbor has come close to meeting its reported parent satisfaction goal of having at least 66 percent of parents report satisfaction with the school through annual surveys; however, in some years Harbor was unable to gain responses from at least 66 percent of parents.

Harbor has generally established a well-functioning organizational structure with staff, systems, and procedures that allow the school to carry out its academic program. Day-to-day operations are managed by the school's central leadership, whose priorities are aligned to the school's mission. Much of the operational policy development has been delegated to the school leadership, which provides periodic reports to the board regarding changes and updates to the policies and procedures.

The school board has worked effectively to oversee the educational program and achieve the school's mission, though they have difficulty in ensuring that particular legal and compliance issues are addressed in a timely manner, discussed further below. The composition of the board of Harbor includes individuals with a diverse set of skills, to include trustees with finance, educational, legal, and management expertise.

Further, a member of the board is currently affiliated with the school's partner organization, Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc., a New York not-for-profit corporation that seeks "to empower children and their families to become full, productive participants in society through education, cultural enrichment and social services." At present, Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc., is also the school's landlord and provides some back-office services pursuant to a lease/partnership agreement. Subsequent to the renewal inspection visit, Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc. indicated a desire to discontinue its partnership with the school. Both the school and Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc. are working amicably to transition

back office services to the school or an outside vendor, and the partner organization has agreed to allow the school continued use of the facility until the end of the 2012-2013 school year unless a suitable facility becomes available prior to that time. Once the relationship between the school and Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc., is formally concluded, the partner organization will no longer have a representative on the school's board.

The school board has capably evaluated school leadership on an annual basis, using the same process throughout the charter period, and fully vets all plans submitted to them by providing constructive criticism. The school board has been proactive in addressing the school's facility needs during the current charter period, given the limited space available to serve students and ongoing maintenance issues. The school's board of trustees has generally avoided creating conflicts of interest where possible, and where conflicts exist, such as with the facility and services arrangement with Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc., the board has generally managed those conflicts in a clear and transparent manner through recusal.

In material respects, the school board has implemented adequate policies and procedures to ensure the effective governance and oversight of the school. The school has adopted a comprehensive complaint policy, and evidence was presented to verify that the school board and leadership team had promptly and effectively responded to parent and community complaints.

Based on the evidence available at the time of the renewal inspection visit and throughout the current charter term, in material respect Harbor has been in general and substantial compliance with the terms of its charter, bylaws, applicable state and federal law, rules and regulations. Minor deficiencies were noted in the areas of teacher certification requirements, Freedom of Information Law compliance, federal Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) compliance, Gun Free Schools Act compliance, and compliance with the Open Meetings Law. During the current charter term, the school failed to establish a relationship with the New York City Department of Education or an independent agency to provide all necessary nursing services, though it is currently remedying that deficiency. The school board has generally maintained a relationship with outside counsel including the solicitation of pro bono services, for advice on legal, compliance, and real estate matters. The school has substantially followed the terms of its monitoring plan.

The school's Application for Renewal contains all necessary elements as required by the Act. The proposed school calendar allots an appropriate amount of instructional time to comply with all necessary requirements, and taken together with other academic and key design elements, should be sufficient to allow the school to meet its proposed accountability plan goals. Other key aspects of the Application for Renewal, to include the proposed bylaws and code of ethics, have been amended to comply with various provisions of the Education Law, Not-for-Profit Corporation Law, Public Officers Law, and the General Municipal Law, as appropriate.

Fiscal Soundness

Harbor has created realistic budgets over the course of the charter period that it has monitored and adjusted when appropriate. The school develops annual budgets as a collaborative effort between the Boys and Girls Harbor's Controller with appropriate input from the school's principal, key staff and members of the school board. The Boys and Girls Harbor Controller and other business office staff routinely analyze budget variances and discuss material variances with the principal and the board on a regular basis. Boys and Girls Harbor and the school have implemented a strategic approach when considering spending trends, staffing and instructional needs in the development of its budgets.

Actual expenses have been equal to or less than actual revenue over the course of this charter period with only one exception in 2007-08.

The school has maintained appropriate fiscal policies, procedures and controls related to external and internal compliance for cash disbursements, cash receipts, bank reconciliations, payroll, fixed assets, grants/contributions, and the preparation of financial statements. The school has accurately recorded and appropriately documented transactions in accordance with management's direction. The Boys and Girls Harbor Controller, with input from Harbor's principals, key staff and the school board, works to ensure that fiscal policies and procedures are accurately documented and followed. The school's Fiscal Year (FY) 2007-08 - 2010-11 audit reports of internal controls—related to financial reporting and compliance with laws, regulations and grants—disclosed no material weaknesses or instances of non-compliance. As with all audits conducted using GAAP standards, the lack of identified deficiencies in the reports provides reasonable but not absolute assurance that the school has maintained adequate internal controls and procedures.

The school has complied with financial reporting requirements during the charter period. The school filed budget, quarterly and annual financial statement audit reports in a timely, accurate and complete manner. Each of the school's annual financial audits indicate that school staff followed and conducted reports in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and received an unqualified opinion, indicating that, in the auditor's opinion, the school's financial statements and notes fairly represent, in all material respects, the school's financial position, changes in net assets, and cash flows. The school board has reviewed and approved various monthly and quarterly reports along with the annual financial audit report.

The school has maintained adequate financial resources to ensure stable operations and has monitored and successfully managed cash flow. The school completed the FY 2010-11 in stable financial condition slightly increasing the school's total net assets while maintaining and slightly increasing cash reserves.

As illustrated in the Institute's Fiscal Dashboard,³ which appears as an appendix to this report, the school has averaged a "fiscally adequate" financial responsibility composite score rating over the current charter term along with its most recent year of operation, 2010-11, indicating a constant level of fiscal stability. The composite score assists in measuring the financial health of a school using a blended score that measures the school's performances on key financial indicators. The blended score allows a school's sources of financial strength to offset areas of financial weakness. The school has also averaged a "medium risk/good" rating in its working capital ratio, which indicates the school has had enough short term assets to cover immediate liabilities/short-term debt. Further, Harbor has averaged a "medium risk/good" rating debt-to-asset ratio, indicating the proportion of debt the school has relative to its assets. The school has no short or long-term debt. Finally, the school has averaged a "high risk/poor" rating in regards to the months-of-cash ratio, demonstrating it has had less than the suggested three months of annual expenses in reserves. The school has no major investments and leaves all cash in savings and/or money market accounts to ensure the school has sufficient cash available to pay current bills and other payables that are shortly due. The school averaged slightly less than 94 percent of all expenses being allocated to program services over the current charter term. The school also saw revenue slightly exceed expenses per student on

³ The Institute's Fiscal Dashboard, which provides a detailed financial analysis of each school authorized by the SUNY Trustees, is available at: <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/FiscalDashboard.htm>. A memo explaining the metrics used within the dashboard is also available at that web address.

an average of just over one percent a year, consistent with its effective operational plan on a year-to-year basis.

Based on all of the foregoing, Harbor has demonstrated fiscal soundness over the course of its charter term.

Plans for the Next Charter Period

Harbor has provided all of the key structural elements for a renewal charter and those elements are deemed to be reasonable, feasible and achievable. The school proposes to continue implementing its current educational program but would change slightly the mission, key design elements and organizational structure during the next charter period.

The school would continue to provide instruction to students in Kindergarten through eighth grade. Projected enrollment in each of the five years within the proposed charter period is 244 students. The school intends to offer 198 days of instruction each year to students in first and third grade and 180 days of instruction each year to students in all other grades.

The school would make a minor revision to its mission statement as follows:

It is the mission of the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School to provide students with a high quality education through a rigorous academic program that infuses character building, physical wellness and the arts. Students will graduate with the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in higher learning institutions and have the capability to make a positive contribution to society.

Additionally, Harbor would change its key design elements to reflect:

- An extended day program that addresses the needs of students who are in need of remediation as well as students who excel in core subject areas;
- A summer readiness program in the lower grades (1st graders and 3rd graders) that prepares students for the upcoming school year in English Language Arts and mathematics;
- For elementary grades (K-5), at least two teachers in the classroom at all times;
- Smaller class sizes in the upper grades (6-8) to ensure that student needs are truly met through small group and individual learning strategies.
- Emphasizing literacy and mathematical concepts in the lower grades (K-2), and devoting at least 60% of the academic time to those subject areas.

The organizational structure of the academic staff at the school would continue as in previous charters with the addition of an instructional administrator position to increase the teaching and instructional capacity of 5th-8th grade teachers. Additionally, the school would continue to offer 3rd-8th grade students a Saturday Test Preparation Program as well as its Summer Readiness program for first and third grade students.

Harbor would continue, for the time being, its partnership with Boys & Girls Harbor, Inc., which implements the after-school program. As stated above, the school and partner organization are in the process of concluding their partnership agreement. Both the school's board and the board from Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc., have formed a transition subcommittee to ensure that there is a smooth conclusion to the partnership agreement with minimal impact on the school's students and staff.

Harbor will either hire external vendors to provide the services now being provided by Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc. or hire new school staff to perform those functions.

Assuming effective communication continues to take place between the school board and leadership, the proposed organizational structure would support the maintenance of distinct lines of accountability with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Members of the current board of trustees expressed their interest in continuing their service to the school. The school board would seek to add individuals with additional finance, fundraising and educational experience. The school board would also create a fundraising and board development committee.

Harbor has presented a reasonable and appropriate fiscal plan for the term of the next charter including adequate budgets, that are likely achievable. The school has taken a strong strategic approach to budgeting and planning for the next charter period. Harbor will be able to hire outside vendors or new school staff to perform the functions currently handled by Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc. using the funds budgeted but not expended on the Boys and Girls Harbor, Inc. contract. The school may have difficulty finding a new private space at the same cost per square foot paid under the current lease but given the cash flows and reserves available to Harbor, the school should be able to adjust its budget accordingly when it identifies space. Moreover, if the school were to obtain NYCDOE space or a space where it could increase enrollment (which it has not been able to do in the current space), the school's cash position could improve or be even. As with all schools, the Institute will monitor the school's space transition ensuring all regulatory and fiscal requirements are met.

Due to state deficit problems and the uncertainty of per-pupil funding beyond 2012-13, the school has developed a working budget that uses the 2010-11 and 2011-12 funding level as a baseline for the 2012-13 academic year projections, increasing three percent in years two and four and remaining the same as the previous year in years three and five. The plan projects a minor operating and cash flow surplus in each year contingent upon the school's continuing to meet enrollment goals that it has met in the past, and paying rent similar to its current rent, a factor which cannot be known at this time. These slight surpluses would help the school continue its current trend of increasing fiscal steadiness; however, it would also need to maintain current reserves and resources to ensure the school's fiscal stability. As noted in the Fiscal Dashboard below, the school's financial metrics have largely improved since the beginning of the current charter term. However, the school's months of cash on hand, a measure of fiscal health designed to see how long an entity could meet expenses without revenue, have never been over the 3 month standard the Institute uses even though they have improved steadily over time to about half of the standard. In the absence of other negative factors, this is not alarming as a 2010 survey by the Nonprofit Finance Fund found that 61% of non-profit entities surveyed had less than 3 months of cash and 12% had none. The Institute will continue to monitor this and other fiscal metrics throughout the next charter term.

Long-range fiscal projections are more susceptible to error than those for a single year. Such projections are subject to revision due to changes in local conditions, objectives, laws and state funding. The school would be required to continually develop and adopt annual budgets based on known per pupil amounts for the districts from which it draws enrollment. Based on the foregoing fiscal information and the school's track record of fiscal soundness to date, the Institute finds that the school has demonstrated the ability to operate in a fiscally sound manner during the next charter term despite facility plans in the last four years of the charter term being unsettled.

SCHOOL OVERVIEW

Opening Information

Date Initial Charter Approved by SUNY Trustees	January, 2000
Date Initial Charter Approved by Board of Regents	April, 2000
School Opening Date	September 2000

Location

School Year(s)	Location(s)	Grades	District
2000 - present	One East 104 th Street, Suite 603 in East Harlem, NY	K-8	New York City CSD 4

Partner Organizations

	Partner Name	Partner Type	Dates of Service
Current Partner	Boys & Girls Harbor, Inc	Community Youth Organization	2000 - present

Renewal

Type of Renewal	Date
Short Term Renewal	March 1, 2005
Full Term Renewal	January 21, 2007

Current Mission Statement

It is the mission of the Harbor Science and Arts Charter School to provide students with a high quality education through a rigorous academic program that infuses character building, physical wellness and the arts. Students will graduate with the skills and knowledge necessary to succeed in higher learning institutions and have the capability to make a positive contribution to society.

Current Key Design Elements

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a summer readiness program in grades 2 and 3 that prepares students for the upcoming school year in English language arts and mathematics;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for grades 1-5, at least two teachers in the classroom at all times;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • smaller class sizes in the upper grades (6-8) to ensure that student needs are truly met through modified curriculum and instruction;
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • emphasizing literacy and numeracy in the lower grades (1-3), and devoting at least 60% of the academic time to those subject areas; and
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • remediation classes for students who are at-risk and are in need of extra support in English language arts and mathematics

School Characteristics

School Year	Original Chartered Enrollment	Actual Enrollment ⁴	Original Chartered Grades	Actual Grades
2005-06	210	211	1-8	1-8
2006-07	210	210	1-8	1-8
2007-08	222	208	1-8	1-8
2008-09	228	212	1-8	1-8
2009-10	228	215	1-8	1-8
2010-11	228	215	1-8	1-8
2011-12	228		K-8	K-8

Student Demographics

	2007-08		2008-09		2009-10	
	Number of School Enrollment	Percent of School District Enrollment	Number of School Enrollment	Percent of School District Enrollment	Number of School Enrollment	Percent of School District Enrollment
Race/Ethnicity						
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%
Black or African American	77.0%	32.0%	81.0%	30.0%	76.0%	30.0%
Hispanic	22.0%	62.0%	17.0%	62.0%	22.0%	62.0%
Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	5.0%	1.0%	5.0%
White	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%	0.0%	2.0%
Multiracial	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%
Special Populations						
Students with Disabilities ⁵	9.5%		15.0%		15.2%	
Limited English Proficient	0.0%	13.0%	1.0%	13.0%	1.0%	13.0%
Free/Reduced Lunch						
Eligible for Free Lunch	50.0%	74.0%	48.0%	80.0%	52.0%	83.0%
Eligible for Reduced-Price Lunch	20.0%	6.0%	23.0%	7.0%	19.0%	4.0%

⁴ Source: SUNY Charter School Institute's Official Enrollment Binder. (Figures may differ slightly from New York State Report Cards, depending on date of data collection.)

⁵ School data is from NYC DOE Progress Reports.

Current Board of Trustees⁶

Board Member Name	Term Expires	Position/Committees
Mr. Alvin Patrick	June 2013	Chair
Ms. Kelli Doss	June 2012	Secretary
Mr. Robert North	June 2013	Trustee
Mr. Richard Asche	June 2013	Trustee
Ms. Heather Carter	January 2012	Trustee
Ms. Luly Duke	January 2013	Trustee
Ms. Susan Etess	September 2011	Trustee
Mr. Thomas Howard	June 2013	Trustee
Mr. Phil Salmon	June 2013	Vice Chair
Ms. Lisa Stenson – Desamours	June 2013	Treasurer

School Leader(s)

School Year	School Leader(s) Name and Title
2003-present	Joanne Hunt, Principal

School Visit History

School Year	Visit Type	Evaluator (Institute/External)	Date
2000-2001	First Year Visit	Institute	May 18, 2001
2001-2002	Second Year Visit	Institute	April 29, 2002
2002-2003	Third Year Visit	External	March 10-11, 2003
2004-2005	Renewal Visit	Institute	September 29, 2004
2006-2007	Subsequent Renewal	Institute	October 4, 2006
2008-2009	Evaluation	Institute	April 28, 2009
2011-2012	Subsequent Renewal	Institute	September 15, 2011

⁶ Source: School renewal application and Institute board information.

ACADEMIC ATTAINMENT AND IMPROVEMENT

Background

At the beginning of the charter period the school developed and adopted an Accountability Plan that set academic goals in the key subjects of English language arts and mathematics. The plan also includes science and NCLB goals. For each goal in the Accountability Plan specific outcome measures define the level of performance necessary to meet that goal. The required outcome measures include the following three types: 1) the absolute level of student performance on state examinations; 2) the comparative level of student performance on state examinations; and 3) the growth in student learning according to year-to-year comparisons of grade level cohorts. The following table shows the outcome measures currently required by the Institute in each subject area goal, as well as for the NCLB goal. Schools may have also elected to include additional optional goals and measures in their Accountability Plan.

Summary of Required Goals and Outcome Measures in Elementary/Middle School (K-8) Accountability Plans					
GOAL	Required Outcome Measures				
	Absolute⁷		Comparative		Growth
	75 percent at or above Level 3 on state exam	Performance Index (PI) meets Annual Measurable Objective (AMO)	Percent proficient greater than that of local school district	School exceeds predicted level of performance compared to similar public schools by small Effect Size	Grade-level cohorts reduce by half the gap between prior year's percent at or above Level 3 and 75 percent
English Language Arts	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Mathematics	◆	◆	◆	◆	◆
Science	◆		◆		
NCLB	School is deemed in "Good Standing" under state's NCLB accountability system				

The most important criterion for renewal is academic success, which is demonstrated in large part by meeting or coming close to meeting the goals in a school's Accountability Plan. The Institute determines the outcome of a goal by evaluating the multiple measures associated with that goal.

The following presentation indicates the outcome of each of the school's goals, as well as an analysis of the respective measures for each goal during the last four years of the five-year Accountability Period.⁸ Italicized text indicates goals or measures as written in the school's Accountability Plan;

⁷ Note: In 2009-10, the State Education Department (SED) raised its achievement standard, by increasing the scaled score cut off for proficiency or Level 3 performance on the English language arts and mathematics exams. In order to maintain a consistent standard for determining meeting the absolute measure, the Institute has adapted SED's "time-adjusted" cut-offs. In the presentation of English language arts and mathematics results below, we use the "time-adjusted" Level 3 cut-offs, where noted, for 2009-10 and 2010-11.

⁸ Because the renewal decision is made in the last year of a Charter Period, the Accountability Period ends in the next to last year of the Charter Period. For initial renewals, the Accountability Period is the first four years of the Charter Period. For subsequent

bold numbers appearing in the tables are the critical values for determining if a measure was achieved in a given year. Aside from required Accountability Plan measures, the following also presents the results of optional measures that the school may have included in its plan.

English Language Arts

Accountability Plan Goal: Students will become proficient in the English Language Arts skills of reading, writing and listening.

Outcome: Harbor has met its English Language Arts goal.

Analysis of Accountability Plan Measures:

Absolute Measure: For the 2006-2011 school years, 75% of 3 rd -8 th graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 ⁹ on the New York State ELA exam.				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Grade	2007-08 (Tested: 148)	2008-09 (Tested: 152)	2009-10 (Tested: 146)	2010-11 (Tested: 149)
3	90.5	86.4	85.0	91.3
4	85.2	100.0	85.0	96.3
5	75.0	92.3	91.3	100.0
6	74.1	95.7	88.0	87.5
7	80.8	90.0	88.5	89.3
8	69.6	60.7	53.1	44.8
All	79.1	84.2	80.1	83.2

Harbor has exceeded its absolute performance target in English Language Arts throughout the Accountability Period. In 2007-08, 79.1 percent of students and Harbor exceeded its 75 percent target by a small margin. In 2008-09, the school’s performance improved and 84.2 percent of students were proficient. In 2009-10, student performance exceeded targets though it experienced a slight decline to 80 percent proficiency as the result of the state releasing new cut scores. In the most recent year, the school posted stronger results with 83 percent proficiency.

Absolute Measure: Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index on the state ELA exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system. ¹⁰				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Index	2007-08 (Tested 162)	2008-09 (Tested: 166)	2009-10 (Tested: 172)	2010-11 (Tested: 174)
PI	176	187	180	153
AMO	133	144	155	122

renewals, the Accountability Period includes the last year of the previous Charter Period through the next to last year of the current Charter Period.

⁹ In 2009-10 and 2010-11, this standard is based upon the state determined “time adjusted cut scores” instead of Level 3 cut scores as in previous years.

¹⁰ In 2009-10, the Performance Index was based on “time adjusted cut scores” instead of Level 3 cut scores used in the other years. In 2010-11, the state adjusted the AMO to reflect the higher standard used in setting the Level 3 cut scores.

Harbor has surpassed the elementary/middle school English Language Arts Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) established by the state’s NCLB accountability system during each year of its Accountability Period.

Comparative Measure: <i>Each year, the percent of 3rd-8th grade students who are enrolled in at least their second year and are performing at or above Level 3 on the state ELA exam will be greater than that of New York City CSD 4.</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Comparison	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
	(Grades 3-8)	(Grades 3-8)	(Grades 3-8)	(Grades 3-8)
School	79.1	84.2	46.6	51.7
District	50.2	64.4	36.1	37.8

Harbor has outperformed the local school district on the state’s elementary/middle school English language arts exam by a wide margin during each year of the Accountability Period.

Comparative Measure: <i>Each year, the school will exceed its expected level of performance on the State ELA exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Index	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
	(Grades 3-8)	(Grades 3-8)	(Grades 3-8)	(Grades 3-8)
	(Tested: 162)	(Tested: 166)	(Tested: 172)	(Tested: 174)
Predicted	63.2	74.7	46.9	46.1
Actual	75.9	87.3	47.1	53.4
Effect Size	0.86	1.20	0.06	0.50

In comparison to demographically similar schools state-wide, Harbor has performed better than expected throughout the current Accountability Period and exceeded its Effect Size target in all but one year.

Growth Measure: <i>For the 2006-2011 school years, grade-level cohorts 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. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least some increase in the current year.</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Percent Level 3 & 4	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10¹¹	2010-11
	(Grade 4-8)	(Grade 4-8)	(Grade 4-8)	(Grade 4-8)
	(N=128)	(N=127)	(N= 126)	(N= 128)
Baseline	70.3	78.7	94.4	52.3
Target	72.6	78.8	94.5	63.7
Actual	87.4	87.4	79.4	49.2
Cohorts Made Target	3 of 5	4 of 5	0 of 5	2 of 5

¹¹ In 2009-10, cohort growth is based on the state determined “time adjusted cut scores” instead of the Level 3 cut scores used in other years.

Harbor’s overall cohort performance showed growth in two years of the Accountability Period, however at least two of five cohorts experienced growth in all years but one. In 2007-08, three cohorts experienced growth and the school’s performance improved by a small margin. In 2008-09, school performance stayed flat while four out of five cohorts experienced growth with 87 percent proficiency. In 2009-10, overall performance declined and no cohorts experienced year to year performance improvement. In 2010-11, two cohorts experienced growth while overall performance declined slightly.

Optional Measures:

The school’s Accountability plan did not include any optional measure related to its English Language Arts goal.

Mathematics

Accountability Plan Goal: Students will become proficient in the mathematics skills of problem solving and computation.

Outcome: Harbor has met its mathematics goal.

Analysis of Accountability Plan Measures:

Absolute Measure: For the 2006-2011 school years, 75% of 3 rd - 8 th graders who are been enrolled in at least their second year will score at or above Level 3 ¹² on the New York State Mathematics exam.				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Grade	2007-08 (Tested: 148)	2008-09 (Tested: 152)	2009-10 (Tested: 148)	2010-11 (Tested: 149)
3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
4	88.9	95.7	90.5	100.0
5	95.8	100.0	100.0	94.4
6	77.8	87.0	96.2	100.0
7	100.0	93.3	26.0	96.4
8	91.3	96.4	32.0	89.7
All	91.9	95.4	93.2	96.6

Harbor has exceeded its absolute performance target in mathematics in each year of the Accountability Period with student proficiency percentages above 90 percent.

Absolute Measure: Each year, the school’s aggregate Performance Index ¹³ on the state math exam will meet its Annual Measurable Objective set forth in the State’s No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Index	2007-08 (Tested 162)	2008-09 (Tested: 166)	2009-10 (Tested: 173)	2010-11 (Tested: 174)
PI	191	195	194	176
AMO	102	119	135	137

¹² In 2009-10, this is based upon the State’s determined “time adjusted cut scores” instead of Level 3 cut scores as in previous years.

¹³ In 2009-10, the Performance Index was based on “time adjusted cut scores” instead of Level 3 cut scores used in the other years. In 2010-11, the state adjusted the AMO to reflect the higher standard used in setting the Level 3 cut score.

Harbor has surpassed the elementary/middle school mathematics AMO established by the state’s NCLB accountability system during each year of its Accountability Period.

Comparative Measure: <i>Each year, the percent of 3rd-8th grade students who are enrolled in at least their second year and performing at or above Level 3 on the state Mathematics exam will be greater than that of New York City CSD 4.</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Comparison	2007-08 (Grades 3-8)	2008-09 (Grades 3-8)	2009-10 (Grades 3-8)	2010-11 (Grades 3-8)
School	91.9	95.4	62.9	77.2
District	67.0	76.5	60.2	50.0

Harbor has outperformed the local school district on the state’s elementary/middle school mathematics exam by a wide margin throughout the Accountability Period. In the most recent year, the school’s level of performance was over 20 percentage points higher than that of its local school district.

Comparative Measure: <i>Each year, the school will exceed its expected level of performance on the State Math exam by at least a small Effect Size (performing higher than expected to small degree) according to a regression analysis controlling for students eligible for free lunch among all public schools in New York State.</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Index	2007-08 (Grades 3-8) (Tested: 162)	2008-09 (Grades 3-8) (Tested: 166)	2009-10 (Grades 3-8) (Tested: 173)	2010-11 (Grades 3-8) (Tested: 174)
Predicted	76.4	84.3	55.1	57.4
Actual	91.4	95.2	64.7	77.0
Effect Size	0.95	1.07	0.56	1.07

In comparison to demographically similar schools state-wide, Harbor has performed better than expected throughout the current Accountability Period and exceeded its Effect Size target each year.

Growth Measure: <i>For the 2006-2011 school years, grade-level cohorts 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. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75 percent at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least some increase in the current year</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Percent Level 3 & 4	2007-08 (Grade 4-8) (N=128)	2008-09 (Grade 4-8) (N=127)	2009-10¹⁴ (Grade 4-8) (N= 127)	2010-11 (Grade 4-8) (N= 129)
Baseline	90.6	91.3	94.5	71.3
Target	90.7	91.4	94.5	73.1
Actual	90.6	95.3	92.9	76.7
Cohorts Made Target	3 of 5	2 of 5	3 of 5	2 of 5

¹⁴ In 2009-10, cohort growth is based on the state determined “time adjusted cut scores” instead of the Level 3 cut scores used in other years.

Harbor had overall year-to-year increases in cohort performance during three of the four year and half of the individual grade levels met their respective targets during the four years.

Optional Measures:

The school’s Accountability plan did not include any optional measure related to its mathematics goal.

Science

Accountability Plan Goal: Students will become proficient in knowledge, skills and concepts of science.

Outcome: Harbor has met its science goal.

Absolute Measure: <i>In each year, 75% of fourth and eighth graders who are enrolled in at least their second year will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examinations.</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Grade	2007-08 (Tested: 48)	2008-09 (Tested: 48)	2009-10 (Tested: 53)	2010-11 (Tested: 59)
4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
8	96.0	82.0	72.0	80.0

Harbor has consistently posted strong results on the 4th grade science exam and has exceeded performance targets in all but one year for the 8th grade exam.

Comparative Measure: <i>Each year, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their second year and are performing at or above Level 3 on the State Science exam in each tested grade will be greater than that of New York City CSD 4.</i>				
Results (in percents)				
	School Year			
Comparison	2007-08 (Grade 4)	2008-09 (Grade 4)	2009-10 (Grade 4)	2010-11 (Grade 4)
School	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
District	68.0	51.0	82.0	N/A

	School Year			
Comparison	2007-08 (Grade 8)	2008-09 (Grade 8)	2009-10 (Grade 8)	2010-11 (Grade 8)
School	96.0	82.0	72.0	80.0
District	46.0	44.0	48.0	N/A

Throughout the charter period, Harbor has consistently outperformed the district on the 4th and 8th grade science exams. Harbor’s performance on the 8th grade exam has almost doubled the performance of the district during each year of the charter period.

NCLB

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

Accountability Plan Goal: Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.

Outcome: The school met the goal. Harbor was deemed to be in good standing in each of the four years of the Accountability Period.

Absolute Measure: <i>Under the state's NCLB accountability system, the school's Accountability Status will be "Good Standing" each year.</i>				
Results				
Status	School Year			
	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Good Standing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Analysis of Additional Evidence

Harbor received a letter grade of "B" on its 2010-11 New York City Department of Education (DOE) Progress Report. According to the DOE, overall Progress Report scores are based on school performance in three categories: School Environment, Student Performance and Student Progress, with the greatest emphasis placed on Student Progress. To raise the bar for schools and increase stability in grades, the city reports that overall cut scores were determined for 2010-11 based on a pre-determined scoring distribution: 25 percent A, 35 percent B, 30 percent C, seven percent D, and three percent E.

Harbor received the "B" based on the composite score of the three categories. The school received an "A" in school environment, which measures factors other than student achievement. This category is largely based on parent and teacher satisfaction surveys which are used to measure the conditions necessary for learning. In the category that measures student performance, the school received a "B", indicating that the school's absolute performance was better on the whole than its peer schools in the city. As a result of Harbor's limited year-to-year growth, especially with a decline in English language arts, in comparison to its peer schools, it received a "C" in Student Growth.

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

APPENDIX: FISCAL DASHBOARD

