

# New York State Education Department

## 2021-2022 Renewal Site Visit Report for BoR-Authorized Charter Schools under the 2019 Charter School Performance Framework

New York City Montessori Charter School

Site Visit Dates: November 4-5, 2021 Date of Report: April 18, 2022

> Charter School Office 89 Washington Avenue Albany, New York 12234 charterschools@nysed.gov 518-474-1762

## **Table of Contents**

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION	3
METHODOLOGY	6
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS	7
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	
Benchmark 1: Student Performance	
BENCHMARK 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING	
BENCHMARK 3: CULTURE, CLIMATE, AND STUDENT AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT	
BENCHMARK 4: FINANCIAL CONDITION	
BENCHMARK 5: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	
BENCHMARK 6: BOARD OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNANCE	
BENCHMARK 7: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY	29
BENCHMARK 8: MISSION AND KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS	
BENCHMARK 9: ENROLLMENT, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION	34
BENCHMARK 10: LEGAL COMPLIANCE	37

#### ATTACHMENT 1: 2021 NYSED CHARTER SCHOOL INFORMATION DASHBOARD

ATTACHMENT 2: CHARTER SCHOOL FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY DASHBOARD

## SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

#### Charter School Summary<sup>1</sup>

Name of Charter School	New York City Montessori Charter School
Board Chair	Maria Keane
District of location	NYC CSD 7
Opening Date	September 7, 2011
Charter Terms	<ul> <li>Initial Charter: July 1, 2011 - June 30, 2016</li> <li>First Renewal: July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2019</li> <li>Second Renewal: July 1, 2019 - June 30, 2022</li> </ul>
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K - Grade 5 / 294 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K - Grade 5 / 294 students
Facilities	423 East 138 <sup>th</sup> Street, Bronx - Private Space
Mission Statement	The New York City Montessori Charter School will empower children to be critical thinks and creative problem solvers with strong social skills so that they can succeed in their world and continue to learn in their pursuit of higher education as they prepare for careers needed in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century.
Key Design Elements	<ul> <li>Differentiated instruction</li> <li>Individual work plans</li> <li>Specially designed materials</li> <li>Prepared environment</li> <li>Independence and the freedom and ability to make choices</li> <li>Time and practice</li> <li>Peer modeling and teacher scaffolding</li> <li>Content related instructional strategies</li> <li>Montessori philosophy</li> </ul>
<b>Requested Revisions</b> (Revisions are not approved unless approved by the Board of Regents)	<ul> <li>To change the name of the school from: New York City Montessori Charter School to: Choice Charter School.</li> <li>To revise the school's organizational chart to better reflect its roles and responsibilities.</li> <li>To modify the description of the following Key Design Element, "Mixed Age Groupings" to "Responsive Flexible Classroom Sizes to Meet Students' Needs".</li> <li>To revise the Key Design Element, "Specially Designed Materials" to edit the description of what these materials will be and remove specific reference to Montessori materials.</li> </ul>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The information in this section was provided by the NYS Education Department Charter School Office. New York City Montessori Charter School –2021-2022 RENEWAL SITE VISIT REPORT

**Noteworthy:** The New York City Montessori Charter School (NYCMCS) is dedicated to inclusion. The school ensures that all parents, families, and students are full participants of the school through the inclusive practices they have established for parent engagement. The school's translation services during workshops and meetings and is have parents not just have their voices heard, but also for parents to know what other parents are saying. Key informational meetings conducted in English and Spanish use professional academic language in presentations to guarantee parents a fully transparent and meaningful experience. The school's special education practices extend beyond students who are classified as students with disabilities (SWD) and the school actively seeks to provide whatever supports are necessary for all students to be successful in the least restrictive environment.

**COVID-19 PANDEMIC NOTE:** As of the publication of this document, New York State continues to be in the midst of responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. NYSED understands that these are challenging times. The NYSED Charter School Performance Framework is a robust document that allows NYSED to continue to use it as an evaluative tool even during the current statewide crisis. With state assessments cancelled for the 2019-2020 school year and administered under the constraints of the COVID-19 pandemic for the 2020-2021 school year (see the applicable memos at <a href="http://www.nysed.gov/charter-schools/law-regulations-memos">http://www.nysed.gov/charter-schools/law-regulations-memos</a>. Benchmark 1 allows for the use of longitudinal data. NYSED has also implemented a local assessment plan that will supplement, not supplant, state assessment data as per the <a href="memo">memo</a> (See Monitoring Plan section).

### **Renewal Outcomes**

Pursuant to the Board of Regents Renewal Policy, the following are possible renewal outcomes:

- **Full-Term Renewal:** A school's charter may be renewed for the maximum term of five years. For a school to be eligible for a full-term renewal, during the current charter term the school must have compiled a <u>strong and compelling record</u> of meeting or exceeding Benchmark 1, and at the time of the renewal analysis, have met substantially all other performance benchmarks in the Framework.
- Short-Term Renewal: A school's charter may be renewed for a shorter term, typically of three years. As discussed above, the Regents will place an even greater emphasis on student performance for schools applying for their second or subsequent renewal, which is consistent with the greater time that a school has been in operation and the corresponding increase in the quantity and quality of student achievement data that the school has generated. In order for a school to be eligible for short-term renewal, a school must either:

(a) <u>have compiled a mixed or limited record</u> of meeting Benchmark 1, but at the time of the renewal analysis, have met substantially all of the other performance benchmarks in the Framework which will likely result in the school's being able to meet Benchmark 1 with the additional time that short-term renewal permits, **or** 

(b) <u>have compiled an overall record of meeting</u> Benchmark 1 but falls far below meeting one or more of the other performance benchmarks in the Framework.

• Non-Renewal: A school's charter will not be renewed if the school does not apply for renewal or the school fails to meet the criteria for either full-term or short-term renewal. In the case of non-renewal, a school's charter will be terminated upon its expiration and the school will be required to comply with the Charter School Office's Closing Procedures to ensure an orderly closure by the end of the school year.

**Please Note:** The Regents may include additional terms, conditions, and/or requirements in a school's Full-Term or Short-Term Renewal charter to address specific situations or areas of concern. For example, a school may meet the standards for full-term renewal or short-term renewal with regard to its educational success but may be required to address organizational deficiencies that need to be corrected but do not prevent the Regents from making the required legal findings for renewal. A school may also meet the standards for full-term renewal or short-term renewal of only a portion of its educational program (e.g., for the elementary school program, but not the middle school program). Such additional terms and/or requirements may include, but are not limited to, restrictions on the number of students and grades to be served by the school, additional student performance metrics, heightened reporting requirements, or specific corrective action.

#### SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022
Grade Configuration	K - Grade 5	K - Grade 5	K - Grade 5
Total Approved Enrollment	294	294	294

Current Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2022 to 2023	Year 2 2023 to 2024	Year 3 2024 to 2025	Year 4 2025 to 2026	Year 5 2026 to 2027
Grade Configuration	K - Grade 5				
Total Proposed Enrollment	294	294	294	294	294

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This proposed chart was submitted by New York City Montessori Charter School in its renewal application. It is subject to change pending the final renewal recommendation and approval by the Board of Regents. This chart should not be used to determine the final approved grade levels or enrollment of the school in the subsequent renewal term.

New York City Montessori Charter School -2021-2022 RENEWAL SITE VISIT REPORT

# METHODOLOGY

A two-day remote renewal site visit was conducted at New York City Montessori Charter School on November 4-5, 2021. The New York State Education Department's Charter School Office (CSO) team conducted interviews with the board of trustees, school leadership team, special education team, culture team, parents and teachers. In cooperation with school leadership, the CSO administered anonymous online surveys to and parents.

The team conducted remote ten classroom observations in K - Grade 5. The observations were approximately 15 minutes in length and conducted jointly with the school's principal and the assistant principal for curriculum and instruction. NYSED utilizes the CSO's remote Classroom Observation Worksheet as a lens for remote classroom observations. It is shared with the school prior to the site visit, and can be found in the <u>Renewal SV Protocol</u>.

The documents and data reviewed by the team before, during, and after the site visit included the following:

- Current 2021-2022 organizational chart;
- A 2021-2022 master school schedule;
- Board materials (roster, minutes, monthly data dashboard example, and strategic plan, if applicable) and a narrative describing the board's self-evaluation process;
- Narrative describing the process used to evaluate school leadership;
- Narrative describing the process school leadership uses to evaluate teachers;
- 2021 CSO Annual Survey of Charter School Parents/Guardians, Teachers, and Students results;
- Current school policies, including the discipline policy, complaint policy, enrollment and admissions policy, and by-laws;
- NYSED Attachment 1: 2021 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard;
- NYSED Attachment 2: Charter School Fiscal Accountability Summary Dashboard;
- Narrative describing the school's progress and efforts made toward reaching its enrollment and retention targets;
- Admissions and Waitlist information;
- 2021-2022 teacher retention data;
- School-submitted Annual Reports during current charter term;
- Prior CSO monitoring reports (check-in, midterm, renewals);
- School's 2021 renewal application; and
- Social Emotional Learning description, morning meeting pacing guide, circle keepers guide culture calendar, monthly parent meeting presentation, teacher digital culture resource platform, and a virtual stepping up slideshow.

## **BENCHMARK ANALYSIS**

The 2019 Performance Framework, which is part of the Oversight Plan included in the Charter Agreement for each school, outlines 10 Performance Framework benchmarks in three key areas of charter school performance:

- Educational Success
- Organizational Soundness
- Faithfulness to Charter and Law

Observational findings from the review of the renewal application, supporting data, and the site visit will be presented in alignment with the 2019 Performance Framework benchmarks and Indicators according to the rating scale below. A brief summary of the school's strengths will precede the benchmark analysis. Each benchmark will be rated; and the report narrative will provide evidence-based information relative to each indicator.

Level	Description
Meets	The school generally meets or exceeds the performance benchmark; few concerns are noted. May be a potential exemplar, if noted.
Approaches	The school does not meet the performance benchmark; a number of concerns are noted.
Falls Far Below	The school falls far below the performance benchmark; significant concerns are noted.

For the site visit conducted from November 4 - 5, 2021 at NYCMCS, see the following Performance Framework benchmark ratings and narrative.

## New York State Education Department 2019 Charter School Performance Framework Rating<sup>3</sup>

	2019 Performance Benchmark	Level
ess	<b>Benchmark 1: Student Performance:</b> The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic proficiency, trends toward proficiency, similar schools, college and career readiness, and high school graduation, if applicable. Proficiency at the elementary/middle school level shall be defined as achieving a performance level of 3 or higher on Grade 3-8 state assessments in ELA, math, and science. At the high school level, passing shall be defined as obtaining a Regents exam score of 65 or higher. Note: Due to the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the data used to formulate this rating has not been updated since the administration of the state 3-8 math and ELA Assessments in SY 2018-2019. Therefore, this rating does not reflect the efficacy of the school's academic program in SY 2019-2020 through the current academic year which is reflected in the Benchmark 2 and 3 ratings.	
Educational Success	<b>Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning:</b> School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students' well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school implements research-based practices and has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to New York State Learning Standards for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.	
	Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Student and Family Engagement: The school has systems in place to support students' social and emotional health and to provide for a positive, safe, and respectful learning environment that prepares all students for college and career. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school's academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.	Meets
10	Benchmark 4: Financial Condition: The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.	Meets
oundness	<b>Benchmark 5: Financial Management:</b> The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls and procedures, and in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.	Meets
Organizational Soundness	Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance: The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.	Meets
Organ	<b>Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity:</b> The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure, clearly delineated roles for staff, management, and board members. The school has systems and protocols that allow for the successful implementation, evaluation, and improvement of its academic program and operations.	Meets
Faithfulness to Charter & Law	Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements: The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.	Meets
	<b>Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention:</b> The school is meeting or making annual progress toward meeting the enrollment plan outlined in its charter and its enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced priced lunch program; or has demonstrated that it has made extensive good faith efforts to attract, recruit, and retain such students High schools are meeting persistence rates commensurate with the NYSED target.	
	Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance: The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.	Meets

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Charter schools authorized or renewed beginning in the 2019-2020 school year and thereafter use the <u>2019 Charter School</u> <u>Performance Framework</u>, and all other charter schools use the <u>2015 Charter School Performance Framework</u> until renewal. Refer to the appropriate framework for the applicable benchmark standards.

New York City Montessori Charter School –2021-2022 RENEWAL SITE VISIT REPORT

#### Summary of Findings

• NYCMCS is in year 10 of operation and serves students in K - Grade 5. During its current charter term, the school is rated in the following manner: meeting nine benchmarks and approaching one benchmark. A summary of those ratings is provided below.

#### • Summary of Areas of Growth and Strengths:

NYCMCS has built a strong community among its staff, families, board of trustees and community. The school serves its families in an inclusive manner and is responsive to the needs of the community. Through the school's dynamic leadership and its board, the school has many external partnerships which support their ability to serve students well, meet the needs of its families, within an inclusive culture, centered on growth.

The school's social and emotional learning curriculum is grounded in best practice and is culturally responsive to the needs of the community. The school has developed pacing guides and parental supports for morning meetings and follows the Second Step curriculum which focuses on self-awareness, social awareness, responsible decision making, self-management, relationship skills, mindfulness, and growth mindset.

#### • Summary of Areas in Need of Improvement:

The school is reliant on a scripted curriculum provided by its curriculum partner, Great Minds. While the partnership with Great Minds provides the necessary support for teachers to implement the curriculum with fidelity, using a scripted curriculum may limit the quality of instruction based on teachers' understanding of the instructional objectives that are the foundation for each lesson. It should be noted that the school is planning to decrease its reliance on scripted lesson plans as the instructional staff continues developing their mastery of the curriculum being implemented.

#### **Benchmark 1: Student Performance**

The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic proficiency, trends toward proficiency, similar schools, college and career readiness, and high school graduation, if applicable. Proficiency at the elementary/middle school level shall be defined as achieving a performance level of 3 or higher on Grade 3-8 state assessments in ELA, math, and science. At the high school level, passing shall be defined as obtaining a Regents exam score of 65 or higher.

#### Finding: Approaches

**Note:** State assessments were not administered in the 2019-2020 school year and were administered under the COVID-19 constraints during the 2020-2021 school year. As such, NYSED is limited to what results it can include from those two years in the analysis of this benchmark. The Local Assessment Plan is designed to help charter schools demonstrate academic progress and growth, the NYSED CSO is implementing a local assessment plan to collect authorizer-approved local/interim assessment data from Board of Regents-authorized schools. More details regarding this initiative can be found in the <u>NYSED</u> Local Assessment Plan memo. Local assessment data will be shared starting in the 2021-2022 school year.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 1:

Over this charter term and the 2016 -2019 charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has been consistent with an Approaches rating.

Over the period of the last charter term, this school's ELA and math proficiency rates have steadily increased and in 2018-2019 exceeded the NYC CSD 7 by +9 and +7 percentage points, respectively. However, the school lagged behind the NYS overall proficiency rates by -3 and -13 percentage points as measured by the 2018-2019 NYSTP 3-8 Assessments.

#### See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional academic information.

#### Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning

School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students' well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school implements research-based practices and has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLS) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.

#### **Finding: Meets**

<u>Element</u>	Indicators
1. Curriculum	<ul> <li>a. The school has a documented curriculum that is aligned to current New York State learning standards.</li> <li>b. The curriculum is aligned horizontally across classrooms at the same grade level and vertically between grades.</li> <li>c. The curriculum and corresponding materials are differentiated to provide opportunities for all students to master grade-level skills and concepts, including students with disabilities, English language learners/multi-lingual learners, economically disadvantaged students, and other subgroups.</li> <li>d. The curriculum is systematically reviewed and revised.</li> </ul>
2. Instruction	<ul> <li>a. The school staff has a shared understanding of high-quality instruction that supports all learners and observed instructional practices align to this understanding.</li> <li>b. Instructional delivery fosters engagement with all students.</li> <li>c. The school differentiates instruction to ensure equity and access for all students.</li> <li>d. The school provides staff with professional development opportunities that promote best practices and improves all students' success, including sub-groups.</li> </ul>
3. Assessment and Program Evaluation	<ul> <li>a. The school uses a system of formative, diagnostic, and summative assessments.</li> <li>b. The school uses qualitative and quantitative data to inform instruction and improve student outcomes.</li> <li>c. The school uses qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the academic program and modifies the program accordingly for both individual students as well as subgroups.</li> <li>d. The school uses multiple measures to assess student progress toward State learning standards.</li> </ul>
4. Supports for Diverse Learners	<ul> <li>a. The school follows the NYSED approved identification process for students with disabilities and English language learners/multi-lingual learners.</li> <li>b. The school provides supports to meet the academic needs for all students including, but not limited to: students with disabilities; English language</li> </ul>

## <u>Element</u>

## **Indicators**

learners/multi-lingual learners; and economically disadvantaged students. c. The school has systems to monitor the progress of individual students and to facilitate communication between interventionists and classroom teachers regarding the needs of individual students.

## Academic Program for Elementary School/Middle School/High School:

- ES:
  - The renewal application states that NYMMCS in the process of adapting its Montessori approach to instruction include guaranteed instruction which is defined by creating learning objectives and activities to support students' continuous academic gains.
  - The renewal application states that classroom instruction includes a variety of teaching modalities including direct instruction, small group work and individualized intervention and utilizes the Montessori approach to build independence support individualized instruction

### Academic Program for Students with Disabilities (SWDs) and English language learners (ELLs):

- SWDs:
  - The renewal application, NYCMCS addresses the needs of special education students within the regular classroom by providing two adults in every classroom, allowing students to receive services alongside their peers. All students receive differentiated targeted instruction.
  - NYCMCS's curriculum is chosen to provide differentiation according to student need and used classroom and assessment data to design intervention strategies according to its response the intervention protocols.
- ELLs:
  - The renewal application states that NYCMCS provides an English as a New Langrage (ENL) teacher to work directly with classroom teachers to integrate language learning into their lesson plans and activities.
  - ELL students receive differentiated instruction within the classroom through the support of the ENL teacher as well as through targeted instructional strategies for ELL students.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 2:

Over this charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has improved from an Approaches to a Meets. The school has transitioned to using the Great Minds curriculum for math, which incorporated the Engage NY and Eureka math curricula. Great Minds curriculum specialists analyze student achievement data and suggest improvements to the curriculum and instructional methods. Great Minds provides scripted curriculum for ELA and math. Lesson plans, which are provided by Great Minds, are annotated by teachers with adjustments to increase student engagement and document their differentiation methods.

- 1. Element: *Curriculum*:
  - Indicator a: (NYCMCS in its application for renewal describes the school's efforts to combine Montessori instruction with curriculum aligned to NYS Learning Standards (NYSLS). The school has

transitioned to using the Great Minds curriculum for math, which incorporated the Engage NY and Eureka math curricula. The school has transitioned from using the Teachers College Readers and Writers Workshop Model for English Language Arts (ELA) to the Wit and Wisdom curriculum which is also from Great Minds and aligned to the NYSLS. The science curriculum, also part of the Great Minds curriculum is called Phd Science. The school uses My World Interactive by Pearson for social studies. The school also uses Montessori Albums for Grades PreK-2, Wilsons Foundations and Raz Kids/ Headsprout, Renaissance Learning, Star Reading, Early Literacy, and Accelerated Reader.

- Indicator b: The school's application for renewal indicates that horizontal and vertical alignment of its curriculum is ensured by the publishers of the curricula that is used. During the remote site visit, the school leaders discussed their partnership with Great Minds which provides scripted curriculum for ELA and math. The company was chosen for its alignment to the Montessori constructivist approach and for the collaborative relationship they provide. Great Minds supports grade teams, which are grouped by subject, and discusses vertical and horizontal alignment during their meeting time. The renewal narrative also describes the school's use of classroom visits, formal and informal observations, grade-team and department meetings as venues for ensuring that everyone is working on pace and in the same ways to support students.
- Indicator c: In the renewal application, NYCMCS states that the curricula used by the school incorporates methods of differentiation. Staff uses Wilson's Foundations, Lexia, Success Maker and Star to help identify student need and provide individualized instruction. This data is also used to guide grouping students for targeted instructional intervention.
- Indicator d: The school's leadership team, during the remote renewal site visit described their process for reviewing and revising the curriculum during their summer professional development period. Great Minds supports the school in refining their goals and analyzing student achievement data in order to make adjustments. During this time period, teachers focus on differentiating instruction and making adjustments to their curriculum plans according to the needs of their students.
- 2. Element: *Instruction*:
  - Indicator a: The school's expectations for high-quality instruction that supports all learners is articulated in the application for renewal. The school employs whole-group instruction and small-group learning as well as independent work time. Direct instruction is implemented in a whole class format and is infused with constructivist activities. Small group instruction addresses specific learning needs of students at similar levels. Learning objectives and activities are carefully crafted to ensure success by eliminating any lapses in instructional gains. Teachers use exit tickets, compare their results across classrooms and share their most effective instructional strategies. During grade-team and subject area meetings, teachers share their lessons and best practices both vertically and horizontally.
  - Indicator b: According to school leaders who discussed student engagement during the site visit focus group, student engagement is primarily gauged by observing students in their classrooms. The school's leadership observes classrooms daily and works with teachers directly on ensuring student engagement. Lesson plans, which are provided by Great Minds, are annotated by teachers with adjustments to increase student engagement and document their differentiation methods. During the remote site visit, classrooms were observed through video conferencing and student engagement was noted in all classrooms. The school uses its staffing model to provide support to students who require more personalized attention in order to maintain their engagement. During the teacher focus group, teachers described their use of manipulatives in math and their use of Tik-Tok in ELA in addition to sticky notes and wondering/ noticing charts. In

math, teachers focus on students identifying a strategy to figure out a problem and being able to draw their answers.

- Indicator c: According to the renewal application, teachers are supplied with pre-made curriculum materials through Great Minds. Teachers are expected to supplement or edit their lessons in order to guarantee achievement for all students regardless of need, placement, or classification. Teachers annotate all lesson plans which are reviewed by school leaders and Great Minds consultants who provide feedback to teachers. Great Minds visits the school monthly or more frequently and works with teachers in small groups to support differentiation. Leaders, during the remote site visit conversation, described the infusion of special education techniques in order to guarantee that all students master concepts taught, regardless of classification.
- Indicator d: The school's renewal narrative describes the use of department and grade team meeting, where teachers collaborate on planning and review lesson plans and exit tickets as professional development. During the site visit school leaders described the professional development that teachers receive from the New York City Charter Center's Collaborative for Inclusive Education as well as from Columbia's Teachers College. The school has also created a Google Classroom repository for videos and recorded workshops, articles, etc., to support teachers ongoing professional development needs.

#### 3. Element: Assessment and Program Evaluation:

- Indicator a: The school's application for renewal describes the interim assessment plan for students which includes the following instruments: Fountas & Pinnell, which is given every six weeks, Wit and Wisdom, Eureka Math which are pre, mid and post assessments given three times per year, and Lexia and Star reading assessment which are given five times per year. The school has also developed an assessment tool called Beat the Testmaker (BTTM) which utilizes state exam questions and is implemented four times per year. Additionally, BTTM is an instructional period where specific test-taking strategies and navigation of content are taught and assessed specifically.
- Indicator b: The school's renewal application states that it uses these interim assessments as checks on instructional quality. Teachers and school leaders use this data to identify where students may need additional intervention. During their site visit conversation with reviewers, school leaders described teachers' use of exit tickets as one data source they use regularly to make adjustments to their instructional plans. School leaders discussed their internally designed instructional guarantee, which focuses on assessing whether students have mastered the content or skill identified in the instructional objective for each lesson. The narrative also describes the school's use of coaching conversations, and observations to gather data on instructional quality.
- Indicator c: The NYCMCS renewal application asserts that the school uses a combination of qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the effectiveness of the instructional program to ascertain whether changes need to be made to increase student achievement. According to school leaders, the school's formative and summative assessments and data from BTTM assists the school in evaluating the effectiveness of the academic program and in determining necessary modifications. Great Minds curriculum specialists also analyze student achievement data and suggest improvements to the curriculum and instructional methods. The renewal narrative also describes the school's use of survey data to gather and analyze the school's culture and climate, special education services, operations, as well as family involvement. The renewal application states that the school's ELA proficiency according to the most recent BTTM assessment, a schooldeveloped tool which uses publicly available state exam test questions, demonstrates an overall schoolwide proficiency score of 51 percent with third graders at 58 percent proficiency.

• Indicator d: According to school leaders, the school tracks student achievement data through a master spreadsheet which includes various assessments tracked by classroom teachers. Data is analyzed by grade level and schoolwide. Teachers also track data from exit tickets in their grade team meetings in order to measure students' progress towards state learning standards.

### 4. Element: Supports for Diverse Learners:

- Indicator a: In the renewal application narrative, the school states that the number of SWDs, ELLs, and those who are economically disadvantaged (ED)has increased over the charter term. During the site visit, the school's leadership team described the way they conduct universal screenings at the beginning of each year through the Lexia assessment. Based on literacy needs identified, students are provided additional support. The administration surveys teachers three times a year to identify any students they are concerned about or those who are not making expected progress. Students with disabilities are tracked by the special education team to ensure that they receive all mandated services mandated in their IEP's. Potential ELL students are identified through the home language survey and interviews with families that are conducted during the enrollment process.
- Indicator b: According to the renewal application, the school supports SWD, ELL and ED students through its co-teaching program which provides at least two adults in every classroom. ELL students are provided support each week in line with the NYCDOE requirements. According to school leaders, depending on proficiency levels, ELL students received push-in and integrated instruction in addition to pull-out targeted instruction in small groups. The renewal narrative describes the way that the English as a new language (ENL) teacher provides support individually or in small groups and works with teachers to integrate language standards and differentiation for ELL students into lessons. The school provides all manded services to SWD students and uses the response to intervention program (RTI) as needed. The school employs one full time guidance counselor and has acquired a special education teacher support services (SETSS) teacher from the NYC DOE. All ED students and any students performing below grade level are placed in an RTI program for a minimum of eight weeks, at which point progress is assessed and subsequent plan is developed. During the pandemic, all students who were identified as needing additional support through the RTI program remained with those supports through the remainder of the year.
- Indicator c: As articulated in the school's renewal application, teachers monitor student progress by recording exit ticket data every day. Each week teachers update their math and ELA data tracker which is reviewed by the principal and the assistant principal of curriculum and instruction (APCI). Grade-team leaders share feedback with teachers at grade-team meetings and adjustments to lesson planning, instruction and curricular resources are made as needed. Special education teachers monitor progress towards IEP goals every four to six weeks through the school's IEP goal progress monitoring tool. Teachers meet with the APCI to discuss struggling students and reflect on progress of SWD one to three times per month. All special services providers communicate weekly via email, in-person check-ins, and at weekly meetings as well as through updating progress reports through the school's use of a shared Google Folder. In conversation with special education teachers during their IEP goals. Student assessment data is examined six times per year, using specific assessments as described in students' IEP's. Next steps which can include modification to students RTI supports are determined based on assessment results.

#### Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Student and Family Engagement

The school has systems in place to support students' social and emotional health and to provide for a positive, safe, and respectful learning environment that prepares all students for college and career. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school's academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.

#### Finding: Meets

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
	Magguras of Cultura	a. The school has processes and procedures in place to address chronic absenteeism for all students and sub-groups such that all students are fully engaged within the school community and have access to the educational program. Given the increased autonomy to engage students, chronic absenteeism rates are expected to be equal to or less than those of the district of location. In New York City, the district of location is the community school district. Charter schools that have a mission or key design element to serve students in a particular school district will also be compared to that school district. In addition, charter schools with more than 40% of enrolled students residing in districts other than the district of location, or the school district they are mandated to serve, will also be compared to the reside. <sup>4</sup>
1.	Measures of Culture, Climate, and Student Engagement	b. The school has processes and procedures in place to address out of school suspension rates for all students and sub-groups such that all students are fully engaged within the school community and have access to the educational program. Given the increased autonomy to engage students, out of school suspension rates are expected to be equal to or less than those of the district of location. In New York City, the district of location is the community school district. Charter schools that have a mission or key design element to serve students in a particular school district will also be compared to that school district. In addition, charter schools with more than 40% of enrolled students residing in districts other than the district of location, or the school district they are mandated to serve, will also be compared to that next highest district where students reside. <sup>5</sup>
		school climate and culture.
2.	Behavior Management and Safety	a. The school has a clear approach to behavioral management, including a written discipline policy that is applicable to all students, includes a policy that addresses

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See <u>https://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/P-</u>

 $<sup>\</sup>underline{12\%20New\%20York\%20State\%20Safe\%20Schools\%20Task\%20Force\%20Recommendations\%20Status\%20Update\%20.pdf.$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Student Suspension rate is determined by dividing the number of students who were suspended from school (not including in-school suspensions) for one full day or longer anytime during the school year by the Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) day enrollments for that school year. A student is counted only once, regardless of whether the student was suspended one or more times during the school year. Data Source: L2RPT Report SIRS-351: Student Attendance Summary Report - http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/level2reports/documents/SIRS\_351-360-361-370AttdnceAbsenceandDayCalRprtGuiderev3.6.18.pdf. New York City Montessori Charter School –2021-2022 RENEWAL SITE VISIT REPORT

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
		a school's stance toward in and out of school suspensions, and is implemented throughout the school by all school staff with fidelity.
		b. The school uses a tiered approach to behavioral interventions that support student social-emotional development.
		c. The school appears safe and all school constituents are able to articulate how the school community maintains a safe environment.
		d. The school has systems in place to ensure that the environment is free from bullying, harassment, and discrimination in accordance with the Dignity for All Students Act (DASA). The school has a DASA Coordinator that staff can identify.
		e. Classroom environments are conducive to learning and generally free from disruption.
<ul> <li>the school community maintains a safe environmed. The school has systems in place to ensure the bullying, harassment, and discrimination in accost Students Act (DASA). The school has a DASA Coole. Classroom environments are conducive to lead disruption.</li> <li>a. The school communicates with families in the students' strengths, progress, and needs and encommunity.</li> <li>b. The school uses multiple methods of family enwith all parents, in their preferred language, reglanguage ability of their children.</li> <li>c. The school assesses family satisfaction using feedback sessions, community forums, or participation.</li> <li>d. The school has a systematic and transparent or community concerns.</li> <li>e. The school shares NYSED school report card dates school community to promote transparency and f. The school has systems, programs, and curris social-emotional and mental health needs of all stores of the section.</li> </ul>	a. The school communicates with families in their preferred language to discuss students' strengths, progress, and needs and engages them as part of the school community.	
		b. The school uses multiple methods of family engagement for all communication with all parents, in their preferred language, regardless of the disability status or language ability of their children.
3.		c. The school assesses family satisfaction using strategies such as surveys, feedback sessions, community forums, or participation logs, and considers results when making schoolwide decisions.
		d. The school has a systematic and transparent process for responding to family or community concerns.
		e. The school shares NYSED school report card data with parents and the broader school community to promote transparency and accountability.
		f. The school shares its New York State exam participation rate compared to the district of location.
		a. The school has systems, programs, and curriculum in place to support the social-emotional and mental health needs of all students.
		b. School leaders collect and use data to track the social-emotional needs of all students, including students in subgroups.
4.	Social-Emotional and Mental Health	c. School leaders collect and use data regarding the impact of programs designed to support the social and emotional health of all students.
	Supports	d. The school provides staff with professional development opportunities to support the social-emotional and mental health of students in a culturally responsive manner.
		e. The school has processes and procedures in place to address the learning and social-emotional needs of McKinney-Vento eligible students such that all students are fully engaged within the school community and have access to the

educational program. The school has a McKinney-Vento Coordinator that staff can identify.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 3:

Over this and the last charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has been consistent as a Meets.

#### 1. Element: Measures of Culture, Climate, and Student Engagement:

- Indicator a: During the site visit focus group with school leadership, leaders described their system for monitoring absentee students through weekly attendance checks. The members of the school's culture team, the assistant principal and school's counselor make calls to students' homes and schedule appointments to meet to discuss absences and chronic lateness. The school staff works with families to understand their needs and situations in order to support improved attendance while maintaining a positive relationship with families.
- Indicator b: School leaders, during the site visit, discussed the school's approach to student discipline as restorative and preventative. The school favors support for students with challenging behaviors rather than behavioral punishments such as suspension. At the time of the site visit, there has been one student suspension during the current school year. The school uses morning meeting activities to build connections between students and families and the school. The school's social emotional learning practices are trauma informed and the school uses the restorative practices which includes a peace corner for students to deescalate their behavior on their own. School leaders observe student behavior and meet with students as needed, including over the summer. During the school's remote learning period, the school-maintained connections with families through online chat and video. Special education teachers, during their remote site visit focus group, discussed the way they track student behavior in order to assess whether students need more, different, or less support. The goal is to support students in developing replacement behaviors for unwanted behaviors. When needed, the school will develop a behavior intervention plan (BIP) so that teachers and parents work as a team in order to improve behavior and ultimately decrease behavioral supports so the student can function independently.
- Indicator c: During the site visit, school leaders discussed their process measuring and evaluating school climate and culture. School leaders observe student behavior across classrooms in order to determine the appropriate level of support each student receives. After a year and a half of remote learning, the school paid particular attention to students who had not experienced in person schooling before and worked to support their development of appropriate behaviors and habits. School leaders noted that older students and those that had experienced NYCMCS inschool environment were helpful as role models for appropriate behavior and self-regulation. School leaders noted their belief that culture is a reflection of the emotional state of students and teachers and discussed their support for staff members as well as students in maintaining mental health.

#### 2. Element: Behavior Management and Safety:

• Indicator a: According to the renewal application, NYCMCS's approaches discipline by promoting positive interactions and prevention. They have adopted aspects of the positive discipline model which include community meetings and shared rule setting along with developing skills of self-direction, responsibility, and mutual respect. The school has also added aspects of restorative

justice and instituted a school-wide positive behavior intervention system (PBIS) to define schoolwide procedures that foster a peaceful and respectful climate throughout the school. The school also relies on the Montessori philosophy and peace curriculum which establishes a safe and harassment-free zone. This curriculum focuses on the values of global citizenship, personal responsibility, respect for diversity and the importance of peace for the well-being of the community. Class meetings allow students to bring up issues affecting the community and develop solutions. Strategies of conflict resolution assist students in working out their interpersonal problems. The school establishes peace corners for students to cool down and reflect on their emotions and student-pairs can use the peace corner to work out their problems. Community meetings occur weekly and are focused on one of the values of the curriculum and include all teachers and students in the school as well as parents.

- Indicator b: As stated in the school's renewal application, NYCMCS uses the PBIS system which is
   a tiered approach to managing disciplinary problems and supports social and emotional
   development. NYCMCS also draws on the Montessori peace curriculum which stresses the values
   of global citizenship, personal responsibility, respect for diversity and the importance of peace for
   the well-being of human beings in all communities and activities. The school's written discipline
   policy, submitted as part of the school's renewal application documents, describes the school's
   discipline process. The assistant principal of culture, along with the school counselor and special
   education classroom support staff compose the school's culture support team (CPT), which
   monitors school-wide behavior and works with teachers and parents on social and emotional
   needs that impact learning.
- Indicator c: During the site visit, school leaders described their approach to maintaining a safe environment. School leaders observe classrooms to ensure that all students are receiving the necessary support to maintain a safe and productive environment. The school views student behavior as an indicator for the level of support they need and addresses students' needs in order to support positive behavior. Culture team staff discussed the way they communicate expectations and the way they work with students to parents and families in meetings conducted in English and Spanish. The school disseminates a culture calendar each month which described the values which are the focus of the month as well as supports for how parents can use the school's approach in their homes. During the remote site visit, observers noted all students engaged in their lessons, some receiving differentiated support services from the additional teachers in the classroom or through assistive technology and accommodations as required by their IEP's or 504 plans. Teachers, during their focus group described helping students regulate their emotions through the use of meditative techniques, drawing and reflection. In the 2021 CSO Parent survey conducted by the NYSED CSO, 93 percent of parents who responded, (representing 25 percent of parents at the school,) agreed or strongly agreed that the school provides a safe environment.
- Indicator d: According to the school's application narrative, the CST works with teachers and
  parents to address behavior as well as issues around bullying harassment and discrimination. The
  school holds anti-bullying community meetings and conducts in-class workshops to discuss and
  prevent harassment and discrimination. The school provides information on the dignity for all
  students act (DASA) and provides support materials and contact information for the school's
  designated DASA coordinator in the school's welcome packet given to parents.
- Indicator e: During the site visit, observers visited ten classrooms and noted that classroom environments were conducive to learning and free from distraction. During classroom observations, school leaders pointed out their elaborate system for cameras and microphones to allow for some students to learn remotely while the majority of students were in classrooms.

School leaders also pointed out their curated use of anchor charts, calendars, and other classroom wall hangings to support student learning while not providing a source of distraction for students. Lastly, the school's peace corner supports students' self-regulation of behavior which helps in sustaining a distraction free learning environment.

### 3. Element: Family Engagement and Communication:

- Indicator a: As articulated in the school's renewal application, NYCMCS communicates with their families through mailings, classroom communication and homework folders. Teachers communicate with families through Google Classroom, Google Meet and Google Hangouts which can be easily downloaded on mobile devices. All communication is made available in the recipient's home language and conducted through their preferred method of communication. The school communicates student strengths and needs through progress reports which are sent home in the student's communication folders as well as report cards which are delivered during parent teacher conferences. During the remote site visit focus group, the school provided a translator to ensure that Spanish speaking families were able to participate. Spanish translation was provided so that families understood what others were saying in addition to having their input translated to reviewers. School leaders, during their focus group described their practice of conducting simultaneous workshops when there were more than a few Spanish speakers in order to ensure that they receive the same level of detail than their English-speaking counterparts.
- Indicator b: As stated in the school's renewal application the school communicates with parents in the recipient's home language and conducted through their preferred method of communication. The school also uses an automated contact program which can contact parents via text message, voice message and email. During the remote site visit, school leaders discussed additional methods of family engagement which include monthly workshops for parents on topic such as school culture and support for remote instruction. Staff meet with parents during student arrival and dismissal and are available for video or phone conversation through classroom links that are provided to parents. The school also conducts book fairs and ensures that all parents and families can participate. During the remote site visit parent focus group, participants agreed that the school was effective in establishing and maintaining communication with parents and families. Parents were extremely appreciative of the support they received during remote learning, grateful for the assistance with technology and with the regular outreach from school staff.
- Indicator c: According to the school's renewal application, the school's family association meets with parents every other month to discuss school activities. During these meetings parents can voice any concerns that they may have, either verbally, on comment cards or through email. On alternating months, the family association meets with the school leader to discuss plans for upcoming events or raise any concerns from parents. Meetings are held in both mornings and afternoons to accommodate parent schedules and translation is provided for families who require it. The school implements three surveys each school year, one from the board of trustees, regarding the principal's performance and two addressing school culture, climate, and academic performance. This data is synthesized and used to support decisions that are made in both short term and long-term planning. In the CSO 2021 Parent survey, 93 percent of parents who responded to the survey agreed or strongly agreed that they receive regular and timely information on their child's progress in their preferred language.
- Indicator d: According to the school's application for renewal, the school has a systemic approach to addressing family's or community concerns. When concerns arise from parents or community members, their complaints are addressed by the AP of Operations will attempt to resolve any

issues of miscommunication. If necessary, the principal will meet with the complainant. Concerns can be addressed in the following three ways: resolution without contacting the principal; resolution of the issue and follow-up by contacting the complainant and resolution of the issue and communication to the entire school community. Parents who attended the remote focus group noted the school's attention to family concerns during remote instruction and were satisfied with the safety procedures instituted when students resumed face to face instruction.

- Indicator e: According to the school's application narrative, NYCMCS holds a variety of meetings to inform parents about student achievement. The school holds a family orientation, conducted each year, in which the school shares the previous year's state testing results. The school also holds a back- to- school night, conducted early in the year, where the school communicates the school's most recent test scores with all parents. A curriculum night is held to inform parents of the results of the latest diagnostic results and then there are two events that that are focused on NWEA MAP assessment data.
- Indicator f: At the remote site visit focus group, school leaders discussed the way they share information on participation rate for their exams. During the school's curriculum nights and open school events, data is regularly shared with parents. This data includes comparisons to the district and includes the participation rate on students who take state exams when given.

#### 4. Element: Social-Emotional and Mental Health Supports:

- Indicator a: According to the school's renewal application, NYCMCS has created a robust model for addressing their students' emotional needs. The school uses the responsive classroom program as its behavior management system in all classrooms. Staff members have attended responsive classroom training and the school utilizes its morning mornings, in addition to the Montessori peace curriculum to address the core competencies found in all social emotional learning programs. In addition to this support the school also uses the second step program which helps students develop self-regulation skills, understanding, respect empathy and problem solving which reinforces the use of emotional management skills. The skills taught in the program are in alignment with academic content standards including, civics life skills and other subject areas.
- Indicator b: According to the school's renewal application, NYCMCS relies on its teachers to support a comprehensive social- emotional learning environment. Data on student behavior is entered in PowerSchool, the school's student information system. The AP of school culture conducts regular walk-throughs of the school and notes the behavioral support requests that are made each day. The AP uses this data to make informed decisions and recommendations in addition to identifying teachers who may need additional coaching. Additional data is also captured by RTI teachers, classroom teachers, and related service providers. All of these data points assist the principal and the school leadership team in overseeing the interventions that are taking place and ensuring students' needs are met.
- Indicator c: The school describes their approach to tracking social-emotional data in its application for renewal. Data is collected daily through regular classroom walkthroughs that gauge student engagement and classroom culture, lesson accommodations and modifications, the percentage of students engaged in the lesson, as well as anecdotal feedback from students to their counselors. School leaders also collect data on the comfort of students in their learning environment and parent feedback about behavior at home. The school reports that since the introduction of the second step curriculum and morning meetings, there has been a decrease in level one and level two behaviors.

- Indicator d: The renewal application states that the school's approach to professional development regarding social and emotional learning and mental health that is culturally responsive, is to engage academic professional development as well as to collaborate with its teaching staff. The school leverages the expertise in the teaching staff by having teachers of high performing classrooms lead professional development for their peers. In addition, the school leadership team meets with teachers regularly to discuss observations of behavior and trends that are observed in the school's classrooms as well as parent-reported behavior of students in their homes. When reflecting on behaviors, staff works to assess their own behavior and possible implicit biases, while creating positive narratives of student attributes as opposed to viewing student behavior through a deficit lens. The staff regularly brainstorms adaptations and makes plans to ensure that all students' cultures are reflected and valued in its next steps.
- Indicator e: According to the school's renewal application, the NYCMCS has processes and procedures in place to address the learning and social emotional needs of McKinney- Vento eligible students. Those students are supported by technology that is supplied by the school, if needed. All classroom teachers post all assignments and announcements to Google Classroom which allows students continuous access to information. All curricula have a digital component which includes videotaped teacher instruction for ELA and math lessons. McKinney-Vento students are tracked by the assistant principal of operations who receives information from classroom teachers on students who may approach being eligible for this designation.

#### **Benchmark 4: Financial Condition**

The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.

#### Finding: Meets

Over the charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark moved from a Falls Far Below on the 2018-2019 renewal report to a Meets. At that time the school appeared to be in poor financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements. The school now appears to be in good financial condition.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 4:

See the school's fiscal dashboard attached to the end of this report (Charter School Fiscal Accountability Summary). The fiscal dashboard provides detailed information regarding the school's compliance with Benchmark 4 of the Charter School Performance Framework. Unless otherwise indicated, financial data is derived from the school's annual independently audited financial statements which can be found on the NYSED website at <a href="http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/csdirectory/CSLaunchPage.html">http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/csdirectory/CSLaunchPage.html</a>.

- Financial Composite Score
- Working Capital
- Debt to Asset
- Cash Position
- Total Margin

#### **Financial Condition**

New York City Montessori Charter School appears to be in good financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements.

#### **Overall Financial Outlook**

A financial composite score is an overall measure of financial health based on a weighting of primary reserves, equity, and net income. A charter school with a score between 1.5 and 3.0 is generally considered to be in good financial health. New York City Montessori Charter School's 2020-2021 composite score is 2.10.

2016-2017 to 2020-2021			
Year	Composite Score		
2016-2017	0.17		
2017-2018	1.50		
2018-2019	2.49		
2019-2020	2.67		
2020-2021	2.10		

**Composite Scores** 

#### **Benchmark 5: Financial Management**

The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls, and procedures, and in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.

#### Finding: Meets

Over this and the last charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has been consistent as a Meets.

Renewal is based on evidence that the following indicators are generally present:

- 1. The school has financial professionals assigned to manage school finances.
- 2. The school has an accurate and functional accounting system that includes monthly budgets.
- 3. The school sets budget objectives and regularly analyzes its budget, including detailed assumptions within the budget, in relation to those objectives.
- 4. The school has allocated budget surpluses in a manner that is fiscally sound and directly attends to the social and academic needs of the students attending the school.
- 5. The school has and follows a written set of fiscal policies.
- 6. The school has complied with State and federal financial reporting requirements.
- 7. The school has and is maintaining appropriate internal controls and procedures.
- 8. The school has procedures in place to ensure that programmatic and independent fiscal audits occur at least once annually, with such audits being comparable in scope to those required of other public schools. Audits will be undertaken by auditing firms with experience working with New York State charter schools and are peer reviewed.
- 9. The school follows generally accepted accounting principles as evidenced by independent financial audits with an unqualified audit opinion, a limited number of findings that are quickly corrected, and the absence of a going concern disclosure.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 5:

NYSED CSO reviewed New York City Montessori Charter School's 2020-2021 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

#### Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance

The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.

#### Finding: Meets

<u>Element</u>

<u>Indicators</u>

1.		a. The board utilizes an annual written performance-based evaluation process for evaluating school leadership, itself, and providers.
		b. The board recruits and selects board members with a diverse set of skills and expertise that meet the needs of the school and represent the community in which the school serves.
	management, comprehensive service provider(s), if applicable	c. The board demonstrates active oversight of the charter school's management, comprehensive service provider(s), if applicable, fiscal operations, and progress toward meeting academic and other school goals through written evaluation processes.
	Board Oversight and Governance	d. The board engages in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting priorities and goals that are aligned with the school's mission and charter.
		e. The board regularly updates school policies when needed and receives NYSED approval prior to applicable policy implementation.
		f. The board engages in ongoing professional development.
		g. The board demonstrates full awareness of its governance role, its legal obligations to the school and stakeholders, and requirements of the school's charter.
		h. The board is familiar with NYSED Charter School Performance Framework standards and has a plan to ensure that the school meets these standards.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 6:

Over this and the last charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has been consistent as a Meets.

- 1. Element: Board Oversight and Governance:
  - Indicator a: According to the school's renewal application, each board member completes an evaluation of the board annually. This information is compiled and reviewed by the board to determine its strengths, weaknesses and to develop more effective methods of operation when needed. In its evaluation of the school the board of trustees (BoT) uses the surveys conducted by

the NYSED each year as well as information revealed in the annual evaluation of the principal. The BoT monitors the progress of various aspects of the school on a continuous basis through its committees. The BoT monitors the principal's performance through its data dashboard which provides specific data points that are monitored on a monthly basis. Schoolwide goals are given to the principal annually. The education committee discusses academic priorities and strategies for implementation with the with the principal. Building and grounds committee and the finance committee discuss their goals and data points respective to their oversight. Goals are compiled through discussions of the full BoT and adopted for sharing with the principal who has input into the goals. The education committee starts the process by preparing a draft evaluation that includes data from the surveys of instructional staff, administrative staff, and the family association. Evaluation criteria include curriculum development and implementation, supervision, professional development, management of school culture, financial oversight, and community outreach. Each board member participates in the annual principal evaluation process. The information is examined, and final judgements are summarized and used to establish goals and objectives as well as financial strategies with respect to budgeting for the upcoming year. The BoT makes the ultimate decision as to whether the principal will continue and recommends strategies for improvement. The board chair meets with the principal to review the final evaluation. During the board's focus group conversation, board members noted their frequent communication with the principal, the lack of any formal complaints received by the board in addition to reiterating the evaluation process.

- Indicator b: In the school's renewal application, the Board of Trustees' approach to board membership is described. The BoT continually recruits new members as it assesses its expertise, knowledge, skills, experience, and demographics to pinpoint its strengths and gaps in expertise or representation. The BoT's goal is for members to reflect a diverse set of experiences and expertise, including individuals with backgrounds in education, finance, operations, legal, marketing, and real estate, as well as representation from the South Bronx Overall Economic Development Corporation and other community-based organization. The board solicits referrals from board members and others in its networks. During this charter term, new board members with expertise in areas of early childhood education, real estate development, law, and community development have been added. The composition of the board has changed over this charter term due to board members, one of which is a founding board member and committee chair. According to the board roster submitted as part of the renewal documents six members have joined the board and four members have left the board over the charter term.
- Indicator c: As described in the school's renewal application, the BoT demonstrates active oversight of the charter school's management through its committees. The BoT reviews recommendations from its committees in order to make decisions related to the management of the school. Overall school management is overseen by the education committee, finance committee, and building and grounds committee. Fiscal operations are reviewed by the finance committee and academic goals are overseen by the academic committee. During this charter term, the board has embarked on initiatives designed to significantly bolster the school's education and supervision of teachers as well as the professional development of teachers and staff. Education committee members offer ideas for professional development and identify higher educational institutions from which the school could partner to support the principal's efforts and closely monitors the school's metrics to assess and measure student achievement.

- **Indicator d:** According to the school's renewal application the BoT engages in strategic planning through the work of its committees. The BoT has the following committees: education, finance, executive and buildings and grounds. The board sets yearly goals at each annual meeting in June. Progress towards these goals is reviewed monthly by respective board committees. The board establishes a schedule for committee work to make sure that all work is paced to ensure continuous improvement. Recently, the board worked with the school-based team and a real estate firm to consider the feasibility of relocation from its current building. The BoT developed a market analysis and reviewed facilities and began negotiations with the school's current landlord in the hopes of attaining a more advantageous lease structure. The finance committee and the building and grounds committee collaborated to identify potential risks, needs of the school, and negotiation points in order to chart a clear plan for the future of the school. Also, during this charter term, the finance committee worked with the principal to establish recommendations regarding salaries and best employee practices while maintaining a balanced budget. During the pandemic the board worked closely with principal and the school-based team to ensure that every available resource was made available to the school and ensured that the school had the financial support to purchase personal protective equipment and the necessary furniture and technology so that learning could continue uninterrupted. At the remote site visit panel discussion with board members, the BoT discussed its pride that NYCMCS was able to navigate the pandemic, which included fluctuations in enrollment, with no issues related to their facility and the school was able to maintain financial stability despite the additional COVID-19 pandemic related expenses the school experienced. Board members also described their strategic planning process, how they plan to maintain their commitment to the Montessori philosophy while making changes to their key design elements in order to serve their students and meet their accountability goals.
- Indicator e: In the renewal application, the BoT's practice of reviewing and updating school policies is described. The school has established bylaws, conflict of interest policy, code of ethics, open meeting laws, financial policies and procedures, a personnel manual, and family association handbook. The BoT reviews these documents annually during May and June in preparation for recommended changes at the school's annual meeting which is held in June. Financial policies and procedures document are sent to Charter School Business Management for recommendations that are forwarded to the Finance Committee for review. The personnel manual is sent to school's payroll benefits company and school management reviews the family association handbook. Board committees and individual members can offer recommendations for revision at any board meeting though the BoT generally updates all policies and manuals at its annual meeting. The school has not sent CSO any policies for review; but did speak to the CSO during the 2021-2022 school year about possible changes to the personnel policies and evaluation system once the new executive director had the opportunity to review what was in place.
- Indicator f: In the school's application for renewal, the process of the board's professional development is described. Board members are in contact with the NYC Charter School Center and periodically reviews its website to obtain appropriate new information regarding legal obligations. Board members also take advantage of opportunities to participate in webinars and training courses that offer professional development opportunities to stay up-to-date with the knowledge required to provide the necessary governance to the school. Each board member attends a mandatory annual training seminar on their obligations and responsibilities, which is provided by an outside law firm in the fall of each year. Attorneys serving as trustees also periodically conduct research on behalf of the board to assure that the board stays current with its legal obligations.
- Indicator g: In the school's renewal application the BoT discusses its legal obligations to the school and its stakeholders, and the requirements of the school's charter. The NYCMCS BoT works to

avoid conflicts of interests where possible through the inclusion of third-party advisors. The BoT networks with experts in Montessori education, charter schools, educational, legal, and financial fields in order to ensure that the school is guided by best practices. The BoT has traditionally conducted all BoT monthly meetings on-site. Prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, press releases were sent to area papers, posted on the school's website and in high traffic areas inside and outside of the school. At each meeting, the public is invited to make comments at the opening of each meeting. Parents, students, and community members are all invited to attend. During the pandemic, all meetings have been virtual. The board meeting schedule continues to be posted online along with information to log into the virtual meeting each month. Monthly press releases continue to be sent out to news outlets with directions for logging into the monthly meetings. The BoT also works closely with the family association and invites parents to participate in providing feedback at the classroom level, school-wide level and anonymously through the family association surveys. Staff are welcome at monthly meetings and the BoT also requests feedback on teacher satisfaction and school leadership performance through direct communication with staff or through survey results.

 Indicator h: During the board's focus group conversation during the remote site visit, the board sited the effectiveness of the school's leadership in focusing on NYSED's charter school performance framework and providing data to the board through its monthly dashboard and data presented to the education committee. The board has submitted its strategic goals for the current school year, which includes goals for academic achievement, responsive education programming and environment, responsible governance and management, financial stability and internal controls and the sustaining of a strong culture and supportive relationships. Each goal identifies performance targets and goals taken from the performance framework.

## Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity

The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure, clearly delineated roles for staff, management, and board members. The school has systems and protocols that allow for the successful implementation, evaluation, and improvement of its academic program and operations.

#### **Finding: Meets**

<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
	a. The school has an effective school leadership team that communicates a clearly defined mission and set of goals to staff and the school community.
1. School	b. The school has clear and well-established communication systems and decision-making processes in place to ensure effective communication across the school.
Leadership	c. The school successfully recruits, hires, and retains key personnel that meets the needs of all students and subgroups, and makes decisions – when warranted – to remove ineffective staff members.
	d. School leadership is familiar with NYSED Charter School Performance Framework standards and has a plan to ensure that the school meets these standards.
	a. Roles and responsibilities for leaders, staff, management, and the board of trustees are clearly defined and adhered to.
	b. The school ensures that staff has the requisite skills, expertise, and professional development necessary to meet all students' needs, including students in subgroups.
2. Professional	c. The school is fully staffed with personnel who are able to meet all operational needs, including finance, human resources, and communications.
Climate	d. The school has established procedures for effective collaboration among teachers.
	e. The school has systems to monitor and maintain organizational and instructional quality through a formal evaluation process for teacher and other staff.
	f. The school has mechanisms to solicit teacher and staff feedback and to gauge their satisfaction.
3. Contractual Relationships (if applicable)	a. Changes in the school's charter management or comprehensive service provider contract comply with required charter amendment procedures.

#### Element

**Indicators** 

b. The school monitors the efficacy of contracted service providers or partners and has established an effective working relationship.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 7:

Over this and the last charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has been consistent as a Meets.

- 1. Element: School Leadership:
  - Indicator a: As described in the school's application for renewal, the school is led by an extended leadership team that is headed by the principal and includes the APCI, APO, APSC, and the director of HR and finance. The leadership team works closely with their departmental staff and establishes staff commitment and by-in during their summer professional development sessions. The leadership is intentional in establishing the school's learning and continuous improvement culture by creating opportunities for staff to collaborate by including their input in policies and procedures and the execution of tasks. Staff feels ownership of what is happening in the school at all times. During the school year each leader works directly with their department on established goals. Leaders solicit feedback from staff at the close of each meeting or professional development session. All meetings follow a strengths-based approach which creates buy-in from the staff and an environment of constructive criticism.
  - Indicator b: In the application for renewal, the school describes the methods of communication they have established. The school communicates with staff and families through in person conversations phone calls, emails, mailings, and notices that are posted in the entrances to the school. The school's sends its communications and notices to parents who speak languages other than English in the individual's preferred language or communication style. Translation services are made available during school-wide performances or community meetings in order to facilitate dialogue. The school ensures that all meetings are translated into languages in which the parents speak when soliciting feedback anonymous surveys via Google forms or SurveyMonkey. During the remote visit focus groups with school leaders and parents, both groups described the school's translation practices as being very inclusive.
  - Indicator c: As articulated in the school's renewal application, NYCMCS recruits staff members
    from its existing networks in addition to online postings, job fairs, referrals from current staff, and
    contacting local colleges and universities. The school's hiring process includes an initial resume
    screening, a phone screening, an interview with the school leadership team followed by a
    performance task or demo lesson, a reference check and finally the school tour and final meetings
    with the school leader. During the remote site visit school leadership team conversation, school
    leaders discussed the importance of diversity and representation and its commitment to
    inclusionary practices. School leadership provide opportunities and support to their staff to
    improve their performance. Staff members who are not meeting expectations receive verbal and
    written communication and are placed on a professional improvement plan. When employees do
    not improve after two cycles of an improvement plan, they are recommended for termination or
    non-renewal.
  - Indicator d: During conversations with school leadership and board members during the remote site visit, the school's leadership demonstrated its familiarity and awareness of the New York State education department charter school performance framework standards and the way they

monitor their efforts in meeting these standards. The school incorporates these standards as part of their annual goal setting process and the monthly dashboard tracks their progress towards their goals.

#### 2. Element: Professional Climate:

- Indicator a: According to the school's renewal application, the roles of the school's leadership team members are clearly articulated. Each assistant principal is responsible for the workings of their team. The school has also submitted an organizational chart which outlines the reporting and accountability structure. During the remote site visit focus group, teachers, and parents both articulated their understanding of the organization chart and the leaders' roles. Both staff members and parents remarked on the helpfulness of the staff and administration and their commitment to making sure that everyone's needs are addressed.
- Indicator b: The school's renewal application outlines the way it ensures that staff members have the requisite skills, expertise, and professional development necessary to meet all students' needs. The school provides weekly coaching sessions with its teaching staff with the principal or the assistant principal of curriculum and instruction and has biweekly special education meetings with instructional leaders to focus on instructional methods to serve SWD. During the remote site visit school, leadership described their daily visits to classrooms which can lead to providing teachers with informal feedback and demonstrations of instructional techniques. During the renewal site visit conversation, teachers commented on the hands on and supportive approach of the administration in helping them master techniques for instruction and student engagement.
- Indicator c: According to school leaders with whom we spoke during the remote site visit there are currently six vacancies on the staff. All current staff members are highly qualified and meet the instructional, operational, finance, human resources and communication needs of the school. Parents who spoke to reviewers during the remote site visit indicated that the level of communication between the school and parents was frequent and helpful.
- Indicator d: According to the school's renewal application, the school has a commitment to teacher collaboration. During the school's three-week professional development sessions prior to the arrival of students, veteran teachers provide professional development in reading, Wilson's Fundations, Montessori education and Montessori philosophy. During the school year, teachers meet in subject teams to ensure a smooth transition of students from one grade to the next. Teachers also work in grade teams to plan and share lessons. Teachers are given common planning time to affectively collaborate. In addition, teachers of ELL meet with ENL teachers and attend professional development sessions together to support their students. Special education teachers likewise meet with grade team leaders to support SWD in their classrooms. The school also has a partnership with Great Minds and works very closely with their curriculum developers who support intensive professional development for all teachers. During the remote site visit focus group with teachers, staff members discussed the team atmosphere of the school and how the administration is always ready to support their development through direct coaching or feedback. Administrators are known to demonstrate techniques for teachers in their classrooms which teachers found extremely supportive and helpful.
- Indicator e: According to the school's renewal application, staff members are evaluated through a formal process that is conducted at least twice during each school year. Teachers receive two formal observations and school leaders receive a mid-year and end-of-year review. The teacher evaluation system contains three parts: an initial lesson plan review, a pre-observation meeting and a post-observation debrief. Teachers receive a written formal observation description which includes actionable next steps. School leaders are evaluated using the NYCMCS management

standards and the school's values. The school's management standards are a specific set of characteristics that are related to the expectations for school leaders' performance. These standards include execution, problem solving, job specific knowledge, organization, interpersonal communication, organizational communication, managing others, mindset, and instruction.

- Indicator f: According to the school's renewal application teacher feedback is solicited through surveys. During the summer professional development teachers provide feedback on professional development and training sessions received each day as well as questions relating to positive school culture and school values. The results of the survey are shared with the staff the following day. During the school year the school employs the plus/delta feedback protocol to solicit feedback at meetings and at weekly staff professional development sessions. This protocol is used either in the whole group setting where the facilitator charts that feedback or individuals provide written feedback after the meeting. A plus is an area that the individual or a team would like to maintain or continue to work on, a delta is a specific area for improvement or something that they would like to see changed.
- 3. Element: *Contractual Relationships*: Not applicable.
  - Indicator a: N/A
  - Indicator b: According to school leadership and the board, they work together to evaluate the contracted service providers and have established an effective working relationship. Much of this work is done between the school leader and the board committees who report out to the entire board.

#### Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements

The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.

#### **Finding: Meets**

<u>Element</u>

Indicators

 Mission and Key Design Elements
 a. School stakeholders share a common and consistent understanding of the school's mission and key design elements outlined in the charter, including in public-facing materials.

b. The school has fully implemented the key design elements in the approved charter and in any subsequently approved revisions.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 8:

Over this and the last charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has been consistent as a Meets.

#### 1. Element: *Mission and Key Design Elements:*

- Indicator a: According to the school's application for renewal, the school's mission is: "to empower children to be critical thinkers and creative problem solvers with strong social skills so that they can succeed in their world and continue to learn in their pursuit of higher education as they prepare for careers in the 21st century." The school lists the following key design elements: differentiated instruction, continuous ongoing assessment, specially designed materials, responsive flexible classroom sizes to meet students' needs, time to achieve mastery and prepared environment. The school's website (https://nycmcs.org/educational-programs/) describes the Montessori approach and the family handbook, which is also posted on their website, describes the school's educational approach. At the BoT focus group conducted over the remote site visit, board members discussed their commitment to the Montessori educational philosophy as well as the challenges the school has faced in adapting the model to meet the needs of its students and the community in which it is located. The board acknowledged that the Montessori approach required some adjustments in order to successfully serve its students' needs and the material changes they have submitted reflect the lessons they have learned over time. The BoT affirmed their continued commitment to the philosophy of Montessori and articulated how the proposed changes to the key design elements and the proposed change in the school's name were a reflection of their commitment to the original mission and vision of the school as well as their commitment to serving the academic needs of their students and meeting the school's accountability goals.
- Indicator b: During the remote site visit focus group conversations with teachers and school leaders, school staff described their work which was aligned to one or more of the key design elements. During the remote site visit, reviewers observed each element in practice. Students were observed in class activities alongside others who were working on individualized assignments that addressed their learning and pacing needs as well as differing modalities and scaffolded supports provided by teaching

staff. Classrooms were organized with specialized areas to support student learning and anchor charts, school calendars and other visual learning supports, and reminders were posted on the wall in a curated manner. During the site visit teacher focus group, staff discussed their focus on providing hands-on activities for students to support the school's commitment to constructivist learning and their appreciation for providing additional instructional support for students regardless of students IEP status. The Montessori Philosophy could be observed in how the school and classrooms were organized and run as well as the various materials and time spent on individualized instruction. Due to COVID peer modeling was not observed.

#### Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention

The school is meeting or making annual progress toward meeting the enrollment plan outlined in its charter and its enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners,

and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced priced lunch program; or has demonstrated that it has made extensive good faith efforts to attract, recruit, and retain such students. High schools are meeting persistence rates commensurate with the NYSED target.

#### **Finding: Meets**

	<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
1.	Targets are met	a. The school maintains sufficient enrollment demand for the school to meet or come close to meeting the enrollment plan outlined in the charter.
2.	Targets are not met	<ul> <li>a. The school is making regular and significant annual progress toward meeting the targets.</li> <li>b. The school has implemented extensive recruitment strategies and program services to attract and retain students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for free and reduced priced lunch. Strategies include but are not limited to outreach to parents and families in the surrounding communities, widely publicizing the lottery for such school, efforts to academically support these students, and enrollment policy revisions, such as employing a weighted lottery or enrollment preference, to increase the proportion of enrolled students from the three priority populations.</li> <li>c. The school has implemented a systematic process for evaluating recruitment and outreach strategies and program services for each of the three categories of students, and makes strategic improvements as needed.</li> </ul>

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

Over this and the last charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has improved from an Approaches rating on the 2018-2019 renewal report to a Meets. The reasons for this improvement include targeted and specific outreach strategies to recruit and retain ELL students.

- 1. Element: Target are met:
  - Indicator a: During the current charter term, the school has consistently enrolled a comparable population of SWD and ELL students. The 2020-2021 report of only 4 percent ELLS (-19 percentage points below the district of location) is the result of a reporting error. The school self-reported to the NYSED CSO that it enrolled 26 percent of its enrollment as current ELLs, during the 2020-2021 school year. The school has steadily increased their enrollment of ED students over the charter term and in 2020-2021 the school is 4 percentage points below the NYC CSD 7. The school's overall retention rate is currently 6 percentage points below NYC CSD 7.
- 2. Element: *Targets are not met:* 
  - **Indicator a:** During the current charter term and prior to 2020-2021, the school averaged 96 percent of their contracted enrollment, however this fell to 83 percent in 2020-2021.
  - Indicator b:
    - $\circ$  To recruit SWDs:

- The school shared information on the wide range of interventions and special education services offered at the school at every community visit, school tour, and information session.
- Promotional materials also highlight the inclusive nature of the school and the personalized instructional model.
- They also maintained a strong relationship with the Committee on Special Education.

To recruit ELLs:

- The school contacted local day care centers that serve a high number of non-English speaking families. All materials shared are translated into Spanish.
- They presented to numerous local early childhood center staff and parents. The presentation included a description of the school, their educational philosophy, and programs to serve ELL students.
- Translators were brought to every presentation, and applications in multiple languages were available.
- They conducted outreach to local community-based organizations, such as Mott Haven Community Partnership and St. Jerome Church, that serve non-English speaking and shared information in several languages to facilitate referrals to their school.
- They held monthly recruitment events beginning in February 2021. Presentations were provided in English and Spanish.
- They posted signs in Spanish regarding their application process outside of their building and throughout the community, including grocery stores, churches, and libraries. They contacted local day care centers in high-need neighborhoods. They specifically targeted all daycare centers in the 10454 zip-code. Outreach included distributing brochures and notifying parents of admission and lottery instructions. They presented to numerous local early childhood center staff and parents, again targeting neighborhoods with a high-need population. The presentation included a description of the school, their educational philosophy, and programs to promote an inclusive environment.
- They also shared application instructions and invited parents to tour the school.
- Indicator c: As the school almost met this enrollment goal, they are confident that their specific strategies are effective, and will continue to focus on these efforts in the 2021-2022 school year. They will continue to assess and make any necessary adjustments to these recruitment strategies to ensure the health and safety of our staff and community members.

## See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional information.
#### Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance

The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.

#### **Finding: Meets**

Element

1. Legal Compliance

**Indicators** 

- a. The school has compiled a record of substantial compliance with applicable State and federal laws and regulations and the provisions of its charter including, but not limited to: those related to student admissions and enrollment; FOIL and Open Meetings Law; protecting the rights of students and employees; addressing complaints; financial management and oversight; governance and reporting; and health, safety, civil rights, and student assessment requirements.
- b. The school has undertaken appropriate corrective action when required, and/or as requested by the Board of Regents and/or the NYSED Charter School Office and has implemented necessary safeguards to maintain compliance with all legal requirements.
- c. The school has a plan to ensure that teachers are certified in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.
- d. The school has sought Board of Regents and/or the NYSED Charter School Office approval for material and non-material revisions.
- e. The school maintains sufficient enrollment demand for the school to meet the expectations detailed in the enrollment plan outlined in the charter and within the parameters set forth in the charter agreement.
- f. The school seeks guidance from its legal counsel when updating documents and handling issues that arise.

#### Summative Evidence for Benchmark 10:

Over this and the last charter term, the trajectory for this benchmark has been consistent as a Meets.

- Element: Legal Compliance:
  - Indicator a: The school, in its renewal application, describes their process for annually reviewing key governance documents such as the board's bylaws, conflict of interest, code of ethics, open meeting laws, financial policies and procedures, personnel manual, and the family association handbook. The school utilizes CSBM to review its financial policies and procedures and the school's benefits company to review its personnel manual. The board contacts the New York City Charter School Center to periodically review the center's website and obtain appropriate information regarding its legal obligations. Attorneys who serve as trustees also periodically conduct research on the board's behalf to ensure that the board stays current with its legal obligations. The board also uses its networks to seek out feedback to ensure any possible conflicts

New York City Montessori Charter School –2021-2022 RENEWAL SITE VISIT REPORT

of interest. Before the COVID-19 pandemic, the board conducted its monthly board meetings at the school, sending press releases to area newspapers and posting schedule on the school's website and in high traffic areas inside and around the school. Board meetings include a public comment period at the beginning of the meeting and all parents, students, and community members are invited to attend. During the COVID-19 pandemic all meetings have been virtual. This information was confirmed during the board focus group and leadership focus group.

- Indicator b: The CSO issued a Notice of Concern to the school in February 2020 for failing to enroll a comparable number of ED students (-9) in comparison to NYC CSD 7. The 2019-2020 Annual Report review does not include fingerprint clearance information for 14 staff and the school will be under corrective action for this violation. Prior to this action, the school has not been under corrective action during this charter term. For the 2020-2021 school year, two faculty/staff were reported without fingerprint clearance.
- Indicator c: During the site visit the school submitted its strategic goals for this 2021-2022 school year. The school commits to 100 percent of its head teachers, special education coordinators and gym teachers having the appropriate teaching certification, and the school will have no more than five uncertified lead teachers. The school's 2020-2021 Annual Report indicates that all teaching staff meet teacher certification requirements to comply with NYS Education Law, which meets a strategic goal of the school.
- Indicator d: The school has not sought revisions during the first two years of the current charter term. It has submitted material revision requests to its charter with this application for renewal. According to the material change cover letter included in the renewal application, the school is seeking a change to its name and changes to two key design elements: The school is requesting to change the key design element "mixed age grouping" to "responsive flexible classroom sizes to meet standards." The application describes the school's intention to strategically place students in classroom settings that meet their needs regardless of IEP classification. An additional change to the school's key design elements refers to the original key design element "specially designed materials." The school wishes to edit the description of the key design element to include the necessary flexibility to meet state expectations while being guided by the Montessori philosophy. Lastly, the school requested to just change its name not the school's educational program from the New York City Montessori Charter School to "Choice Charter School." This name change is requested to address the concern of currently enrolled families and, based on conversations with families during recruitment events who are interested in the school but aren't sufficiently informed to understand what a Montessori education entails. The school has worked with staff and the family association to gather anecdotal information and hear their concerns. The school believes that this name change will have a stronger appeal to parents and will address the school's need to bolster their enrollment numbers in a very competitive school district.
- Indicator e: The 2020-2021 ELL enrollment for this charter school is under-represented due to a reporting error.
- Indicator f: According the school's BoT, the school seeks guidance from its legal counsel when updating documents and as issues arise.

#### **Overview**

Charter School S NEW YORK CITY MONTESSOR			BEDS Code 320700861005	2020-2021 Enrollment 243
ESEA Accountability Designation	This school is designated as a sc	chool in Good	d Standing	
(2019-2020):	under current New York State c	riteria as defined by	the Elementary and Secondary E	ducation Act.

**Charter School Information School District of Location:** NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 7 **Total Public School Enrollment of Resident** 31% **Students attending Charter Schools:** Additional School District: N/A (if applicable)\* Total Public School Enrollment of Resident **Students attending Charter Schools: Grades Served:** Elementary Address: 423 E 138TH ST BRONX NY 10454 Website: www.nycmcs.org NEW YORK CITY RIC: **NEW YORK CITY REGION - BRONX Regents Region:** Regent: ARAMINA FERRER Active Date: 7/1/2011 Authorizer: NYS BOR CEO: ABEKU HAYES **CEO Phone:** (347) 226-9094 **CEO Email:** hayes@nycmcs.org **BOT President:** MARIA KEANE **BOT President Phone:** (718) 732-7595 mkeane@paulweiss.com **BOT President Email:** Institution ID: 80000070182

2021 Survey Results	Expected Responses	Total Responses	Response Rate
Parent Survey	243	61	25%
Student Survey (Grades 9-12)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teacher Survey	-	12	-

\*An additional district may be used for comparison if a school is chartered to serve a school district other than the one in which they are located or if 40% of their students are residents of a district other than the district in which they are located.

BoR Charter School	Office Information
Regional Liaison:	Kimberly Santiago
Performance Framework:	2019
Current Term:	7/1/19-6/30/22
2017-2018	Check-in
2018-2019	Renewal
2019-2020	Check-in
2020-2021	Check-in
2021-2022	Renewal

. . . .

. .

	Benchmark Rating	Year of Rating
BM1		
BM2		
BM3		
BM4		
BM5		
BM6		
BM7		
BM8		
BM9		
BM10		

**Charter School** 

NEW YORK CITY MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL

2018-2019

	NEW YO	RK CITY MONTESSORI CS	ELA Differential	Math Differential	Science Differential	Graduation Rate Differential
Elementary School		CONCOURSE VILLAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	-31	-45	-14	
		MANHATTAN CHARTER SCHOOL	-4	0	-15	
		NYC ACADEMY FOR DISCOVERY	+7	-7	-6	
		PS 103 HECTOR FONTANEZ	+9	+8	+6	
		PS 104 BAYS WATER (THE)	+12	+1	-15	
		PS 108 SAL ABBRACCIAMENTO	-13	-23	-9	
		PS 120 CARLOS TAPIA	+10	+11	+13	
		PS 130 ABRAM STEVENS HEWITT	+20	+7	+21	
		PS 173	+2	-3	+22	
		PS 19 CURTIS SCHOOL (THE)	+11	+12	-7	
		PS 204 MORRIS HEIGHTS	-15	-20	-14	
		PS 22 GRANITEVILLE	+5	+3	-1	
		PS 257 JOHN F HYLAN	-9	-13	-13	1. A.
	+/- 5	PS 297 ABRAHAM STOCKTON	+21	+13	-17	
		PS 315	-2	-4	+4	
		PS 361 E FLATBUSH EARLY CHILDHOOD	+14	+10	+9	
		PS 48 WILLIAM WORDSWORTH	-5	-10	-2	
		PS 55 MAURE	-7	-11	-16	
		PS 56 NORWOOD HEIGHTS	-16	-17	-15	
		PS 69 JOURNEY PREP SCHOOL	-26	-31	-20	
		PS 75 MAYDA CORTIELLA	+16	+9	+4	
		PS 75 SCHOOL OF RESEARCH-DISCOVERY	+10	-6	+17	
		PS 92 ADRIAN HEGEMAN	+15	+7	+18	
		WARRING MAGNET ACAD OF SCI & TECH	+12	+7	+9	
		WEBSTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+17	+14	+10	
		Mean	+2	-4	-1	
		BRONX LITTLE SCHOOL	+7	0	+11	
		EAST HARLEM SCHOLARS ACADEMY CS II	+6	-3	+26	
		GIFFEN MEMORIAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+30	+24	+16	
		GLOBAL COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	-8	-21	-1	
		JOHN F HUGHES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+26	+7	+6	
		LEMOYNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+14	+1	+8	
		MARTIN ROAD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+27	+17	+12	
		MUSEUM SCHOOL 25	+23	+18	+7	
		NORMA ADAMS CLEMONS ACADEMY	+12	+7	0	
		NORTH ALBANY ACADEMY	+33	+31	+22	
		P J SCHUYLER ACHIEVEMENT ACADEMY	+33	+20	+21	
		PORTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+21	+17	+1	
		PS 109 SEDGWICK	+11	+10	+8	
		PS 11 HIGHBRIDGE	+18	+12	+1	
		PS 114 RYDER ELEMENTARY	-4	-3	-10	
		PS 128 AUDUBON	+5	+4	-12	
		PS 132 GARRETT A MORGAN	+7	+18	+18	

PS 139 ALEXINE A FENTY	+6	0	+6	
PS 145 BLOOMINGDALE SCHOOL (THE)	+25	+19	+29	
PS 154	-16	-16	-12	
PS 194 RAOUL WALLENBERG	+12	-1	-2	•
PS 212 LADY DEBORAH MOODY	-7	-12	-9	
7.5 PS 234	-32	-35	-20	
PS 273	-14	-10	-15	
PS 276 LOUIS MARSHALL	+12	+8	-2	
PS 277	+16	+8	+22	
PS 306	+11	+10	+20	
PS 380 JOHN WAYNE ELEMENTARY	-9	-15	-3	•
PS 397 FOSTER-LAURIE	-6	-17	-3	•
PS 54 SAMUEL C BARNES	+11	+5	-8	•
PS 57 CRESCENT	+25	+18	+15	
PS 66 SCHOOL OF HIGHER EXPECTATIONS	+12	+1	-10	
PS 7 ABRAHAM LINCOLN	+8	-1	+5	
PS 71 FOREST	+2	-15	+6	
PS 74 FUTURE LEADERS ELEMENTARY	+20	+12	+5	
PS 94 KINGS COLLEGE SCHOOL	+23	+23	+30	
SALEM HYDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+22	+20	+6	
SCHOOL 33-AUDUBON	+31	+20	+21	
SCHOOL OF SCIENCE & APPLIED LRNG	+16	+11	+10	
STANLEY MAKOWSKI EARLY CHLDHD CTR	+18	+22	+32	
STEM INSTITUTE OF MANHATTAN	+23	+16	+4	
VAILS GATE STEAM ACADEMY	+22	+15	+16	
WAVE PREPARATORY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	-21	-24	-10	
WEST RIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+19	+9	-2	
Mean	+11	+5	+6	
AMBER CHARTER SCHOOL EAST HARLEM	-25	-21	-20	
ARCHER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+15	+15	+12	
BELLEVUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+29	+25	+24	
BENJAMIN COSOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+20	+9	+14	
BRILLA COLLEGE PREP CHARTER	-17	-25	-11	
DR WEEKS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+27	+20	+18	
EAST NEW YORK ELEMENTARY-EXCELLENCE	+19	+9	+19	
FAIRMONT NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOL	+26	+21	+31	
GRANT AVENUE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+7	+2	-5	
GROWING UP GREEN CHARTER SCHOOL II	-4	-2	+1	
HEKETI COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL	+6	-8		
HORIZON-ON-THE-HUDSON MAGNET SCHOOL	+26	+17	+23	
LEARNERS AND LEADERS	0	-21	+1	•
LIGHTHOUSE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+22	+10	+11	
MORSE YOUNG MAGNET SCHOOL	+13	+18	+7	
MOUNT EDEN CHILDREN'S ACADEMY	+4	-14	-8	
NEW BRIDGES ELEMENTARY	+5	+4	+13	
PS 1 ALFRED E SMITH	-7	-17	+20	
PS 105 SEN ABRAHAM BERNSTEIN	+9	+12	+7	
PS 106 PARKCHESTER	-1	-6	-5	
PS 108 CAPT VINCENT G FOWLER	-16	-27	-17	
	-14	-18	-11	

PS 11 THOMAS DONGAN SCHOOL	-7	-21	-13	
PS 126 DR MARJORIE H DUNBAR	+8	+20	-3	
PS 129 PATRICIA LARKIN	-22	-36	-12	
PS 13 ROBERTO CLEMENTE	+4	0	-1	
PS 140 EAGLE SCHOOL (THE)	+13	+9	+7	
PS 145 ANDREW JACKSON	+16	+10	+1	
PS 147 ISSAC REMSEN	-4	-4	-20	
PS 149 DANNY KAYE	+1	-2	+3	
PS 150 CHARLES JAMES FOX	+13	+3	+10	
PS 151 MARY D CARTER	-2	-15	-18	
PS 154 HARRIET TUBMAN	+10	+11	+19	
PS 157 GROVE HILL	+7	+9	+2	
PS 159 ISAAC PITKIN	-3	-7	-5	
PS 16 WAKEFIELD	+9	+6	-10	
PS 160 WALTER FRANCIS BISHOP	+9	+7	-10	
PS 164 CAESAR RODNEY	-15	-27	-1	
	+13	+18	-6	
PS 171 PETER G VAN ALST	+13	+17	+9	
PS 175 HENRY H GARNET	+3	-3	-14	
PS 196 TEN EYCK	+1	-5	-4	
PS 197 OCEAN SCHOOL (THE)	+13	-3	-6	
PS 200 JAMES MCCUNE SMITH SCH (THE)	+10	+15	+1	
PS 202 ERNEST S JENKYNS	+14	+11	+17	
PS 205 FIORELLO LAGUARDIA	+4	0	-1	
 PS 207	+19	+18		
PS 21 PHILIP H SHERIDAN	+15	+18	+17	
PS 214 MICHAEL FRIEDSAM	+3	-5	-8	
PS 219 KENNEDY-KING	+7	+3	-12	
PS 226	+12	+14	-5	
PS 236 LANGSTON HUGHES	+6	-8	+15	
PS 245	0	-6	-5	
PS 25 BILINGUAL SCHOOL	+7	-2	0	
PS 25 EUBIE BLAKE SCHOOL	-10	-18	-2	
PS 250 GEORGE H LINDSAY	+19	0	-2	
PS 290 JUAN MOREL CAMPOS	+4	-9	+1	
PS 3 BEDFORD VILLAGE (THE)	+17	+11	+21	
PS 30 HERNANDEZ/HUGHES	+1	+13	+12	
PS 30 WILTON	+16	+20	+26	
PS 305 DR PETER RAY	+18	+17	+11	
PS 310 MARBLE HILL	+5	-3	-14	•
PS 33 TIMOTHY DWIGHT	+23	+11	+10	
PS 34 JOHN HARVARD	-3	-6	+15	
PS 345 PATROLMAN ROBERT BOLDEN	+24	+10	+14	
PS 35 FRANZ SIEGEL	+20	+11	+8	
PS 360	+9	+12	+14	
PS 375 JACKIE ROBINSON SCHOOL	+19	+12 +13	+14	•
PS 375 JACKIE ROBINSON SCHOOL PS 377 ALEJANDRINA B DE GAUTIER	+19	+13	+15	•
PS 377 ALEJANDKINA B DE GAUTIEK	+15	+22	+8	•
PS 398 WALTER WEAVER	+15	+4	-5	•
1 5 550 WALIEN WLAVEN	77	74	-5	· · · · ·

PS 44 MARCUS GARVEY	+7	+8	+13	
PS 45 CLARENCE WITHERSPOON	+15	+4	-2	
PS 46 ALBERT V MANISCALCO	+10	+12	•	
PS 46 EDWARD C BLUM	+17	+11	+4	
PS 47 JOHN RANDOLPH	+14	+10	+13	
PS 48 JOSEPH R DRAKE	+24	+19	+33	
PS 49 WILLIS AVENUE	-3	-14	-6	
PS 50 TALFOURD LAWN ELEMENTARY	-3	-13	0	
PS 536	+15	+16	+22	
PS 54 HILLSIDE	-5	-5	-2	
PS 58	+12	+8	+4	
PS 60 WOODHAVEN	-15	-34	-17	
PS 61 FRANCISCO OLLER	+11	+5	+10	
PS 63 AUTHOR'S ACADEMY	+9	+3	+5	
PS 63 OLD SOUTH	-2	-17	-11	
PS 65 ROOSEVELT ECC	+10	+4	-7	
PS 73 BRONX	+23	+15	+11	
PS 76 BENNINGTON SCHOOL (THE)	+21	+22	+2	
PS 8 ISSAC VARIAN	+12	+9	-8	
PS 83 LUIS MUNOZ RIVERA	-4	-16	-17	
PS 85 GREAT EXPECTATIONS	+20	+13	+17	
PS 88 S SILVERSTEIN LITTLE SPARROW	0	+5		
PS 90 EDNA COHEN SCHOOL	+10	0	+15	
PS 91 ALBANY AVENUE SCHOOL (THE)	-12	-8	-15	
PS 96 RICHARD RODGERS	+17	+9	-2	
PS 97 FOREST PARK	-7	-12	-8	
PS/IS 54	+12	+13	+16	
QUEENS SCHOOL FOR LDSHP-EXCELLENCE	-6	-17		
ROSALYN YALOW CHARTER SCHOOL	-15	-36	-18	
SAMARA COMMUNITY SCHOOL	+17	+4	+35	
SCHOOL 17	+24	+16	+8	
SCHOOL 5	-1	-23	-10	
SCHOOL 7-VIRGIL GRISSOM	+29	+16	+21	
SCHOOL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY	+2	+1	+4	
SODUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+14	+16		
SUCCESS ACADEMY CS-BUSHWICK	-55	-63		
URBAN SCHOLARS COMMUNITY SCHOOL	+7	+5	+2	
WATSON WILLIAMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	+27	+11	+1	
WILLIAM A CARTER ELEMENTARY	+23	+5	-10	
WOODSIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOL (THE)	-26	-28		
Mean	+7	+1	+3	
	+7	+1	+3	

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

Charter School

NEW YORK CITY MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL

2.a.i. and 2.a.ii. Trending Toward Proficiency – Aggregate and Subgroup Standards-Based Trend Toward Proficiency :

New York City Montessori CS		EL	A		Math								
	All Students	SWD	ELL	ED	All Students	SWD	ELL	ED					
2015-2016	34%	24%	-	34%	16%	12%	-	13%					
2016-2017	25%	14%	8%	25%	14%	10%	0%	16%					
2017-2018	33%	31%	40%	31%	38%	21%	40%	40%					
2018-2019	40%	27%	41%	40%	32%	19%	23%	32%					

Elementary/Middle School Trending Toward Proficiency - Minimum Expectation = 80%

\*See NOTES (2), (3), (7), and (8) below.

## 2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

#### 2.b.i. and 2.b.ii Proficiency - Aggregate and Subgroup School Level Proficiency:

#### Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency State and District Differentials Over Time Comparison of



<sup>\*</sup>See NOTES (1), (2), (3), and (6) below.

## 2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

#### 2.b.i. and 2.b.ii Proficiency - Aggregate and Subgroup School Level Proficiency:

							Proficiency Outcomes: Charter School, District, and NYS										
				ELA				Math					Science				
		New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	
	2015-2016	12%	21%	-9	39%	-27	11%	21%	-10	43%	-32	-	-	-	-	-	
All	2016-2017	20%	24%	-4	40%	-20	13%	24%	-11	45%	-32	53%	72%	-19	86%	-33	
Students	2017-2018	33%	30%	+3	45%	-12	32%	30%	+2	49%	-17	81%	77%	+4	88%	-7	
	2018-2019	43%	34%	+9	46%	-3	37%	30%	+7	50%	-13	80%	72%	+8	86%	-6	
	2015-2016	6%	7%	-1	11%	-5	13%	10%	+3	16%	-3	-	-	-	-		
SWD	2016-2017	14%	8%	+6	12%	+2	8%	12%	-4	18%	-10	50%	59%	-9	69%	-19	
3000	2017-2018	19%	12%	+7	18%	+1	19%	17%	+2	21%	-2	54%	66%	-12	74%	-20	
	2018-2019	22%	13%	+9	17%	+5	18%	17%	+1	22%	-4	71%	60%	+11	68%	+3	
	2015-2016	15%	11%	+4	16%	-1	10%	17%	-7	24%	-14	-	-	-	-	-	
ELL	2016-2017	12%	14%	-2	15%	-3	6%	18%	-12	23%	-17	27%	57%	-30	64%	-37	
	2017-2018	35%	20%	+15	28%	+7	29%	27%	+2	34%	-5	100%	65%	+35	75%	+25	
	2018-2019	44%	25%	+19	29%	+15	38%	28%	+10	36%	+2	79%	63%	+16	73%	+6	
	2015-2016	10%	21%	-11	28%	-18	10%	20%	-10	31%	-21	-	-	-	-	-	
ED	2016-2017	20%	24%	-4	29%	-9	13%	24%	-11	33%	-20	52%	72%	-20	80%	-28	
	2017-2018	34%	30%	+4	35%	-1	34%	30%	+4	38%	-4	82%	77%	+5	84%	-2	
	2018-2019	44%	33%	+11	36%	+8	34%	30%	+4	40%	-6	80%	73%	+7	80%	0	

#### Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes: Charter School, District, and NYS

\*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7) below.

## Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

#### 2.b.iii. Aggregate Grade-Level Proficiency:

				ELA			Math							Science		
		New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS
	2015-2016	15%	26%	-11	42%	-27	12%	24%	-12	44%	-32	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 3	2016-2017	24%	27%	-3	43%	-19	17%	28%	-11	48%	-31	-	-	-	-	-
Sidde 5	2017-2018	52%	38%	+14	51%	+1	47%	39%	+8	54%	-7	-	-	-	-	-
	2018-2019	64%	43%	+21	52%	+12	57%	35%	+22	55%	+2	-	-	-	-	-
	2015-2016	14%	24%	-10	41%	-27	13%	23%	-10	45%	-32	-	-	-	-	
Grade 4	2016-2017	17%	25%	-8	41%	-24	8%	22%	-14	43%	-35	53%	72%	-19	86%	-33
Sidue 4	2017-2018	25%	33%	-8	47%	-22	30%	30%	0	48%	-18	81%	77%	+4	88%	-7
	2018-2019	35%	36%	-1	48%	-13	26%	29%	-3	50%	-24	80%	72%	+8	86%	-6
	2015-2016	8%	14%	-6	33%	-25	8%	16%	-8	40%	-32	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 5	2016-2017	17%	19%	-2	35%	-18	13%	21%	-8	43%	-30	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 5	2017-2018	20%	20%	0	37%	-17	18%	23%	-5	44%	-26	-	-	-	-	-
	2018-2019	33%	22%	+11	38%	-5	31%	27%	+4	46%	-15	-	-	-	-	-

#### All Students Grade-Level Proficiency

\*See NOTES (1), (3), (6), and (7) below.

## Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

#### 2.b.iv. Subgroup Grade-Level Proficiency:

				Stu	dents w	lith Dis	Sapilitie	es Grad	ie-Leve	I Profic	lency					
				ELA			Math							Science		
		New York City Montessori CS	2 CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	2 CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS
	2015-2016	7%	10%	-3	13%	-6	21%	10%	+11	18%	+3	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 3	2016-2017	21%	10%	+11	15%	+6	7%	14%	-7	22%	-15	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 5	2017-2018	28%	19%	+9	23%	+5	37%	26%	+11	28%	+9	-	-	-	-	-
	2018-2019	43%	19%	+24	22%	+21	50%	19%	+31	27%	+23	-	-	-	-	-
	2015-2016	0%	7%	-7	11%	-11	0%	13%	-13	16%	-16	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 4	2016-2017	11%	9%	+2	13%	-2	11%	9%	+2	16%	-5	50%	59%	-9	69%	-19
Graue 4	2017-2018	17%	11%	+6	19%	-2	0%	14%	-14	20%	-20	54%	66%	-12	74%	-20
	2018-2019	19%	13%	+6	18%	+1	12%	15%	-3	21%	-9	71%	60%	+11	68%	+3
	2015-2016	13%	5%	+8	7%	+6	13%	7%	+6	13%	0	-	-	-	-	-
Grade 5	2017-2018	12%	8%	+4	11%	+1	13%	13%	0	16%	-3	-	-	-	-	-
	2018-2019	15%	8%	+7	11%	+4	8%	18%	-10	17%	-9	-	-	-	-	-

#### Students with Disabilities Grade-Level Proficiency

\*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7) below.

## Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

#### 2.b.iv. Subgroup Grade-Level Proficiency:

				Engi	ISH Lah	guage	Leanne	is Grad	de-Leve	PION	liency	-					
				ELA					Math				Science				
		New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	
	2015-2016	19%	12%	+7	21%	-2	13%	20%	-7	28%	-15	-	-	-	-	-	
Grade 3	2016-2017	20%	21%	-1	19%	+1	20%	26%	-6	29%	-9	-	-	-	-	-	
Grade 5	2017-2018	44%	26%	+18	33%	+11	38%	35%	+3	40%	-2	-	-	-	-	-	
	2018-2019	50%	36%	+14	33%	+17	70%	31%	+39	39%	+31	-	-	-	-		
	2016-2017	9%	10%	-1	15%	-6	0%	14%	-14	20%	-20	27%	57%	-30	64%	-37	
Grade 4	2017-2018	40%	24%	+16	30%	+10	40%	29%	+11	32%	+8	100%	65%	+35	75%	+25	
	2018-2019	35%	24%	+11	33%	+2	18%	27%	-9	38%	-20	79%	63%	+16	73%	+6	
Grade 5	2017-2018	20%	9%	+11	20%	0	10%	16%	-6	28%	-18	-	-	-	-		
Grade 5	2018-2019	60%	15%	+45	20%	+40	40%	26%	+14	30%	+10	-	-	-	-	-	

### English Language Learners Grade-Level Proficiency

\*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7) below.

## Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

#### 2.b.iv. Subgroup Grade-Level Proficiency:

				ECON	Jinicali	y Disac	ivanta	geu Gra	ade-Lev	el Ploi	iciency						
				ELA					Math			Science					
		New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	SAN	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	
	2015-2016	11%	25%	-14	31%	-20	13%	23%	-10	33%	-20	-	-	-	-	-	
Grade 3	2016-2017	23%	27%	-4	32%	-9	16%	28%	-12	37%	-21	-	-	-	-	-	
Grade 5	2017-2018	52%	38%	+14	40%	+12	49%	39%	+10	43%	+6	-	-	-	-	-	
	2018-2019	61%	42%	+19	42%	+19	53%	34%	+19	44%	+9	-	-	-	-	-	
	2015-2016	12%	24%	-12	30%	-18	12%	22%	-10	33%	-21	-	-	-	-	-	
Grade 4	2016-2017	18%	25%	-7	31%	-13	9%	22%	-13	31%	-22	52%	72%	-20	80%	-28	
Glaue 4	2017-2018	27%	32%	-5	37%	-10	32%	29%	+3	37%	-5	82%	77%	+5	84%	-2	
	2018-2019	39%	35%	+4	38%	+1	26%	29%	-3	39%	-13	80%	73%	+7	80%	0	
	2015-2016	6%	14%	-8	23%	-17	3%	16%	-13	28%	-25	-	-	-	-		
Grade 5	2016-2017	20%	19%	+1	25%	-5	15%	21%	-6	31%	-16	-	-	-	-		
Grade 5	2017-2018	21%	19%	+2	27%	-6	20%	22%	-2	32%	-12	-	-	-	-	-	
	2018-2019	33%	21%	+12	28%	+5	27%	27%	0	36%	-9	-	-	-	-	-	

#### **Economically Disadvantaged Grade-Level Proficiency**

\*See NOTES (1), (3), (6), and (7) below.

#### **Regents Outcomes**

**Charter School** 

NEW YORK CITY MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL

Regents Testing Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Annual Regents Outcomes: Not applicable to this charter school

## 2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 3: High School Outcomes

**Charter School** 

NEW YORK CITY MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL

3.a.i. and 3.a.ii. High School Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Total Cohort Regents Testing Outcomes: Not applicable to this charter school

## 2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 3: High School Outcomes

3.a.iii. and 3.a.vi. High School Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup College and Career Readiness: Not applicable to this charter school

## 2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 1 - Indicator 3: High School Outcomes

3.b.i. and 3.b.ii. Graduation Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Cohort Graduation Rates: Not applicable to this charter school

3.b.iii. and 3.b.iv. Graduation Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Cohort On-Track to Graduate: Not applicable to this charter school

#### Benchmark 9 - Indicator 1: Enrollment and Retention

**Charter School** 

NEW YORK CITY MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL

#### 1.a.i. Aggregrate Enrollment:

New York City Montessori CS	Con tracted Enrollment	Reported Enrollment	Percent of Contracted Enrollment
2016-2017	294	271	92%
2017-2018	294	291	99%
2018-2019	294	283	96%
2019-2020	294	280	95%
2020-2021	294	243	83%

#### Aggregate Enrollment: Reported vs Contracted - Target = 100%

#### 1.a.ii. Subgroup Enrollment:

		and	Econom	ically Dis	advanta	ged			-
		SWD			ELL			ED	
	New York City Montessori CS	AYC CSD 7	Differential to District	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District
2016-2017	28%	26%	+2	22%	21%	+1	90%	97%	-7
2017-2018	32%	27%	+5	23%	23%	0	88%	96%	-8
2018-2019	27%	28%	-1	22%	24%	-2	86%	95%	-9
2019-2020	29%	28%	+1	27%	24%	+3	93%	95%	-2
2020-2021	26%	29%	-3	4%	23%	-19	92%	96%	-4

## Subgroup Enrollment: Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners\*,

\*See NOTES (2) and (6) below.

\*The 2020-2021 ELL enrollment for this charter school is under-represented due to a reporting error.

### 2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 9 - Indicator 1: Enrollment and Retention

#### 1.b.i. and 1.b.ii. Retention:

			R.	etention	- Aggreg	ate and	Subgrou	ps				
	A	All Student	ts		SWD			ELL		ED		
	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District	New York City Montessori CS	NYC CSD 7	Differential to District
2016-2017	75%	84%	-9	73%	84%	-11	72%	86%	-14	75%	85%	-10
2017-2018	70%	83%	-13	69%	83%	-14	81%	87%	-6	73%	83%	-10
2018-2019	79%	84%	-5	76%	84%	-8	85%	84%	+1	82%	84%	-2
2019-2020	80%	84%	-4	86%	84%	+2	91%	84%	+7	82%	84%	-2
2020-2021	81%	87%	-6	82%	87%	-5	83%	87%	-4	82%	88%	-6

**Retention - Aggregate and Subgroups** 

\*See NOTES (2) and (6) below.

### 2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard Benchmark 9 - Indicator 1: Enrollment and Retention

1.c.i. and 1.c.ii. High School Persistence:

Not applicable to this charter school

#### **Notes**

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on the NYS ELA and/or math assessment.

(2) For the students with disabilities and the English language learners subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

(3) Pursuant to NYSED business rules, the data was suppressed for subgroups containing <5 students and the subgroup category may not be included for the metric.

(4) Data in the table above represents students who passed the Annual Regents or equivalents (score of 65 or better).

(5) The 4- and 5-year graduation rates reported are as of August. The 6-year graduation rates are as of June.

(6) Data in the table above represents a comparison between those grades served in the charter school to only those same grades in the district.

(7) A "." in any table indicates that the data was suppressed, no student sat for the exam, or the exam was not given.

(8) Data in the table above represents tested students who either maintained a proficient score from one year to the next or students whose proficiency level increased from one year to the next (a proficient score is level 3 or 4).

(9) Data in the table above represents students within their respective subgroups who have passed three out of the five Annual Regents and Regents Common Core Examinations (score of 65 or better) or equivalents.

(10) Data in the table above represents the percentage of students from the original 9th grade cohort who persisted within the same school to a 4-year graduation (includes August graduates).



#### NEW YORK CITY MONTESSORI CHARTER SCHOOL

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21		Chartenadore Astrono Examplement
Grades Served	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5		Chartered vs. Actual Enrollment
Maximum Chartered Grades Served	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5	UPK, K-5		300
Chartered Enrollment	294	294	294	294	294	ent	200
Maximum Chartered Enrollment Actual Enrollment	294	294 291	294 283	294 280	294 243	Enrollment	100
ASSETS						E	
Current Assets							2017 2018 2019 2020 2021
Cash and Cash Equivalents	291,946	705,823	1,387,420	1,467,857	898,778		Chartered Enrollment     Actual Enrollment
Grants and Contracts Receivable Prepaid Expenses	209,952 37,685	339,633 33,051	- 35,432	264,034 37,996	- 40,369		Cash, Assets and Liabilities
Other Current Assets			245,094	156	40,303		1
Total Current Assets	539,583	1,078,507	1,667,946	1,770,043	1,375,554		2021
Non-Current Assets		100.070		407.074	100.007		2020
Property, Building and Equipment, net Restricted Cash	212,846 75,000	160,072 75,000	124,044	137,874 100,000	130,227 100,000	Year	2019
Security Deposits	229,716	229,716	231,189	231,189	231,189	¥	
Other Non-Current Assets		-		-	-		2018
Total Non - Current Assets Total Assets	517,562 1,057,145	464,788 1,543,295	355,232 2,023,178	469,062 2,239,105	461,416 1,836,970		2017
	1,057,145	1,545,255	2,023,178	2,235,105	1,030,570		0 500 1,000 1,500 2,000 2,500
LIABILITIES and NET ASSETS Current Liabilities Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses							0 500 1,000 1,500 2,000 2,500 Thousands
	165,841	165,006	143,019	106,790	77,923		Cash and Cash Equivalents Total Assets Total Liabilities
Accrued Payroll and Payroll Taxes	281,253	296,429	314,669	349,769	295,136		
Due to Related Parties Refundable Advances	- 12,274	- 12,028			-		Net Assets
Other Current Liabilities	-	-	-	11,369	2,822		2021
Total Current Liabilities	459,368	473,463	457,688	467,928	375,881		2021
Long-Term Liabilities Deferred Rent	759,425	671,682	552,582	401,418	217,470		2020
Other Long-Term Liabilities	- 159,425			401,418	21/,4/0	Year	2019
Total Long-Term Liabilities	759,425	671,682	552,582	401,418	217,470	×	-
Total Liabilities	1,218,793	1,145,145	1,010,270	869,346	593,351		2018
NET ASSETS							2017
Unrestricted	-	398,150	1,012,908	1,369,759	1,243,619		0 500 1,000 1,500
Restricted Total Net Assets		- 398,150	- 1,012,908	- 1,369,759	- 1,243,619		0 500 1,000 1,500 Thousands
							Restricted     Unrestricted
Total Liabilities and Net Assets	1,218,793	1,543,295	2,023,178	2,239,105	1,836,970		
OPERATING REVENUE							Revenue & Expenses
State and Local Per Pupil Revenue - Reg. Ed	4,434,672	5,049,686	4,095,388	4,396,079	3,919,874		8,000
State and Local Per Pupil Revenue - SPED State and Local Per Pupil Facilities Revenue	668,098 213,351	459,009 382,532	980,677 413,023	1,039,847 465,987	800,664 443,177		7,000
Federal Grants	239,169	382,532	318,504	289,165	514,034	\$	6,000
State and City Grants	23,364	20,921	17,176	72,129	18,189	and	5,000
Other Operating Income	-	-	635,153	393,939	363,636	Thousands	4,000
Total Operating Revenue	5,578,654	6,227,895	6,459,921	6,657,145	6,059,574	F	3,000
EXPENSES							2,000
Program Services Regular Education	2,864,124	2,726,959	2,986,413	3,564,403	3,419,256		1,000
Special Education	1,205,739	1,964,240	1,808,722	1,637,860	1,610,426		╴┼└╴┻┻╷└╴┻┻╷└╴┻┻╷└╴┻┻╷└╴┻┻
Other Expenses	586,831	348,586	403,789	408,465	405,229		2017         2018         2019         2020         2021           Operating         In Non-Operating         Expenses
Total Program Services	4,656,694	5,039,785	5,198,924	5,610,728	5,434,911		
Supporting Services Management and General	967,902	630,239	646,928	706,160	751,496		Change in Net Assets
Fundraising	-	-	-	-	-		
Total Support Services	967,902	630,239	646,928	706,160	751,496		2021
Total Expenses	5,624,596	5,670,024	5,845,852	6,316,888	6,186,407		2020
Surplus/Deficit from Operations	(45,942)	557,871	614,070	340,258	(126,833)	5	2019
SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE				390	693	Yea	2013
Contributions and Grants			686	16,204			2018
Fundraising Support	-	-	-	-	-		2017
Other Support and Revenue	12,686	1,927		· ·			
Total Support and Other Revenue Change in Net Assets	12,686 (33,256)	1,927 559,798	686 614,756	16,594	693		-500 0 500 1,000 1,50
Net Assets - Beginning of Year	(128,392)	(161,648)	014,/30		(126 140)		
Net Assets - End of Year			398.152	356,851 1,012,908	(126,140) 1,369,759		Thousands
	(161,648)	398,150	398,152 1,012,908		(126,140) 1,369,759 1,243,619	- 1	Thousands Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Yea
	(161,648)			1,012,908	1,369,759	•	
REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN Revenue - Per Pupil	(161,648)			1,012,908	1,369,759	•	
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating	20,585	398,150 21,402	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776	1,369,759		
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue	20,585	398,150 21,402 7	1,012,908 22,827 2	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3		Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Yea
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue	20,585	398,150 21,402	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776	1,369,759 1,243,619	ands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year E Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Year
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil	20,585	398,150 21,402 7	1,012,908 22,827 2	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3	sands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses 5,800 300
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue	20,585 47 20,632	398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093	sands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Yee Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755	398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,435	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,550	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458	(in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Yee Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,286	398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,435 88.9%	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88.9%	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,550 88.8%	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,9%	(in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Yea Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755	398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,435	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,550	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458	(in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Net Assets - End of Yee Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses 5,000 6,000 6,000 6,000 5,
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2%	398,150 21,402 7 21,408 	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88,9% 11.1%	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,550 88,8% 11,2%	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 22,458 87,9% 87,9% 12,1%	sands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses 000 000 000 000 000 000 000
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2%	398,150 21,402 7 21,408 	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88,9% 11.1%	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,550 88,8% 11,2%	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 22,458 87,9% 87,9% 12,1%	venue & Expenses (in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Met Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses 5.00 5
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Ramagement and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING:	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0.6%	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,453 88.% 11,1% 9,9% 1,50	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,057 88,5% 11,1% 10,5% 2,49	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5.6%	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,9% 12,1% 12,1% 2,20% 2,10	(in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year         Change in Net Assets         Net Assets - End of Yea           Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses         300 <td< td=""></td<>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1: 5- 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 /	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0.6%	21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,455 88,9% 11,1% 9,5%	1,012,908 22,827 2 2,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88,9% 11,1% 10,5%	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,560 88.8% 11.2% 5.6%	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 22,365 3,093 25,458 87,9% 12,1% -2,0%	venue & Expenses (in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets Met Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses 5.00 5
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Rogram Services % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong; 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0.6%	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,453 88.% 11,1% 9,9% 1,50	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,057 88,5% 11,1% 10,5% 2,49	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5.6%	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,9% 12,1% 12,1% 2,20% 2,10	venue & Expenses (in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year         Change in Net Assets         Net Assets - End of Year           Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses         300 <t< td=""></t<>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong; 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0,6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,485 88,9% 11,1% 9,9% 1.50 Strong	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 31,371 2,286 20,657 88.5% 11,1% 10,5% 2,49 Strong	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,876 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,550 88.8% 11,2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,975 12,178 -2,0% 2,10 Strong	venue & Expenses (in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year         Change in Net Assets         Net Assets - End of Year           Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses         300 <t< td=""></t<>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDINC: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0.6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,453 88,9% 11,1% 9,9% 5,500 5,500 5,500 4,605,044	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88,9% 11,1% 2,286 20,557 88,9% 2,49 Strong 1,210,258	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong 1,302,115	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 22,365 3,093 22,458 87,9% 12,1% -2,0% 2,10 Strong 999,673	Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	A data est - Beginning of Year Change in Net Assets - End of Vet Change in Net Assets
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring: -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital (Current) Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING:	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0,6% 0,17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1,2 Partly Meets	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,485 88,9% 11,1% 9,9% 1.50 Strong	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 31,371 2,286 20,657 88.5% 11,1% 10,5% 2,49 Strong	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5,6% 2,67 Strong 1,302,115 3,8	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,975 12,178 -2,0% 2,10 Strong	Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Net Assets - End of Vet <ul> <li></li></ul>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1:5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1:0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,28% 17,2% -0.6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2	2398,150 21,402 7 21,403 17,319 2,166 19,485 88,9% 11,1% 9,9% 150 Strong 605,044 2,3	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88.9% 11.1% 10.5% 2,49 Strong 1,210,258 3,6	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5,6% 2,67 Strong 1,302,115 3,8	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,937 3 24,937 2,493 2,295 2,2	e Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Net Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <sup>6,000</sup> <sup>6,00</sup>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundralsing Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital (Current) Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING:	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0,6% 0,17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1,2 Partly Meets	2398,150 21,402 7 21,403 17,319 2,166 19,485 88,9% 11,1% 9,9% 150 Strong 605,044 2,3	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88.9% 11.1% 10.5% 2,49 Strong 1,210,258 3,6	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5,6% 2,67 Strong 1,302,115 3,8	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,937 3 24,937 2,493 2,295 2,2	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Met Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>6</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 <b>6</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 <b>6</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 </td
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Management and Other % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong; 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital Working Capital Uternet) Adaptation (Strong) BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0,6% 0,17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1,2 Partly Meets	2398,150 21,402 7 21,403 17,319 2,166 19,485 88,9% 11,1% 9,9% 150 Strong 605,044 2,3	1,012,908 22,827 2 22,829 18,371 2,286 20,657 88.9% 11.1% 10.5% 2,49 Strong 1,210,258 3,6	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5,6% 2,67 Strong 1,302,115 3,8	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,937 3 24,937 2,493 2,295 2,2	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Net Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Net Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>6</b> ,000 <b>0 6</b> ,000 <b>0 0</b> ,000 <b>0</b>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital Uvorking Capital Uvorking Capital Uvorking Capital Uvorking Capital Uvorking Capital Debt To Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING:	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0,6% 0,17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1,2 Partly Meets Standard 1,2 Does Not Meet	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,485 88,9% 11,1% 9,39% 1.50 Strong 605,044 2,3 Meets Standard	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88.8% 11.2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong 1,302,115 3.8 Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,9% 12,1% 4,21% 4,21% 5,458 87,9% 12,1% 5,458 87,9% 12,1% 5,458 87,9% 12,1% 5,458 2,20% 5,458 2,20% 5,458 2,20% 5,458 2,258 2,25	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Met Assets - End of Year Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Proogram Services % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDINC: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital (Current) Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDINC: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2 DEBT TO ASSET Debt to Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDINC: Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,28% 17,2% -0.6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2 Partly Meets Standard	2398,150  21,402 7  21,403 17,319 2,166 38,9% 11,1% 9,9% 50,004 50,004 2,3 Meets Standard 0,7	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88.8% 11.2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong 1,302,115 3.8 Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 24,939 24,939 25,458 87.9% 6,12,1% -2.0% 2,10 Strong 999,673 3,7 Meets Standard 0,3	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Met Assets - End of Met <b>EncolIment vs. Revenue &amp; Expenses Met Assets - End of Met Met Assets - Beginning of Year Met Asset Met Asset - Beginning of Year Met Asset - Beginning of Year</b>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services Mangement and General, Fundraising Total Expenses % of Program Services % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital Uvorking Capital Uvorking Capital Uvorking Capital DEBT TO ASSET Debt to Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0 CASH POSITION	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,286 17,2% -0.6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2 Partly Meets Standard 1.2 Does Not Meet Standard	2398,150  21,402  7  21,403  17,319  2,166  19,485  88,9%  11,1%  9,9%  11,1%  9,9%  5trong  605,044  2.3  Meets Standard  Meets Standard	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88.8% 11.2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong 1,302,115 3.8 Meets Standard 0.4 Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 24,939 24,939 25,458 87,9% 12,1% -2,0% 2,10 Strong 999,673 3,7 Meets Standard 0,3 Meets Standard	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Net Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>6</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 ,000
Revenue - Per Pupil         Operating         Support and Other Revenue         Total Revenue         Expenses - Per Pupil         Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Royaram Services         % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses         FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE         Composite Score         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 /         Needs Monitoring: -1.0 - 0.9         WORKING CAPITAL         Net Working Capital         Working Capital         Working Capital         Working Capital         DEBT TO ASSET         DeBt to Asset Ratio         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0         CASH POSITION         Days of Cash	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,8% 17,2% -0.6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2 Partly Meets Standard 1.2 Does Not Meet Standard	2398,150  21,402  7  21,408  17,319  2,166  19,455  88,9%  11,50  5,109  5,100  5,100  4,52  Meets Standard  0,7  Meets Standard  0,7  Meets Standard	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,876 59 23,835 2,522 2,550 88,8% 11,2% 5,6% 2,67 Strong 1,302,115 3,8 Meets Standard 0,4 Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,945 12,186 -2,0% 2,100 Strong 999,673 3,7 Meets Standard 0,3 Meets Standard 53,0	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Net Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>6</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 <b>0</b> ,000 ,000
Revenue - Per Pupil         Operating         Support and Other Revenue         Total Revenue         Expenses - Per Pupil         Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses         FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE         Composite Score         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 /         Needs Monitoring: -1.0 - 0.9         WORKING CAPITAL         Net Working Capital         Working Capital (Current) Ratio         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2         DEBT TO ASSET         Debt to Asset Ratio         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0         CASH POSITION         Days of Cash         BENCHMARK and FINDING:	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,286 17,2% -0.6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2 Partly Meets Standard 1.2 Does Not Meet Standard	2398,150  21,402  7  21,403  17,319  2,166  19,485  88,9%  11,1%  9,9%  11,1%  9,9%  5trong  605,044  2.3  Meets Standard  Meets Standard	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,776 59 23,835 2,522 22,560 88.8% 11.2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong 1,302,115 3.8 Meets Standard 0.4 Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 24,939 24,939 25,458 87,9% 12,1% -2,0% 2,10 Strong 999,673 3,7 Meets Standard 0,3 Meets Standard	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Met Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>Enrollment vs. Revenue &amp; Expenses Subsection Working Capital Working Capital Working Capital Debt to Asset Debt to Asset Days of Cash Days of Cash</b>
Revenue - Per Pupil         Operating         Support and Other Revenue         Total Revenue         Expenses - Per Pupil         Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses         FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE         Composite Score         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 /         Needs Monitoring: -1.0 - 0.9         WORKING CAPITAL         Net Working Capital         Working Capital (Current) Ratio         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2         DEBT TO ASSET         Debt to Asset Ratio         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0         CASH POSITION         Days of Cash         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or greater than 60 days	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,286 17,2% -0,6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2 Partly Meets Standard 1.2 Does Not Meet Standard	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,455 88,9% 11,1% 9,5% 38,9% 1.50 Strong 5trong 605,044 2.3 Meets Standard Meets Standard 0.7 Meets Standard 0.2 Meets Standard 0.5 Meets Standard	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,876 59 23,835 2,522 2,550 88,8% 11,2% 5,6% 2,67 Strong 1,302,115 3,8 Meets Standard 0,4 Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,519 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,9% 12,1% -2,0% 2,10 Strong 999,673 3,7 Meets Standard 0,3 Meets Standard 53,0 Does Not Meet	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Met Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>Enrollment vs. Revenue &amp; Expenses Subsection Working Capital Working Capital Debt to Asset Debt to Asset Days of Cash Days of Cash Days of Cash Days of Cash</b>
Revenue - Per Pupil Operating Support and Other Revenue Total Revenue Expenses - Per Pupil Program Services % of Program Services % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE Composite Score BENCHMARK and FINDING: Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 / Needs Monitoring; -1.0 - 0.9 WORKING CAPITAL Net Working Capital Working Capital Working Capital Working Capital Working Capital Debit to Asset Ratio BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0 CASH POSITION Days of Cash BENCHMARK and FINDING: Ratio should be equal to or greater than 60 days TOTAL MARGIN	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,28% 17,2% -0,6% 0,17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2 Partly Meets Standard 1.2 Does Not Meet Standard 18,9 Does Not Meet Standard	238,150  21,402  7  21,408  17,319  2,166  19,435  88,%  11,15  9,9%  58,%  1.50  5trong  605,044  2.3  Meets Standard  0,7  Meets Standard  0,7  Meets Standard  0,7  Meets Standard  0,7  Meets Standard	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,875 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,560 88.8% 11.2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong 1,302,115 3.8 Meets Standard Meets Standard Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,619 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,975 12,119 -2,0% 2,10 Strong 999,673 3,7 Meets Standard 0,3 Meets Standard 53,0 Does Not Meet Standard	Score Revenue & Expenses (in thousands)	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Met Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>Enrollment vs. Revenue &amp; Expenses Output Description Description Working Capital Working Capital Description Description</b>
Revenue - Per Pupil         Operating         Support and Other Revenue         Total Revenue         Expenses - Per Pupil         Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Program Services         % of Revenue Exceeding Expenses         FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE         Composite Score         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate; 1.0 - 1.4 /         Needs Monitoring: -1.0 - 0.9         WORKING CAPITAL         Net Working Capital         Working Capital (Current) Ratio         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2         DEBT TO ASSET         Debt to Asset Ratio         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0         CASH POSITION         Days of Cash         BENCHMARK and FINDING:         Ratio should be equal to or greater than 60 days	20,585 47 20,632 17,183 3,572 20,755 82,286 17,2% -0,6% 0.17 Needs Monitoring 80,215 1.2 Partly Meets Standard 1.2 Does Not Meet Standard	2398,150 21,402 7 21,408 17,319 2,166 19,455 88,9% 11,1% 9,5% 38,9% 1.50 Strong 5trong 605,044 2.3 Meets Standard Meets Standard 0.7 Meets Standard 0.2 Meets Standard 0.5 Meets Standard	1,012,908	1,012,908 1,369,759 23,875 23,835 20,038 2,522 22,560 88,8% 11,2% 5.6% 2.67 Strong 1,302,115 3.8 Meets Standard Meets Standard 84.8 Meets Standard	1,369,759 1,243,519 24,937 3 24,939 22,366 3,093 25,458 87,9% 12,1% -2,0% 2,10 Strong 999,673 3,7 Meets Standard 0,3 Meets Standard 53,0 Does Not Meet	Days 50016 5 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Met Assets - Beginning of Year     Change in Net Assets     Met Assets - End of Year   Enrollment vs. Revenue & Expenses <b>Enrollment vs. Revenue &amp; Expenses Subsection Working Capital Working Capital Working Capital Debt to Asset Debt to Asset Days of Cash Days of Cash Days of Cash</b>