



Charter Schools Institute
The State University of New York

Summary of Findings and Recommendations

Proposal to establish Citizens of the World Charter School New York 1 and grant it authority to operate Citizens of the World Charter School New York 2

June 15, 2012

Executive Summary

The proposals to establish the Citizens of the World Charter School New York 1 (“Citizens of the World 1”) and Citizens of the World Charter School New York 2 (“Citizens of the World 2”) were submitted to the Charter Schools Institute (the “Institute”) by lead applicant Jeremy Robins on February 29, 2012 in response to the Institute’s Request for Proposals (“RFP”) that was released on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the State University of New York (the “SUNY Trustees”) on January 3, 2012.

The founding education corporation board of trustees seeks to form a single education corporation with authority to operate two schools, which is permitted by the 2010 amendments to the New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 (as amended, the “Act”), provided that two charters are issued. As this legal structure is novel to SUNY, if the authority to form one education corporation is not forthcoming, the founding boards (comprised of the same individuals), would plan to merge the two education corporations shortly after approval by the Board of Regents or operation of law. The schools would partner with Citizens of the World Charter Schools, Inc. (the “Network”), a California based non-profit organization, for limited services including start-up interest free loans, school design, school leader support and a licensing agreement for use of intellectual property.

Citizens of the World 1 and 2 each intend to seek facility space from the New York City Department of Education (“NYCDOE”) in New York City Community School District (“CSD”) 14 (Brooklyn). The NYCDOE has indicated its support in general for the proposed schools as set forth in a May 22, 2012 letter from New York City Schools Chancellor Dennis Walcott (Appendix A). The letter detailed the extent to which the NYCDOE will work with the founding group to secure suitable facility space. The schools would open in the fall of 2013 with 126 students in Kindergarten and 1st grade and would add one grade each year thereafter through the initial charter period. Each of the schools would reach its enrollment capacity of 387 students in Kindergarten through 5th grade in the final year of the proposed charter period and envision ultimately expanding through the 12th grade in subsequent charter periods, if granted. The schools would admit new students to fill available open seats in all grades throughout the initial charter period, a practice known as “backfilling.”

The Network currently partners with three charter schools in California, two of which have received charter approval but not yet opened. The proposed New York schools would replicate the school model employed by the other schools that partner with the Network. As part of a five-year business plan, the Network plans to expand in two other states by seeking authorization for two schools in each state, with similar structure as the California charter schools and the proposed schools. The Institute analyzed this plan, the philanthropy required to implement the plan and the capacity of the Network to fulfill the plan. The Institute concluded that the Network has the capability to provide human, financial and other resources to fully support its current and future charter school partners including Citizens of the World 1 and 2.

Consistent with the May 2010 amendments to the Act, the Institute finds: 1) that the proposals for Citizens of the World 1 and 2 rigorously demonstrate the criteria detailed in the Institute’s RFP including the mandatory criteria set forth in Education Law subdivision 2852(9)(b)(i) (that each proposed charter school would meet the enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners and students who qualify for the federal Free and Reduced Price Lunch program); 2) that the proposed schools have conducted a thorough and meaningful public review processes to solicit community input regarding the proposal in accordance with the

requirements in the RFP, which conform with Education Law subdivision 2852(9)(b)(ii); 3) the proposals are ones that best satisfy the objectives contained within the RFP based on the content of the proposals and its supporting documentation, and are therefore qualified within the meaning of Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(d); and 4) the Institute has scored the proposals pursuant to Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(c), and there are enough charters to be issued by the SUNY Trustees pursuant to the January 2012 RFP to accommodate the proposals and all other RFP applicants the Institute is recommending for approval.

Based on the foregoing:

The Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the charter proposals for Citizens of the World Charter School New York 1 and Citizens of the World Charter School New York 2 and the formation of one education corporation to operate both schools; and approve, to the extent necessary, a corporate merger of the two education corporations, if formed.

Background and Description

While SUNY may still award a small number of charters pursuant to its traditional application process, amendments to the Act in 2010 made additional charters to create new education corporations available only through an RFP process. The Institute received 18 total proposals to create new charter schools in response to the RFP it issued on January 3, 2012. The current review cycle could legally result in a maximum of 80 new charters approved by the SUNY Trustees, 40 of which could be located in New York City, per Education Law subdivision 2852(9). Forty-eight of the 80 charters were available but not awarded in response to the August 2010 and January 2011 RFPs.

The Institute conducted a rigorous evaluation of the Citizens of the World 1 and 2 proposals including academic, fiscal and legal soundness reviews. In addition, the Institute had the proposals reviewed by an independent panel of education experts to evaluate the educational, fiscal and organizational soundness of the applications. Pursuant to its protocols, the Institute met with the applicant, the proposed board of trustees that will oversee the schools, other members of the founding team and representative of the Network. The Institute also requested additional due diligence information from the Network through the submission of a five year business plan as noted above regarding the capacity of the Network to fulfill its role as presented in the proposals together with its other future obligations. In addition, it is anticipated that the chair and other members of SUNY Trustees' Charter Schools Committee will interview the lead applicant and members of the founding board.

The mission of Citizens of the World 1 and 2 would be to "to provide a socio-economically, culturally, and racially diverse community of students in the heart of CSD 14 with an intellectually challenging, experiential learning environment that develops each individual student's confidence, potential, and individual responsibility as citizens of the world in which we live so that they can achieve at the highest levels and be prepared for college, career, and global citizenship..."

Key design elements of the Citizens of the World 1 and 2 include:

- A commitment to academic excellence through a constructivist and project-based approach to learning;

- implementation of balanced literacy, including Writers Workshop, as well as *Everyday Mathematics*;
- a commitment to ensuring a diverse student body and community to prepare students for engagement in a global society;
- weekly community building courses and service learning projects for students, as well as multiple opportunities to encourage parent engagement;
- regular and frequent teacher professional development, as well as opportunities to collaborate with teachers from other schools associated with Citizens of the World Charter Schools, Inc.; and
- an academic model used by other successful charter schools.

The schools would offer 183 days of instruction with the first day of the 2013-14 school year on or around September 9, 2013 and the last day on or around June 25, 2014; subsequent years would follow a similar ten-month calendar. The school day would begin at 8:30 and conclude at 3:10 p.m., except on Wednesdays when students would be dismissed at 1:00 p.m. to allow for teacher professional development.

As noted above, the proposed education corporation’s board would partner with the Network as part of a licensing agreement and the provision of other, limited services. The Network would provide the schools with interest free loans during the start-up period to be reimbursed over the course of the proposed charter period as well as assistance with the recruitment, selection and coaching of school leaders during the start up period and beyond and a licensing agreement to allow the schools to use the Citizens of the World trademarks and other intellectual property and ensure fidelity to the educational model developed by the Network. The Network would charge the education corporation a licensing fee of three percent of school revenue, repayment of the loan principal and the actual costs of additional services provided to the schools, which does not constitute a full management relationship within the meaning of the proposed charter agreement between SUNY and Citizens of the World 1.

The Network currently partners with the following schools in a manner similar to what is proposed for Citizens of the World 1 and 2.

School Name	Authorizer	Location	Year Opened	Grades Served 2011-12
Citizens of the World Charter School Hollywood	Los Angeles Unified School District	Los Angeles, CA	2011-12	K-2
Citizens of the World Charter School 2	Los Angeles Unified School District	Los Angeles, CA	To Open 2012-13	N/A
Citizens of the World Charter School 3	Los Angeles Unified School District	Los Angeles, CA	To Open 2013-14	N/A

The proposed curriculum of Citizens of the World 1 and 2 would be focused on a constructivist and project-based approach to learning. Science and social studies classes would be taught through project-based learning. The schools would use a balanced literacy approach and Writers workshop

models for English language arts and would use *Everyday Mathematics* as the foundation of the schools mathematics program. Students would be formally assessed three times per year using the Fountas and Pinnell reading assessments, 6+1 Trait Rubric writing assessments, and *Everyday Mathematics* assessments. The results would be immediately reviewed and utilized by teachers and administrators to track individual student progress and the effectiveness of school programs. In particular, teachers and the schools' principals would participate in "whole child meetings" three times per year to track student performance and consider students' overall social, emotional, and physical well being. In addition to its academic curriculum, the schools intend to integrate service learning and other civic engagement activities into the curriculum.

Using a Response to Intervention system, students' learning needs would be assessed and students placed into or graduated out of Tier I (in-class differentiation), Tier II (pullout and push-ins with the general education teachers, teaching assistants, and learning specialists as appropriate), or Tier III (intensive supplemental small group instruction provided by qualified staff). Students who do not respond to Tier 3 interventions would be referred to the district's Committee on Special Education, which would evaluate the need for special classes, settings or related services. School-based strategies and specific goals would be set every nine weeks.

Teachers would receive ample quality professional development, beginning with an intensive three-week program before school starts, which would continue every Wednesday for 2.5 hours throughout the school year. In addition, teachers would be given opportunities to visit and observe excellent teachers at other schools and attend workshops designed to master effective teaching techniques. The school would establish a strong professional learning community to support teachers, including the submission of weekly lesson plans for peer feedback and the creation of professional reading groups.

Both schools would share an executive director to manage the business and operational aspects of the schools and provide overall leadership. Each school would hire a principal focused exclusively on teaching and learning, an assistant principal to assist with administrative and oversight duties and an instructional coach to provide professional development and intensive teacher coaching support. Site based operations and business functions would be carried out by operations and business managers. A special education/resource specialist would coordinate and provide special education services, while a learning specialist/ELL coordinator would coordinate the English as a Second Language Program and general small group instruction. Additionally, each school would also employ an additional special education specialist and two additional learning specialists to assist in meeting the needs of students at-risk of academic failure.

The proposed by-laws indicate that the education corporation board would consist of not less than five voting members. In addition, the Network would be the sole corporate member of the school board. This is not a novel arrangement, and the Institute made certain that procedural safeguards were in place to help ensure the independence of the education corporation board. As the Network is a relatively new organization, it has begun, but not yet completed the process of applying to the New York Secretary of State for authority to do business in New York. As a result, the Institute will add an additional assurance and term to the education corporation's charter whereby the authority must be secured prior to any school being able to open. The proposed initial members who would serve on the education corporation's board of trustees are set forth below.

1. **Rajeev Bajaj** – President, Sangari Global Education; founder of Kitamba, Inc., which provides management consulting on education policy issues; has served on advisory boards for charter schools and as a contributing member of the New York City Teaching Fellows Advisory Board.
2. **Maryanne Kiley** – Vice President of Talent Management, Teach for America; former high school English teacher.
3. **Aretha Miller** – Education consultant, founder of the Venn Group; former Vice President of School Supports and Chief Operating Officer, New York City Charter School Center; Project Manager at SchoolWorks; Curriculum Coordinator at Diploma Plus.
4. **Diane Robinson** – Consultant with experience including serving as a Race to the Top reviewer for the Federal Government and advising New Leaders for New Schools on principal evaluation practices; former president of Urban Teacher Residency United; National Director of Recruitment and Selection for the KIPP Foundation.
5. **Kate Sobel** – Lead Talent Coach, New York Performance Management Team; former principal and Teach for America Corps member; M.A., Harvard University’s Graduate School of Education.

The founding group has met with the NYCDOE to request space in underutilized public school buildings in CSD 14. The Institute received a letter of support (attached as Appendix A and excerpted below) from New York City Schools Chancellor Dennis Walcott, dated May 22, 2012, expressing support for the proposals. Any NYCDOE space would have to be separately approved by the NYC Panel for Educational Policy through provisions of the Education Law related to the co-location of charter schools. That process culminates in the right of aggrieved persons to file an appeal of the use of the space with the New York State Commissioner of Education. In addition, the Institute reserves the right to review and approve all facilities in accordance with the charter agreement, and, pursuant to the Act, would have to hold a hearing on behalf of the SUNY Trustees prior to each school occupying district school space.

The proposals each include contingency budgets that have been deemed sound by the Institute, for the provision of private facility space in the event that public space is unavailable.

The fiscal impact of both Citizens of the World Charter Schools New York 1 and 2 on the district of residence, the New York City School District, is summarized below.

Expected Number of Students	Basic Per Pupil Aid Rate Assumed	Per Pupil Aid Revenue Only	NYCDOE Operating Budget (in billions)	% of NYCDOE Operating Budget
256* (2013-14 school year – year 1)	\$13,527	\$3,462,912	\$18.500	0.0187%
756** (2017-18 school year – year 5)	\$13,527	\$10,226,412	\$18.500	0.0553%

*Sum of 128 expected enrollment in each school.

** Sum of 378 expected enrollment in each school.

The calculations above assume the current basic per pupil aid will not increase during the term of the charter. The NYCDOE yearly budget figure was derived from the December 2010 Financial Status Report (FSR) published on the NYCDOE website. The two schools' aggregate per pupil revenue (basic per pupil aid multiplied by expected enrollment), when compared to the operating budget of the NYCDOE illustrates that the potential fiscal impact of the proposed school on the district is minimal.

The Institute notes that the NYCDOE estimate it used in its analysis is subject to unpredictable increases and decreases in the NYCDOE budget in any given year and in the charter school per-pupil funding (as well as the actual enrollment in each of the schools). For example, the operating budget of the NYCDOE proposed by Mayor Bloomberg in May 2012 was \$19.6 billion. Using the aggregate per pupil revenues derived from the aggregate enrollment as a proportion of the proposed 2012-13 NYCDOE budget would yield even less impact to the district: 0.0177% and 0.0522% in 2013-14 and 2017-18 school years, respectively. While the Network has included in its proposal estimated calculations accounting for special education revenue, federal Title I funds, other federal grants and/or funds provided by the district and to be received by the schools, the Institute's calculations and analysis do not account for these sources of potential revenue.

The Institute finds that the fiscal impact of the proposed schools on the New York City School District, and public charter, public district and nonpublic schools in the same geographic area would be minimal.

The Institute reviewed the Network's proposed fiscal and operating plans for each year of the proposed charter terms and supporting evidence. The Institute also reviewed the Network's business plans to determine whether it could fully support its existing and new schools proposed in this application with a particular emphasis on the philanthropy needed to support the Network. As the Network is a start-up organization, there were no audited financial statements available for review. The Institute accepted unaudited financial statements with the understanding that as an additional assurance and term of the charter agreement, SUNY will receive a certification from an independent accountant that such statements have been reviewed and accurately state the fiscal condition of the Network. The Institute finds the education corporation's budgets and fiscal plans are sound and that sufficient start-up funds will be available to the charter schools.

The Institute has notified the school district as well as public and private schools in the same geographic area of the proposed school. As noted above, the Institute received positive comments from the NYC Schools Chancellor as follows regarding each proposal:

The NYCDOE found this proposal to be well-designed and features a rigorous educational model. Chancellor Dennis Walcott recommends this charter application to support the children of New York City. While there is a need for high quality elementary school seats in Brooklyn, given competing siting priorities, there potentially is not sufficient space for both schools to open in CSD 14. We will work with the applicant space in this district or contiguous districts, where available.

The Institute received a number of comments from various community members and stakeholders both in support of and in opposition to the proposed schools. Comments in support of the schools

cited the core commitment to diversity expressed by the founders and an approach to education that they referred to as “new,” and “progressive.” Parents wrote in support of new schools options, describing “a real need for choice options so they can continue to live in Williamsburg.”

The community group WAGPOPS! (Williamsburg and Greenpoint Parents: Our Public Schools!) wrote in opposition to the proposed schools and also forwarded 281 e-mails, 182 postcards and 32 letters which contained nearly identical messages in opposition to the schools. These messages stated that the proposed schools were “poor replicas” of existing, diverse public schools that enjoy superior programming and curriculum. An Institute analysis of individual school performance in CSD 14 is attached as Appendix B.

The messages also stated that existing district schools are under-enrolled and that the charter schools would draw needed students away, reversing efforts made to diversify district schools. Messages stated that Citizens of the World “does not care about the community,” the proposed schools are “redundant, wasteful and dangerous to our community,” and that the proposals did not meet the statutory requirements for demonstrating community support. The Institute also received letters and other e-mails from residents and elected officials representing CSD 14. These communications cited a lack of demand for the charter schools and the need for more resources and focus on the district schools. They argued that the community already has significant choice options by way of other charter schools and district magnet schools; they requested that more resources be spent on district schools.

One letter and one e-mail sent to the Institute leveled charges against a founder of Citizens of the World, Inc. in California citing allegations against another organization that person is affiliated with. The Institute finds that the allegation has no bearing on the proposed charter schools to be opened in New York.

The Institute thanks those commenting and has carefully considered all comments, particularly those related to the academic program of the proposed schools. The Institute notes that it has determined that the applicant has appropriately demonstrated community support for the schools. The Institute also notes that there is a separate process in the Education Law to seek community input anytime a charter school is proposed to locate in a NYCDOE operated building (for approved schools). In addition to the NYCDOE siting process over which SUNY has no control, SUNY must conduct a public hearing to engage community input on the proposed siting. SUNY takes this responsibility seriously, not only conducting the hearing in the proposed building but physically inspecting the facility space. Per the charter agreement with all approved schools, SUNY needs to approve facilities in a particular site, be it public or private. Persons aggrieved by a charter school siting in district school space may appeal to the State Commissioner of Education. Pursuant to the Act, SUNY also would investigate any formal complaint made from a co-located district school about the conduct of a SUNY authorized charter school that violates the law or charter. The Institute further notes that SUNY has no input on how the NYCDOE allocates school funding to CSDs or to particular schools.

SUNY takes this responsibility seriously, not only conducting the hearing in the proposed building but physically inspecting the facility space. Per the charter agreement with all approved schools, SUNY needs to approve the safety and appropriateness of physical facilities in any particular site, be it public or private. Persons aggrieved by a charter school siting in district school space may appeal to the State Commissioner of Education. Pursuant to the Act, SUNY also would investigate any formal complaint made from a co-located district school about the conduct of a SUNY authorized

charter school that violates the law or charter. The Institute further notes that SUNY has no input on how the NYCDOE allocates school funding to CSDs or to particular schools.

The applicant has conducted public outreach, in conformity with a thorough and meaningful public review process prescribed in the RFP, to solicit community input regarding the proposed schools (Ed. Law §2852(9-a)(b)(ii)).

The RFP also contained minimum eligibility and preference criteria to reflect the requirements of Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a). Each proposal met the eligibility requirements, as evidenced by the following:

- Each proposal met the following basic criteria:
 - submitted by the appropriate deadline;
 - was complete, i.e., include a Transmittal Sheet, Proposal Summary and responses to all RFP requests;
 - individual responses adequately addressed each specific request; and
 - each proposal was coherent.
- The proposals met the standard for describing a quality educational program and provided sufficient evidence that each proposed school is likely to operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner, to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in Education Law subdivision 2850(2) as well as demonstrated a rigorous commitment to student achievement.
- The proposals included a viable plan to meet the enrollment and retention targets established by the SUNY Trustees for each school for students with disabilities, students who are English language learners, and students who are eligible to participate in the federal free and reduced-price lunch program (as detailed in Request No. 24 of the proposals). For the purposes of responding to the RFP, SUNY directed applicants to address overall targets for the school district of location, and in the case of New York City, the Community School District of location as identified by the Institute and available at: <http://www.newyorkcharters.org/documents/DistrictLevelDataonSubpopulations.pdf>. As set forth in the proposed charter agreement, SUNY intends to revise such targets with more specific targets during the first year of the charter.
- The proposals provided evidence of public outreach that conforms to the process prescribed by the SUNY Trustees in the letter of intent and RFP for the purpose of soliciting and incorporating community input regarding each proposed charter school.

As the Citizens of the World 1 and 2 proposals met the eligibility criteria, the Institute's evaluation continued with a full review of the proposal, continued due diligence on the Network, an interview of the founding team and proposed board of trustees, and requests for clarification and or amendments to the proposals. The review process then continued with an evaluation of the proposals in relation to the eleven Preference Criteria contained in the RFP for which proposals can

earn credit as described in the RFP's Scoring Rubric. The purpose of the Scoring Rubric was to prioritize proposals in the event that the number of proposals meeting the SUNY Trustees' requirements exceeded the maximum number of charters to be issued in 2012. In the event of a tie for the last charter both proposals will be rejected unless one applicant agreed to withdraw his or her proposal for consideration in a subsequent RFP. The preference criteria, which in addition to eligibility criteria and the overall high standards established by the SUNY Trustees, included the demonstration of the following in compliance with Education Law subdivisions 2852(9-a)(c)(i)-(viii):

- increasing student achievement and decreasing student achievement gaps in reading/language arts and mathematics;
- increasing high school graduation rates and focusing on serving specific high school student populations including, but not limited to, students at risk of not obtaining a high school diploma, re-enrolled high school drop-outs, and students with academic skills below grade level;
- focusing on the academic achievement of middle school students and preparing them for a successful transition to high school;
- utilizing high-quality assessments designed to measure a student's knowledge, understanding of, and ability to apply, critical concepts through the use of a variety of item types and formats;
- increasing the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;
- partnering with low performing public schools in the area to share best educational practices and innovations;
- demonstrating the management and leadership techniques necessary to overcome initial start-up problems to establish a thriving, financially viable charter school; and
- demonstrating the support of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located and the intent to establish an ongoing relationship with such school district.

While the Institute received a total of 18 proposals in response to its January 2012 RFP, only nine have been recommended for approval. All of the nine proposals recommended for approval met the eligibility criteria and were therefore assigned a score using the rubric contained in the RFP. The proposals for Citizens of the World Charter School 1 and 2 each earned a score of 33 preference points out of a possible total of 64. Based on this score and the other information and findings set forth herein, the Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the proposals to establish the Citizens of the World Charter School 1 and Citizens of the World Charter School 2, which would not exceed the statutory limit in Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(a).

Findings

Based on the comprehensive review of each proposal and interviews of the applicant and the proposed board of trustees, the Institute makes the following findings.

1. The charter school described in each proposal meets the requirements of Article 56 of the Education Law (as amended) and other applicable laws, rules, and regulations as reflected in (among other things):
 - the inclusion of appropriate policies and procedures for the provision of services and programs for students with disabilities and English language learners;
 - the required policies for addressing the issues related to student discipline, complaints, personnel matters and health services;
 - an admissions policy that complies with the Act, federal law and the U.S. Constitution;
 - the inclusion of the proposed by-laws for the operation of the education corporation's board of trustees; and
 - the inclusion of an analysis of the projected fiscal and programmatic impact of each school on surrounding public and private schools.

2. The applicant has demonstrated the ability to operate each school in an educationally and fiscally sound matter as reflected in (among other things):
 - the provision of an educational program that meets or exceeds the State performance standards;
 - the articulation of a culture of self-evaluation and accountability at both the administrative and board level;
 - the student achievement goals articulated by the applicant;
 - an appropriate roster of educational personnel;
 - a sound mission statement;
 - a comprehensive assessment plan;
 - the provision of sound start-up, first-year, and five-year budget plans;
 - a plan to acquire comprehensive general liability insurance to include any vehicles, employees, and property;
 - evidence of adequate community support for, and interest in, the charter school sufficient to allow the school to reach its anticipated enrollment;
 - the inclusion of descriptions of programmatic and independent fiscal audits, with fiscal audits occurring at least, annually;
 - the inclusion of a school calendar and school day schedule that provide at least as much instruction time during a school year as required of other public schools; and

- the inclusion of methods and strategies for serving students with disabilities in compliance with all federal laws and regulations.
3. Granting each proposal is likely to: a) improve student learning and achievement; and b) materially further the purposes of the Act. This finding is reflected by (among other things):
- the inclusion of a curriculum framework document that specifies how the proposed curriculum will ensure that students will meet or exceed the performance standards of the Board of Regents reflecting the adoption of the Common Core State Standards;
 - a comprehensive plan to assess student achievement through the use of State tests, externally-verifiable standardized tests and other diagnostic assessments;
 - robust programs to meet the needs of students at risk of academic failure, students with disabilities, and English language learners;
 - an intensive focus on literacy and mathematics, with 120 minutes of daily English language arts instruction (65 minutes on Wednesdays), and 60 minutes of daily mathematics instruction for each student;
 - the inclusion of significant opportunities for professional development of the school’s instructional staff prior the start of each school year and throughout the year;
 - a commitment to providing an educational program focused on outcomes, not inputs; and
 - an organizational structure that supports the ability of the principal to focus exclusively on improving teaching and student learning.
4. Each proposed charter school would meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets, as prescribed by the SUNY Trustees, of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the federal free and reduced price lunch program as required by Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(b)(i).

The data upon which to base specific enrollment and retention targets mandated by the amendments to the Act was not fully available at the time the statute mandated the RFP be issued. As a result, the Institute developed internal evaluation criteria regarding the enrollment and retention of each class of student referenced in the amendments to the Act such that the Institute could make the determination that the applicant would meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets when developed. The Institute also developed initial targets based on school district or CSD averages to use in making the determination required to approve the proposal. Before the first year of the charter term, SUNY will develop final targets, and shall ensure: “(1) that such enrollment targets are comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in

which the proposed charter school would be located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.” The Institute will conduct separate analyses for setting enrollment and retention targets, respectively. Based on the foregoing, the Institute finds that the proposal has rigorously demonstrated that the proposed charter school would meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets, set by the Institute to evaluate proposals and to be prescribed by SUNY during the first year of the charter in accordance with the Act.

5. The applicant has conducted public outreach for each school, in conformity with a thorough and meaningful public review process prescribed by the SUNY Trustees, to solicit community input regarding the proposed charter school and to address comments received from the impacted community concerning the educational and programmatic needs of students in conformity with Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(b)(ii).
6. The Institute has determined that each proposal rigorously demonstrates the criteria and best satisfies the objectives contained within the RFP, and, therefore, is a “qualified application” within the meaning of Education Law subdivision 2852(9-a)(d) that should be submitted to the Board of Regents for approval.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on its review and findings, the Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve the proposals to establish the Citizens of the World Charter School New York 1 and the Citizens of the World Charter School New York 2 to open in Brooklyn in September of 2013. In the event the Board of Regents does not approve the formation of a single education corporation with authority to operate the two schools set forth in the proposals, the Institute recommends that the SUNY Trustees approve in advance, to the extent necessary, a merger of the two education corporations as described in the proposals as soon as possible after corporate formation.

Citizens of the World Charter Schools 1 and 2

Basic Identification Information

Lead Applicant(s):	Jeremy Robins
Management Co.:	None
Other Partners:	Citizens of the World Charter Schools, Inc.
Location (District):	New York City Community School District 14
Student Pop./Grades:	Each opening with 126 students in K - 1 st grades; growing to 378 students K -5 th grades
Opening Date:	September 2013

School District of Proposed Location Profile

New York City School District 14			
Enrollment (2010-11):		19,714	
Percent (2010-11):			
African-American:		29	
Hispanic:		59	
Asian, White, Other:		11	
Percent Qualifying for Free or Reduced Priced Lunch (2009-010):		87	
English Language Arts (2010-11)		Mathematics (2010-11)	
Grade	Percent Proficient	Grade	Percent Proficient
3	46	3	52
4	49	4	57
5	49	5	61
6	37	6	41
7	31	7	49
8	27	8	42

Source: Demographic data are from the New York State Accountability and Overview Report 2010-11; test data are from the 2010-11 results released on the New York City Department of Education's website.



**Department of
Education**

Dennis M. Walcott, Chancellor

May 22, 2012

Susan Miller Barker
Interim Executive Director
Charter Schools Institute
State University of New York
41 State Street, Suite 700
Albany, New York 12207

Dear Ms. Barker,

The New York City Department of Education Charter Schools Office (NYC DOE CSO) has reviewed seven (thirteen charters) charter school applications submitted to SUNY's Charter School Institute's 2012 round 1 process. The NYC DOE CSO has also participated in three (nine charters) applicant capacity interviews that have moved forward. I genuinely commend the passion and commitment of these founding groups for wanting to serve New York City's school children and provide more high quality options.

Attached are my recommendations for the charter schools I would like to see move forward at this time. During the last few months, the Charter Schools Office evaluated seven applications that were submitted. I appreciate the State University of New York for involving us in reviewing these applications as the District of New York City. After reviewing each application, participating in the interviews, and meeting with the Office of Portfolio Management, we have decided on the attached recommendations.

For high quality applicants aligned to the needs of the community, we try to provide public school space when it is available. The identification of viable public school space is an ongoing and complex process. Support for an application does not guarantee the availability or viability of public school space and all applicants should have private facility plans in place. We plan to invite all of the recommended applicants who are approved by SUNY into our offices this summer to discuss their space needs.

I thank you for inviting us to be reviewers in this process and look forward to many more collaborations between SUNY and the NYCDOE in the near future.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dennis M. Walcott".

Dennis M. Walcott
Chancellor

2012 SUNY New Charter Applications – NYC Chancellor Recommendations

<u>Proposed School Name</u>	<u>Applicant Desired CSD</u>	<u>Overall Comments</u>	<u>Comments on Space Availability</u>
Citizens of the World New York Charter School 1 & 2	14	The NYCDOE found this proposal to be well-designed and features a rigorous educational model. Chancellor Dennis Walcott recommends this charter application to support the children of New York City.	While there is need for higher quality elementary school seats in Brooklyn, given competing siting priorities, there potentially is not sufficient space for both schools to open in CSD 14. We will work with the applicant to identify space in this district or contiguous districts, where available.
Success Academy Charter Schools - Manhattan 1, 2 and 3	2, 4	These proposals are replications of existing high-performing charter schools. Chancellor Dennis Walcott recommends this charter application to support the children of New York City.	While there is need for higher quality elementary and middle school seats in Manhattan, there potentially is not sufficient space for all 3 schools to open as K-8s in CSD 2 and/or 4. We will work with the applicant to consider split siting schools, modifying enrollment to tailor to space availability, and discuss the possibility of other contiguous districts.
Success Academy Charter Schools – Brooklyn 5, 6 and 7	13, 17	These proposals are replications of existing high-performing charter schools. Chancellor Dennis Walcott recommends this charter application to support the children of New York City	There is need for higher quality elementary and middle school seats in Brooklyn and we will work with the applicant on space availability in their identified CSD's. There potentially is not sufficient space for all 3 schools to open as K-8s in CSD 13 and 17. We will work with the applicant to consider split siting schools and modifying enrollment to tailor to space availability.
Explore Exceed Charter School	17,18	This application is proposing to offer students and families a high quality option within a building that also houses a school that is phasing out due to performance concerns. . It is a replication of an existing high-performing charter school. Chancellor Dennis Walcott recommends this charter application to support the children of New York City.	The DOE has not made any decisions regarding potential phase-outs for the 2013-14 school year. However, we do see a need for higher quality elementary and middle school seats in the identified CSD's and will work with the applicant to identify space, where available.

Appendix B



NYC DOE Data 2010-11 State Assessments School in CSD 14																		
School	ELA Percent Proficient								Math Percent Proficient									
	% FRL	All students	Comparison					SWD	ELL	All students	District	Comparison					SWD	ELL
			District	Black	Hsp/Lat	White	White					Black	Hsp/Lat	White	White			
PS 120 CARLOS TAPIA	99.0	33.3	48.1	31.6	33.7	--	15.2	20.0	47.2	56.8	36.8	48.5	--	45.5	42.3			
PS 059 WILLIAM FLOYD	97.5	23.9	48.1	24.8	23.8	--	0.0	8.3	26.5	56.8	22.0	31.4	--	3.7	14.3			
PS 147 ISSAC REMSEN	96.8	33.7	48.1	16.1	43.1	--	15.8	6.7	57.3	56.8	48.4	62.1	--	57.9	86.7			
PS 023 CARTER C WOODSON	95.7	22.7	48.1	19.7	26.8	--	13.3	16.7	40.3	56.8	41.0	39.3	--	38.7	15.4			
PS 257 JOHN F HYLAN	93.5	63.4	48.1	54.8	66.0	--	58.6	54.5	62.5	56.8	56.5	64.4	--	56.9	40.0			
PS 157 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN	91.1	37.3	48.1	25.0	39.3	--	14.3	20.0	47.6	56.8	20.8	52.6	--	22.9	23.3			
PS 017 HENRY D WOODWORTH	90.8	39.3	48.1	30.8	36.7	54.5	8.5	6.1	55.7	56.8	23.1	57.9	45.5	19.1	35.3			
PS 084 JOSE DE DIEGO	90.3	30.8	48.1	57.1	27.8	33.3	8.9	9.3	29.6	56.8	35.7	28.0	40.0	25.0	12.8			
PS 016 LEONARD DUNKLY	89.2	29.2	48.1	15.4	33.6	--	0.0	19.2	46.2	56.8	38.5	48.7	--	8.6	35.7			
PS 297 ABRAHAM STOCKTON	88.7	34.0	48.1	32.1	36.1	--	8.1	5.6	35.2	56.8	29.1	43.2	--	8.1	9.5			
PS 380 JOHN WAYNE ELEM.	88.4	79.3	48.1	73.7	82.5	--	54.8	48.5	89.7	56.8	84.2	91.6	--	80.6	81.8			
PS 250 GEORGE H LINDSAY	88.1	48.7	48.1	39.5	47.8	33.3	10.7	17.9	54.7	56.8	48.8	51.6	44.4	7.1	26.5			
PS 018 EDWARD BUSH	87.2	37.8	48.1	18.8	42.0	--	0.0	5.9	52.5	56.8	31.3	57.8	--	12.5	40.0			
PS 196 TEN EYCK	85.5	46.4	48.1	43.8	46.5	--	21.7	43.5	72.5	56.8	56.3	76.2	--	60.9	80.0			
PS 132 CONSELYA	84.8	61.0	48.1	43.5	57.4	80.3	28.9	15.4	70.3	56.8	50.0	67.0	88.2	38.6	53.8			
PS 019 ROBERTO CLEMENTE	80.0	22.4	48.1	0.0	22.9	--	3.2	1.7	21.9	56.8	0.0	22.4	--	9.7	6.9			
PS 034 OLIVER H PERRY	78.0	82.5	48.1	--	67.3	87.3	38.9	45.8	88.4	56.8	--	75.9	92.1	55.6	64.3			
PS 031 SAMUEL F DUPONT	75.0	90.2	48.1	100.0	85.0	93.1	66.7	--	97.9	56.8	100.0	97.2	97.7	92.3	--			
PS 110 THE MONITOR	72.0	58.4	48.1	30.0	48.0	73.0	15.0	6.3	62.7	56.8	45.0	48.0	77.3	20.0	11.8			

Schools are sorted by percent free or reduced lunch, greatest to least

-- Denotes data are suppressed because there are fewer than 6 students in the category

1 The percentage of overall students that qualify for free or reduced price lunch. This does not reflect the performance of this subgroup of students as relevant data is not available.

Defined Abbreviations
SWD—Students with Disabilities
ELL—English language learners
FRL—Free and Reduced Lunch
CSD—Community School District



Demographics of Schools in CSD 14							
School	% Black	% Hispanic	% Asian	% White	% FRPL	% SWD	% ELL
PS 120 CARLOS TAPIA	11.4	84.3	2.4	1.7	99.0	14.9	22.8
PS 059 WILLIAM FLOYD	49.9	47.8	0.0	1.4	97.5	14.7	7.1
PS 147 ISSAC REMSEN	41.6	56.3	0.0	1.6	96.8	21.6	11.0
PS 023 CARTER C WOODSON	59.7	39.3	0.6	0.3	95.7	19.2	8.8
PS 319	1.6	96.4	2.1	0.0	94.3	9.8	17.6
PS 257 JOHN F HYLAN	21.2	76.0	1.5	1.2	93.5	24.2	22.7
PS 157 BENJAMIN FRANKLIN	16.5	81.4	0.0	1.8	91.1	21.5	28.6
PS 017 HENRY D WOODWORTH	6.1	82.0	4.3	6.9	90.8	24.6	15.7
PS 084 JOSE DE DIEGO	8.2	73.3	3.0	13.8	90.3	18.7	25.8
PS 016 LEONARD DUNKLY	26.3	71.9	0.6	1.2	89.2	18.5	16.7
PS 297 ABRAHAM STOCKTON	45.4	50.6	1.7	2.0	88.7	18.3	14.3
PS 380 JOHN WAYNE ELEM.	21.3	70.2	1.6	7.0	88.4	17.8	20.6
PS 250 GEORGE H LINDSAY	10.3	77.2	9.5	2.1	88.1	9.3	14.0
PS 018 EDWARD BUSH	17.6	81.0	0.0	1.4	87.2	12.2	15.8
PS 196 TEN EYCK	18.0	79.3	0.0	2.2	85.5	21.7	10.7
PS 132 CONSELYA	11.1	49.2	4.7	34.4	84.8	9.4	3.4
PS 019 ROBERTO CLEMENTE	2.6	95.0	0.8	1.6	80.0	15.9	29.1
PS 034 OLIVER H PERRY	3.1	21.1	4.2	71.6	78.0	6.9	16.7
PS 031 SAMUEL F DUPONT	4.3	47.1	9.4	36.9	75.0	12.9	4.5
PS 110 THE MONITOR	7.4	36.1	2.9	52.1	72.0	14.0	16.3