Office of Charter Schools

2012-2013 CHARTER RENEWAL APPLICATION

21st Century Charter School at Gary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Renewal Decision Overview

Part I: Charter Renewal Application – Instructions and CSAPPHIRE Submissions

Part II: Renewal Narrative

INTRODUCTION

According to Indiana law, a charter school is established to provide innovative and autonomous programs that: 1) serve the different learning styles and needs of public school students; 2) offer public school students appropriate and innovative choices; 3) provide varied opportunities for professional educators; 4) allow public schools freedom and flexibility in exchange for exceptional levels of accountability; and 5) provide parents, students, community members, and local entities with an expanded opportunity for involvement in the public school system (IC 20-24-2-1). As an authorizer of charter schools, Ball State University is responsible for ensuring that its charter schools demonstrate that they are achieving academic, financial, and organizational outcomes.

Merit-based renewal decisions will be based on an analysis of a comprehensive body of objective evidence defined by the Accountability Framework and gauged under standards developed in conjunction with the National Association of Charter School Authorizers ("NACSA") under NACSA's Principles and Standards for Quality Authorizing. Renewals will be granted to each charter school that can demonstrate that it has achieved academic standards and targets (developed by OCS in cooperation with NACSA), are organizationally and fiscally viable, and have been faithful to the terms of the contract and applicable laws.[1]

The renewal process serves two purposes. First, it informs OCS' decision on whether to renew a school's contract by providing evidence of school performance in relation to the academic, financial, and organizational performance standards set out in the school's charter and in the Accountability Framework. Second, the process through the renewal application provides the school a meaningful opportunity to present additional evidence regarding its performance.[2]

---

[1] Principles & Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing, National Association of Charter School Authorizers, 2010 Edition.
[2] Principles & Standards for Quality Charter School Authorizing, National Association of Charter School Authorizers, 2010 Edition.

RENEWAL DECISION OVERVIEW

The OCS intends to conduct a rigorous, transparent renewal decision process that leads to merit-based decisions consistent with NACSA's Principles and Standards for Quality Authorizing. The OCS will base its renewal decisions on the existing record of school performance including, but not limited to, the school's response to PART II of this Renewal Application.

The first stage of the process involves the OCS sharing with each school that is up for renewal the schools' data as evaluated through the Academic Accountability Framework. Additional data is gathered through site visits, desk audits, and the CSAPPHIRE database.

The second stage requires the school to prepare and submit the Charter Renewal Application. The Renewal Application provides schools an opportunity to present the school's existing record of performance and to outline Plans for the school's next charter term. Within the Charter Renewal Application, schools will have an opportunity to comment on the data and provide factual corrections and/or supplement the information. The school's future plans for the next charter term may affect whether the school is recommended for renewal/extension and/or the *length* of a renewal term/extension and may shape the development of a new charter contract.

The third stage is an evaluation of the data collected in the first stage and the second stage by the staff and contractors of OCS and the determination by the Executive Director of OCS as to whether to recommend a renewal or extension of the school's existing charter and the term for which the Executive Director recommends an extension. Ball State's President makes the final determination as to whether to extend or renew the school's charter and the duration of the renewal or extension.

2012-2013 CHARTER RENEWAL APPLICATION – INSTRUCTIONS AND CSAPPHIRE SUBMISSIONS

Instructions:

Charter Renewal Applications must be submitted to OCS **electronically through CSAPPHIRE.**

CSAPPHIRE SUBMISSIONS AND UPDATES:

The following documents will be reviewed and verified by the OCS remotely through CSAPPHIRE during the renewal process. In order to make the process more efficient, please review and/or upload the school's most recent version of each of the following documents. If any of these documents was submitted previously, please just be certain that the version in CSAPPHIRE is the most current version.

School Documents

Please upload the following documents to the appropriate subfolder folder in the Plans and Policies folder:

- ☐ Organizational Chart (updated administrative organizational chart with names)
- ☐ Staffing Matrix
- ☐ General descriptions of Responsibilities of Teachers and Staff)
- ☐ School Calendar (current school year)
- ☐ Curriculum and Instructional Methods
- ☐ Professional Development Methods
- ☐ Methods of Promoting Parent and Community Involvement Practices
- ☐ Supplemental Programs (Information on Current Student Clubs, Organizations, and Other Extracurricular Activities Offered (including athletic teams))
- ☐ Methods of Pupil Assessments

Current School Policies and Plans

Please review and verify the following policies and plans in CSAPPHIRE are the most current version. If such document listed below is not in CSAPPHIRE, please upload the required document.

- ☐ Staff Handbook
- ☐ Student Handbook
- ☐ Promotion/Retention Policy
- ☐ Elementary School Reading Plan
- ☐ Policy and Procedures for Special Education
- ☐ Policy and Procedures for ELL Students
- ☐ Performance Evaluation Plan for Administrators and Teachers
- ☐ Personnel Plan, including Methods of Selection, Retention and Compensation of Employees
- ☐ Teacher and Staff Compensation and Benefits Plans
- ☐ Professional Development Methods

☐ School Admission Policy
☐ Transportation Policy (if applicable)
☐ School Safety and Emergency Preparedness Plan
☐ Student Health Screening Policy
☐ Student Records Policy
☐ Medication Policy
☐ Discipline Policy
☐ Criminal Background Check Policy
☐ Graduation Requirements, including diploma types offered (if applicable)
☐ Conflict of Interest Policy

Corporate Documents

Please review and verify the following documents in CSAPPHIRE are the most current version. If such document listed below is not in CSAPPHIRE, please upload the required.

☐ Articles of Incorporation (and any Amendments thereto)
☐ Any Fictitious Name Registrations filed with the Indiana Secretary of State
☐ Board By-Laws
☐ Board Member List (including Current Contact Information)
☐ Calendar of Board Meetings
☐ EMO Agreement (together with all Amendments thereto)

Facility Documents

Please review and verify the following documents in CSAPPHIRE are the most current version. If such document listed below is not in CSAPPHIRE, please upload the required.

☐ Lease Agreement(s) or Deed(s) for All Occupied Facilities
☐ Certificate of Occupancy issued by the Indiana Department of Health

I.   Executive Summary

A.   Enrollment and Demographic

1.   Provide the enrollment and demographic information for the current school year

CURRENT YEAR ENROLLMENT & DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	
Total Enrollment	480
# of Students on Waiting List	242
Gender	
# Male	243
# Female	237
Ethnicity/Race	
# White	0
# Black	473
# Hispanic	4
# Asian	0
# Native American	0
# Other	3
Special Populations	
# Students with IEPs	21
# English Language Learners	0
# Homeless Students	0
# Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch	407

2.   Provide enrollment information for length of charter contract (ADM count).

Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6
315	350	360	372	399	480

3.   Special Education Student Population Chart for length of charter contract.

		Year 1 2007-08		Year 2 2008-2009		Year 3 2009-2010		Year 4 2010-2011		Year 5 2011-2012		Year 6 2012-2013	
	Code	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	15	0		0		1	0.27%	0		0		0	
Blind of Low Vision	3	2	0.57%	1	0.28%	1	0.27%	1	0.25%	0		0	
Cognitive Disability *	10, 11, 12	13	3.71%	5	1.39%	6	1.61%	5	1.25%	2	0.42%	2	0.41%
Deaf of Hard of Hearing	4	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Deaf-Blind	14	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Development Delay (early childhood)	8	0		1	0.28%	0		0		0		0	
Emotional Disability	6	2	0.57%	6	1.67%	1	0.27%	0		0		2	0.41%

th

	9	3	0.86%	6	1.67%	2	0.54%	5	1.25%	4	0.83%	6	1.25%
Language or Speech Impairment	9	3	0.86%	6	1.67%	2	0.54%	5	1.25%	4	0.83%	6	1.25%
Multiple Disabilities	1	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Orthopedic Impairment	2	0		0		0		0		0		0	
Specific Learning Disability **	7	8	2.29%	17	4.72%	17	4.57%	16	4.01%	16	3.33%	11	2.29%
Traumatic Brain Injury	16	0		0		0		0		0		0	

*The classification for Cognitive Disability encompasses mild, moderate, and severe.
** The IDOE classification of Cognitive Disability and Specific Disability has changed over the referenced time period and students who were Mild Cognitive may fall into the Specific Learning Disability category.
***All data is submitted by staff for said year and said staff is not the same from year to year.

3. ELL Student Population Chart for length of charter contract.

Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Year 6	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0		0		0		0		0		0	

4. Homeless Student Population Chart for length of charter contract.

Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		Year 6	
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0		0		0		0		0		0	

21st Century Charter School at Gary (2005)								
	AYP	PL 221	NWEA % meeting reading growth target	NWEA % meeting LA growth target	NWEA % meeting math growth target	ISTEP % Passing Math	ISTEP % Passing ELA	ISTEP % Passing Math & ELA
SY 05 (05-06)	No	Probation	30.4%	22.4%	29.8%	24.23%	35.00%	23.00%
SY 06 (06-07)	No	Probation	50.6%	36.8%	34.95%	25.8%	21.0%	14.5%
SY 07 (07-08)	Yes	Acad Progress	46.6%	49.6%	54.7%	30.1%	20.3%	12.8%
SY 08 (08-09) K-8	n/a	n/a	64.4%	66.5%	72.9%	48.7%	46.2%	30.6%
9-10			49.6%	65.6%	71.45%			
SY 09 (09-10) K-8	Yes	Exemplary	60.8%	58.1%	70.8%	82.8%	66.9%	63.1%
9-10			30.0%	43.2%	57.8%			
SY 10 (10-11) K-8	Yes	A (Exemplary)	60.5%	61.3%	55.4%	80.1%	74.5%	63.4%
9-10			59.6%	35.2%	58.5%			
SY 11 (11-12)	No	C				73.0%	76.1%	63.2%

th

Provide a brief description of the school, including an overview of the mission and vision, educational program, community and local partnerships, and the school's leadership and governance.

Vision and Mission

21st Century Charter School @ Gary is a k-12 building founded in 2005. The mission of 21st Century Charter School will make "no excuses" for its student population and will dedicate itself to ensure that all students show growth in character, academics, life skills, the arts, and wellness using teaching skills tailored to meet the needs of each student. While this mission has stood the test of time, our vision encompasses the belief that all children should have access to a quality education in a nurturing environment that includes college. To that end, we are dedicated to sending 100% of our students to experience post-secondary education while still in high school. Furthermore we have sent the majority of our graduating classes to college, while graduating 100% in our last cohort, all 19 seniors are college bound.

While being founded on technology based instruction and an art infused curriculum, we have expanded to use Core Knowledge (k-8th grade) and implementation of technology suitable for the 21st Century learner. Our educational program starts with a foundational curriculum in the early elementary to middle school that encompasses a standard based instruction that focuses on the Common Core standards and higher level thinking. Moreover, we use standard-based national and state level assessments (eg, Dibels, Acuity, NWEA) to track our students growth and plan for interventions to meet the students' academic needs. In high school we have begun to use Education 20/20 (E20/20) as an intervention tool for remediation and advancement. The dual credit program is utilized through an Ivy Tech partnership that facilitates classes on the college campus as well as using Professor on Loan that brings the instructor to our campus. Finally, in efforts to produce global learners we offer Mandarin and French as our world languages throughout our grade levels.

We have partnered with: Boys and Girls Club of Northwest Indiana, Ivy Tech Community College, Sylvan Learning Center, Americorps (a service based organization), SAAB (a boys mentoring program), College Summit, Horace Mann Alumni Association, and the Sojourner Truth House to fully enrich the lives of our families.

Our leadership and governance has been stable. We have a long tenured principal, Angela West, who has been with the GEO organization for six years and has led the school for five years. This year the school hired the former principal of a blue ribbon school, Chris Evans, to service grades k-5, while Angela West continues as the secondary principal. Our founding School Board members have been with the school for the entity of the schools existence with the expansion of three additional board members within the last two years. Lastly, our EMO has remained constant for the past seven years which has deepened the stability of our school's history.

Our school has been afforded the distinct honor of being recognized by the DOE as a high academic growth school in the areas of both language arts and math in 2009. We were recognized as a finalist with the Panasonic National Change Award given in July 2010 in New York City. In 2012, we were one of only three schools in the state to receive a competitive DOE "school improvement grant" worth more than $3.6 million over the next three years.

II.   Looking Back: The Record of Performance

This section provides schools an opportunity to supplement or augment the record of performance by submitting evidence that informs the school's performance in relation to the Criteria for Renewal. Responses should reference the specific criteria and benchmarks to which the information applies.

th

Responses may include, but are not limited to, information about interim assessments or progress reports; evidence of performance on school-or mission-specific goals; and evidence of progress for any areas in which the school has not previously met or is not currently meeting the performance standard.

Renewal recommendations will be based on all evidence of school performance in the record, including but not limited to the school's responses in this part.

Educational Performance

A. **Provide any educational performance-related evidence, supplemental data, or contextual information that may not be captured in OCS records. Submissions may include updates related to previous school findings.**

Note: Responses to II.A.2 is optional. It is an opportunity to supplement the existing record of performance.

SEE A-F ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT CARD SCORE

B. **Using the school's accountability and assessment data, illustrate the improvement in academic performance of students over the term of the charter school's existence. Consider the following questions in your analysis.**

1. What areas of weakness are indicated by these data? Do the state data, the achievement data and the individual student data align to support your conclusions?

Our overall weakness is math as compared to our language arts scores which have improved over the past three years. Whereas, language arts has gone from 66.9% in 2010 to 76.1% in 2012, our math scores have been on a steady decline from 82.8% to 73.0%, a difference of 9.8%.

Math Scores on ISTEP according to cohort (same group of students that started in 2011 and

2011	2012	Difference in %
Class of 2021 (3rd grade) 68%	same 3rd graders now 4th grade 53%	-15%
Class of 2020 (4th grade) 86%	same 4th graders now 5th grade 85%	-1%
Class of 2019 (5th grade) 100%	same 5th graders now 6th grade 86%	-14%
Class of 2018 (6th grader) 71%	same 6th graders now 7th grade 64%	-7%
Class of 2017 (7th grade) 63%	same 7th graders now 8th grade 68%	+5%
Class of 2016 (8th grader) 81%	same 8th graders now 9th grade 52% (ECA score)	-29%

*This chart does not include new students to the grade level that were not here the previous year

The chart above illustrates that students in 2011 and the same students in 2012 have ISTEP scores that have decreased between the two years as a cohort group. With this understanding we feel that our emphasis must be centered on vertical articulation of our math curriculum. By using vertical articulation our teachers will be better equipped to determine the level of skill attainment as students enter each grade.

We will begin to create exit expectations, like what we have in the area of writing that will provide teachers in a given grade level an end goal to have in mind for the students. Beyond the exit expectations we will develop an evaluation tool to determine if the student has met or exceeded the grade level exit goals.

th

In order for the students to reach the grade level exit goals the school will design a curriculum map that will help the teacher plan how and when the skills should be taught. When designing the curriculum map we will use the textbook and common core standards, along with our school expectations to align the skills needed to master the grade level. We will need to seek and provide professional development to assist with coordination efforts in putting all of these pieces together.

Our school recognizes that the achievement gap is widening and we must address this issue. Our hope is that the above mentioned strategies will close the achievement gap and provide us with scores that better represent the achievement of our students.

2.   What areas of strength are apparent?

We have been able to retain students from elementary level to high school which in turn has yielded an acceptable grade of C under the new State's Accountability Report Card. Our grad rate is 100% and our college and career readiness is also a strength. This data supports our educational practices and commitment to preparing students for post-secondary education. As demonstrated by the BSU Academic Performance Rubric we have meet and exceeded standards in 80% of the areas that are addressed.

3.   What factors have contributed to these results, and how have these factors contributed to student performance results?

- After school tutoring
- SUCCESS period (30 minutes of school embedded remediation time)
- The addition of 4 new core teachers in high school. We added another math, science, English and Social Studies teacher. With the addition of the teachers we are able to reduce the class sizes by adding additional sections in each core subject.
- 16 to 1 ratio in grades k-8 where we have teacher and a learning guide (paraprofessional) and a class size that does exceed 32 students

- Teacher experience:
- 0-2 years   3-5 years   6-8 years   9-over_of experience____
  6 teachers   7 teachers   4 teachers   0 teachers
- We train teachers to interrupt data and use the results to advice their instruction through NWEA training in Indianapolis, the use of our Data Coach and administrative conversations based on cumulative data from the classroom and diagnostic testing.

    a)   Do the areas of weakness affect many or few students? Is it a particular subgroup of students? Is there a trend in one content area or across all content areas?

    Our weakest area of math only affects a few as we have small class sizes and one student can mean the difference of about 3% decline of achievement in each grade level. (Example: the class of 2019 had 100% pass in 2011 and 86% in 2012, which is a difference of only 3 students).

b) Have ALL students performance been analyzed, what progress monitoring tools do you have in place that provided this information?

All of our students take NWEA three times a year, Acuity (in grades 3-8), ECA Acuity and ECA Algebra in high school and Dibels as progress monitoring in early elementary. Although Acuity is not mandated for our school we have continued to use this tool as a predictive way to monitor our students throughout the year and have also added this tool in high school.

In addition to the above mentioned tools we also use teacher made assessments every 6 weeks based on grade level standards, hold weekly professional learning time among grade level teachers to discuss progress monitoring, and we notify parents of progress through student-led conference.

Are students making adequate growth based on the school's median student growth percentile (SGP) in math and ELA? (K-8)? (Meets Standards: the median SGP is at least 50 and less than 66.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math
68	52						

Are the lowest-performing students in the school making adequate growth based on the median student growth percentile (SGP) of the lowest quartile of students in math and ELA? (K-8)? (Meets Standard: the median SGP of the lowest 25% of students in the school is at least 50 and less than 66.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math	School Median SGP-ELA	School Median SGP-Math
64	52						

Are students achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? (K-8) (Meets Standard: At least 80% and less than 90% of students met proficiency in math and ELA.)

2010-11		2011-12		2012-13		2013-14	
Percent Proficient - ELA	Percent Proficient - Math	Percent Proficient - ELA	Percent Proficient - Math	Percent Proficient – ELA	Percent Proficient - Math	Percent Proficient - ELA	Percent Proficient - Math
75	80	76.0	73.0	79	80	81	82

Are students performing well on ISTEP+ in math and ELA in comparison to other schools in the district? (K-8) (*Meets Standard:* School's average % proficient on Reading and Math meets or exceeds the average performance of students in the home district by less than 15 percentage points.)

th

2010-11						2011-12						2012-13						2013-14					
% Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient–Similar Schools-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient–Similar Schools-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient–Similar Schools-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient–Similar Schools-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient–Similar Schools-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient–Similar Schools-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent Proficient - School-ELA	% Proficient–Similar Schools-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	% Proficient - School-Math	% Proficient–Similar Schools-Math	Difference (in percentage points)
75%	59%	15	78%	56%	23																		

Are low-SES students achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? K-8 (Meets Standard: School sub-group's average % proficient on Reading and Math meets or exceeds the statewide average performance of students by less than 15 percentage points.)

2010-11						2011-12						2012-13						2013-14					
Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)
88%	74%	68%	6	78%	70%	8																		

Are ELL students achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? K-8

2010-11							2011-12							2012-13							2013-14						
Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)
***	***	52%	n/a	***	60%	n/a																					

Are students with disabilities achieving proficiency on ISTEP+ in math and ELA? K-8

2010-11							2011-12							2012-13							2013-14						
Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)	Percent of School*	School Low SES Proficiency Rate-ELA	State Low-SES Proficiency Rate**-ELA	Difference (in percentage points)	School Low-SES Proficiency Rate-Math	State Low SES Proficiency Rate**-Math	Difference (in percentage points)
***	***	47%	n/a	***	56%	n/a																					

Is the school meeting acceptable standards according to P.L. 221 categories? K-8 (Meeting Standard: School received a "A" (Exemplary progress) in 2011.

2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14
A	**Overall is a C** D for K-8 C for 9-12 *under new accountability matrix		

th

2011-12 IREAD				
Total Students	# Pass IREAD	% Pass IREAD	% ELL	% F/R Lunch
25	22	88.0%	0.0%	92.0%

After re-testing in the summer our percent improved from 88% to 96% whereas 24 of the 25 passed the IREAD test.

4.   What are your next steps?

- Progress monitor throughout the year and insert timely interventions when appropriate through Title I staffing
- Continue to use assessment data to track student progress through the standards and assign lessons and activities to remediate where necessary
- Inform parents of data and provide after school assistance for students throughout the year
- Use teacher made assessments that target these learning standards throughout the year

5.   How will you know if it is working?

- As we progress monitor and check for growth and then we will re-evaluate and plan accordingly
- Using the Acuity data we will know if our students are moving forward on their grade level standards
- Because we use data throughout the year we are continuously monitoring and planning for individual academic growth

C.   Organizational Performance

Note: *With respect to Findings for Organizational Performance, there will be a presumption of compliance, unless the record includes evidence to the contrary.*

Provide any organizational related evidence, supplemental data, or contextual information that may not be captured in OCS records. Submissions may include evidence of current compliance in areas for which the school was found previously to be non-compliant or other updates relevant to previous school findings.

1.   Is the school implementing the essential terms of the education program as defined in the current charter agreement?

Yes, we have been compliant.

2.   Is the school complying with applicable education requirements?

Yes, we have been compliant.

3.   Is the school protecting the rights of students with disabilities?

Yes, we have been compliant.

th

4. Is the school protecting the rights of English Language Learner (ELL) students?

We do not any ELL learners at this present time.
Note: Response to II.C is optional. It is an opportunity to supplement the existing record of performance.

III. Looking Forward: Plans for the Next Charter Term

The following sections provide the school an opportunity to discuss plans for the next charter term. In addition to providing basic data, schools should treat the following sections as an opportunity to outline a deliberate plan for sustaining success, addressing areas requiring improvement, and ensuring the ongoing viability of the organization.

Note: The response to this part will not affect the Renewal Findings or the Recommendation for renewal or nonrenewal. It may, however, affect the length of the new charter term awarded to the school and will inform the terms of a new charter contract. Should the OCS grant renewal for an additional term or an extension of the current term, OCS expects that the plans presented below will be incorporated into the school's renewal contract or contract extension, as applicable.

A. Educational Plans

1. **Vision.** Provide a vision for what the school will look like in five years. Describe any changes to the school's mission or substantial revisions to the educational program as described in the current charter that the school proposes to make for the next charter term. Discuss any associated challenges or risks.

The school's mission and vision remain the same as stated previously. We hope to have grown in our student enrollment by the next charter renewal term. Our existing building will house the k-5th grade students, with 2 classes per grade level. Our new site will serve students in grades 6-12 with 2 classes per grade levels there as well. A noted challenge will be to maintain our academic success while preparing for the inevitable growth of our two building.

The school is making significant changes in its staffing, curriculum, use of technology, professional development, and is fortunate to have received the support of the Indiana Department of Education in the form of $1.2 million per year for the next three years to implement these changes.

Beyond the three year funded SIG grant we will request additional supports be continued throughout the charter term. Therefore the following materials encompass our request:
- Continue to fund additional core high school teachers
- Continue to fund E20/20 as remediation and advancement technology
- Continue to fund a STEM Coordinator
- Continue to fund the TAP program for teacher evaluations
- Continue to offer Core Knowledge
- Continue to offer PLTW (Project Lead the Way)
- Continue to fund a Curriculum Specialist
- Continue to fund Master/Mentor Teachers
- Continue to fund professional development
- Continue to fund merit pay for licensed teaches and paraprofessionals
- Continue to offer after school programming
- Continue to offer Saturday tutoring
- Continue to offer Summer Advantage (as our summer school program)
- Continue to offer AP courses in high school

th

Due to these additional academic materials we will need to continue their use throughout our charter term in order for the school to continue to be successful.

Financial Plans

      5-year Financial Projections. Complete a five-year projected budget for the next term at the campus and network level (if applicable). The budget detail should make clear the assumptions on which the school bases its key revenue and expenditure projections.

      See attached

B.   **Organizational Plans**

Enrollment Plan. **Describe the enrollment plan for the next charter term (*e.g*., grade level and projected student enrollment).**

Grade 2013-2014	Grade 2014-2015	Grade 2015-2016	Grade 2016-2017
k=60 students	k=60 students	k=60 students	k=60 students
1st=60 students	1st=60 students	1st=60 students	1st=60 students
$2^{n=}$ 60 students	$2^{n=}$ 60 students	$2^{n=}$ 60 students	$2^{n=}$ 60 students
3rd= 60 students	3rd= 60 students	3rd= 60 students	3rd= 60 students
4th= 30 students	4th= 60 students	4th= 60 students	4th= 60 students
5th= 30 students	5th= 30 students	5th= 60 students	5th= 60 students
6th= 60 students	6th= 60 students	6th= 60 students	6th= 60 students
7th= 45 students	7th= 60 students	7th= 60 students	7th= 60 students
8th= 45 students	8th= 45 students	8th= 60 students	8th= 60 students
9th= 60 students	9th= 60 students	9th= 60 students	9th= 70 students
10th= 60 students	10th= 60 students	10th= 60 students	10th= 70 students
11th= 40 students	11th= 60 students	11th= 60 students	11th= 70 students
12th=35 studentrys	12th=40 students	12th= 60 students	12th= 70 students
Total of 645 students	**Total of 715 students**	**Total of 780 students**	**Total of 820 students**

The enrollment will increase due to the demand we have in the city for academically achieving schools. Currently, with over 200 students on our waitlist we believe that we have access to students who want to enroll in our building. The Gary Public School Corporation had approximately 14,000 students five years ago and their decrease in enrollment can attributed to charter school absorbing the students in our schools.

Our charter school proposes growth of 340 students over the next four years which is less than 3% of the current Gary Community School population. 21st Century Charter School will stimulate our growth by word of mouth and high customer satisfaction. We recognize that the citizens of Gary are looking for excellence and that's what we provide.

      1.   **Admissions Policy.** Describe the school's current admissions practices, including criteria for enrollment and admissions procedures and methodology. Attach a copy of the current application for admissions.

      See attached

th

a) Discuss any policies and practices for recruiting and retaining at-risk students and/or students with special needs.

We utilize a blind lottery system whereas students with disabilities are not identified until after they are admitted for enrollment. Therefore we do not have practices for recruiting special education students.

b) Describe any anticipated changes to the admissions policies and practices. Discuss how the school expects these changes to affect enrollment and educational programming, if at all.

None are anticipated as we will continue to follow State and Federal guidelines in terms of admissions policies and practices.

2. **Governance and Management.** Describe any anticipated changes to the governance and management of the school, including but not limited to board composition, committee structure, use of Educational Service Providers (ESP), and/or amendments to by-laws.

We do not anticipate any substantial changes in governce and/or management.

3. **Transportation (if applicable).** Describe the plan for providing transportation to students to attend the school.

N/A

4. **Facility.** Describe the current status of the school's facility. Discuss any anticipated changes in facilities needs and/or location.

The current facility serves our k-12 population and is home to the Gary Middle College, after hours.

In addition to our current facility the City of Gary has donated a block of land to allow us to construct a new 50,000 square foot school building, with the address of 724 Washington St. With this new building, we plan to continue serving grades K-5 at the current and original building and to serve the middle school and high school grades in the new facility. Schmidt Associates has been hired to design the new building on this donated property which is two blocks south of the current school. Attached are the near final plans for the building. The school plans to borrow $13.5 million through an already approved Indiana Finance Authority bond sale. The $13.5 million will allow the school to purchase the existing school building and construct the new building. We have budgeted accordingly for the costs of this purchase and construction. We will grow our existing enrollment from the current 480 to 820 over the next five years.

th