



Renewal Report
Lillie May Carroll Jackson School (371)

Baltimore City Public Schools
Office of New Initiatives, Room 319B
Office of Achievement and Accountability, Room 201
200 E. North Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21202
www.baltimorecityschools.org

REPORT INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Report

The renewal report is a summary of findings and a resulting recommendation regarding renewal of the charter or contract for an operator-run school. To inform this recommendation, Baltimore City Public Schools collects and analyzes documentation including the school's renewal application, and an evaluation of the school's performance based on the renewal rubric, the School Effectiveness Review (SER) performed on site at each school and consideration of all other relevant information.

City Schools' renewal criteria are based on state law (§ 9-101, *et seq.*, MD. CODE ANN., EDUC.) and Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners' policy IHBJ and associated administrative regulations (IHBJ-RA and JFA-RA). The Board's policy requires that schools up for renewal be evaluated on multiple measures including, but not limited to, the following:

- **Student achievement**, constituting at least 50 percent of the renewal score and including measures such as schoolwide performance on state assessments, College and Career Readiness (for schools with high school grades), academic programming for special student populations, and a school's fidelity to its charter
- **School climate** (chronic absence, suspensions, enrollment trends, school choice data, and school survey results from parents, teachers, and students)
- **Financial management and governance** (annual audits, school budget submissions, grants management, board documentation; compliance/adherence with federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations)
- An overall finding of not effective in any of the key areas (Student Achievement, School Climate, or Financial Management/Governance) may be the basis of a non-renewal decision.

The renewal process is a component of City Schools' annual review of its school portfolio, designed to ensure that students and families across the district have access to school options that meet their interests and needs. In 2011, City Schools formed the Renewal Stakeholders Working Group (composed of school operators from a range of school types, Supporting Public Schools of Choice, and the Maryland Charter School Network) to develop a methodology for evaluating the performance of operator-run schools. The result: a fair, transparent, and rigorous renewal framework that reflects schools' unique nature and innovative contributions to student achievement, used for the first time in the 2012-13 school year, and a process for reviewing and updating the framework each year.

At the conclusion of each year's renewal cycle, staff engages operators and other key stakeholders in a review of the process to identify areas for improvement that could be addressed while still maintaining a level of predictability for schools up for renewal in the following year. Key changes made to the framework as a result of this most recent review include the following:

- For the PARCC Growth measure, schools' growth was determined by using the state growth percentile. In previous years, the Baltimore City's growth percentile was used to determine growth rates. For rating purposes, schools' growth rates continue to be compared only to other Baltimore City schools with the same tested grade bands.

- A new measure, Effective Programming for All Student Racial/Ethnic Groups, was added to the renewal rubric for schools with sufficient diversity in their student bodies for a meaningful comparison. The measure considers whether schools are providing quality programming for students in different student groups by examining instructional approaches and processes in place, schools’ use of data to identify differences in achievement among student groups, and the success of schools in addressing these differences. Previously, these factors were considered as part of the Fidelity to Charter/Overall Application measure.
- Parent satisfaction survey ratings are based on an absolute scale. In previous years, schools were ranked against other schools in their grade band to determine parent satisfaction ratings.
- Selective high schools that use PARCC scores as part of their entrance criteria are not included in comparison groups for the PARCC Absolute rubric measure.

The Process

The review process has the following components:

- Renewal rubric (includes data from standardized assessments and school surveys)
- Application for renewal
- Data tables prepared by City Schools
- School Effectiveness Review

The process starts with a review by the Charter and Operator-led Advisory Board, whose members represent foundations, nonprofit organizations, school choice advocates, school operators, and district representatives; and whose function is to provide advice to the CEO on renewal and other issues as they relate to operator-led schools. In performing its review, the Advisory Board looks at all data and information, both quantitative and qualitative, to make sound recommendations to the CEO. After its review of the components above, the Advisory Board makes recommendations to City Schools’ CEO on whether charters or contracts should be renewed. The CEO considers the recommendations and the quantitative and qualitative review, and then makes her own recommendation to the Board. In some instances, the nature or severity of an issue raised during the renewal process is serious enough to give it extra weight in formulating the renewal recommendation and, ultimately, the renewal decision, especially in instances where the issue affects the wellbeing of students, staff, or the district as a whole. For the Financial Management/Governance section, a rating of not effective in any one of the three elements that make up that section results in a rating of not effective for the entire section.

According to Board policy, City Schools may determine that a public charter school is eligible for an eight-year contract term, five-year contract term, three-year contract term, or nonrenewal. The eight-year renewal term is an option based on the updated Public Charter School Policy IHBJ, adopted by the Board in September 2019. The policy allows the Board to consider an eight-year term for schools that have “two or more consecutive full renewals, including demonstrating quality programming for all student groups” and that have met the standard for a five-year renewal in the year of the latest review. The ultimate decision on all operator renewals rests with the Board, which considers the recommendations and rationale of the CEO, the operator renewal report, testimony

given at public Board meetings and work sessions, the contents of the official record and the factors listed in policy IHBJ and administrative regulation IHBJ-RA for charter schools, and policy FCA and administrative regulation FCA-RA for non-charter schools.

Actions	Timeline
Schools submit renewal applications	September 5, 2019
Charter and Operator-led Advisory Board reviews renewal applications and makes recommendations to the CEO	September to October 2019
District presents recommendations to Board at public meeting	November 12, 2019
Opportunity for operator to provide oral testimony to Board in a meeting open to the public	December 5, 2019
Board votes on renewal recommendations	January 14, 2020

Lillie May Carroll Jackson School (#371)

Operator: Girls Charter School, Inc.

Configuration: Middle

Type: Charter

Enrollment: 308¹

Recommendation

3-year renewal

Renewal summary

Category	Finding
Is the school an academic success? (min. 50% weight)	Developing
Does the school have a strong school climate?	Effective
Has the school followed sufficient financial management practices? ²	Developing
Has the school followed sufficient governance practices?	Developing

Discussion

On January 14, 2020, the Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners voted to renew the contract with Girls Charter School, Inc. to operate Lillie May Carroll Jackson School for a three-year term running from July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2023.

The school was rated developing in Academics and Financial Management/Governance, and effective in Climate.

In PARCC achievement growth, a measure that assesses changes in individual student growth over time compared to other students who started with a similar scale score, the school was rated developing in ELA 6-8 (54th percentile overall) and not effective in math 6-8 (39th percentile overall). This measure has the most weight of the PARCC measures in the renewal rubric. For PARCC absolute performance, schools are compared to a Poverty Index (PI) group, made up of schools with similar levels of annual household income within the same grade band because absolute performance is highly correlated with household income. The school was rated not effective in PARCC absolute performance in ELA 6-8 (18th percentile in its PI group, with a mean scale score of 721) and in math 6-8 (18th percentile in its PI group, with a mean scale score of 707). However, the

¹ Total enrollment counts reflect the MSDE official enrollment file for grades k-12, which includes students enrolled on September 30 each year. This file is verified by MSDE prior to becoming the official enrollment count for the year.

² Financial management considers a review of the operator's audits over the contract term. "Meets expectations" is the highest rating available, followed by "Developing" and "Does not meet expectations".

school was rated effective in Fidelity to Charter/Application Overall, indicating that it “has implemented the mission expressed in its charter application, and the mission is clear to most stakeholders...the school has made a good to fair effort to gather data to assess its efficacy and has implemented effective strategies to address any challenges evident in the data, particularly in the areas of enrollment, student attendance, dropout rates, attrition and student choice data/school demand.”

The school was rated effective in Vision and Engagement, a measure from the School Effectiveness Review that indicates the extent to which the school provides a safe and supportive learning environment, cultivates open communication and decision-making with the school community, and establishes a school culture that embraces community diversity. The school was also rated effective in Student Attendance: Chronic Absence, which evaluates not only a school’s data in that area, but also its practices and interventions implemented in response to those data. The school was rated developing in Suspensions which, like Chronic Absence, looks at a school’s data, practices and interventions in the area of student behavior, showing that “the school is aware of its suspension data, has positive behavior interventions in place, and has implemented strategies that the school believes will decrease suspensions,” such as the school’s restorative practices approach, “but these strategies have not yet been proven effective” as shown by the school’s increase in overall suspension rate in 2018-19. The school was rated developing in Operator Capacity, indicating that “during the charter or contract term the operator has received some Notices of Concern and limited or no Notices of Reprimand,” and reflecting issues with timeliness of submitting critical contract requirements and maximizing grant spending.

Findings (middle school rubric)

Category 1, Academics: Is the school an academic success?

Sub-Category	Renewal Metric	City Schools Rating
1.1 Absolute Student Achievement	Average Mean Scale Score PARCC Math (grades 6-8)	Not Effective
	Average Mean Scale Score PARCC ELA (grades 6-8)	Not Effective
1.2 Student Achievement Trend	Trend in Average Mean Scale Score PARCC Math (grades 6-8)	Not Effective
	Trend in Average Mean Scale Score PARCC ELA (grades 6-8)	Not Effective
1.3 Student Achievement Growth	Growth in Average Mean Scale Score PARCC Math (grades 6-8)	Not Effective
	Growth in Average Mean Scale Score PARCC ELA (grades 6-8)	Developing

<p>1.4 Fidelity to Charter/Application Overall</p>	<p>The extent to which the school has fully implemented the mission expressed in its charter application and this mission is clear to all stakeholders. The extent to which the school has delivered high quality programming for all student subgroups. The extent to which the school is gathering data to assess its efficacy and has effectively addressed any challenges evident in the data, particularly in the areas of subgroup performance, enrollment, student attendance, dropout rates, attrition and student choice data/school demand.</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>Academics Overall Rating</p>		<p>Developing</p>

Category 2, Climate: Does the school have a strong climate?

Sub-Category	Renewal Metric	City Schools Rating
<p>2.1 SER, Highly Effective Instruction</p>	<p>School Effectiveness Review Score - Highly Effective Instruction</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>2.2 SER, Talented People</p>	<p>School Effectiveness Review Score - Talented People</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>2.3 SER, Vision and Engagement</p>	<p>School Effectiveness Review Score - Vision and Engagement</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>2.4 Parent, Staff and Student Satisfaction</p>	<p>Staff: School Survey Staff Rating</p>	<p>Not Effective</p>
	<p>Students: School Survey Student Rating</p>	<p>Not Effective</p>
	<p>Parents: School Survey Parent Rating</p>	<p>Highly Effective</p>
<p>2.5 Cohort Retention</p>	<p>Cohort Retention Rating</p>	<p>N/A³</p>
<p>2.6 Student Attendance, Chronic Absence</p>	<p>The extent to which the school is aware of its chronic absence data, has strong processes in place to identify root causes and provide supports to families, and has implemented effective strategies that have kept chronic absence low over the course of the contract or have made significant reductions in chronic absence rates over time.</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>2.7 Suspensions</p>	<p>The extent to which the school is aware of its suspension data, has positive behavior interventions in place, and has implemented effective strategies that have kept suspensions low over the course of the contract or have resulted in significant decreases over time.</p>	<p>Developing</p>

³ Cohort retention was not able to be calculated for this school.

<p>2.8 Effective Programming for Students with Disabilities</p>	<p>The extent to which the school has demonstrated a strong trajectory of growth, is aware of its data and responsibilities to students with disabilities, does not have any gaps or has decreased gaps in the data as it relates to performance and climate metrics for students with disabilities over time, and has effectively and consistently implemented processes, interventions and strategies to support student outcomes over the course of the contract.</p>	<p>Developing</p>
<p>Climate Overall Rating</p>		<p>Effective</p>

Category 3, Finance and Governance: Has the school followed sufficient financial management and governance practices?

Sub-Category	Renewal Metric	City Schools Rating
<p>3.1 Audit Content, Internal Controls</p>	<p>The extent to which the school’s Independent Auditor’s Reports offer unqualified opinions and no management points in each of the years of the charter term. The extent to which statements of cash flow and ratio of assets to liabilities indicate that the operator has strong performance on their short-term liquidity measure.</p>	<p>Developing</p>
<p>Financial Management Overall Rating</p>		<p>Developing</p>
<p>3.2 Operator Capacity</p>	<p>The extent to which the school has operated effectively and the operator has consistently met all state, federal reporting requirements critical District or federal obligations and has not received any Notices of Concern or Notices of Reprimand during the contract period. (Evidence that may be considered include compliance with critical District, state or federal reporting requirements, timely audit and budget submissions, monitoring reports, quarterly reports; whether school has been able to meet financial obligations or needed loans/advances from the district to meet obligations, and the relative number, frequency and severity of Notices of Concern or Notices of Reprimand.)</p>	<p>Developing</p>
<p>3.3 SER, Strategic Leadership/Governance</p>	<p>School Effectiveness Review Score - Strategic Leadership</p>	<p>Effective</p>
<p>Governance Overall Rating</p>		<p>Developing</p>