



Renewal Report
The REACH! Partnership School (341)

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

The REACH! Partnership School (#341)

Operator: Civic Works, Inc.

Configuration: High

Type: Transformation

Enrollment: 587¹

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?	Developing
Has the school followed sufficient financial management practices? ²	Meets Expectations
Has the school followed sufficient governance practices?	Effective

Discussion

On January 14, 2020, the Baltimore City Board of School Commissioners voted to renew the contract with Civic Works, Inc. to operate The REACH! Partnership School for a three-year term running from July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2023.

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

In PARCC achievement trend, which assesses changes in school-level achievement over time, the school was rated highly effective in ELA 10 (88th percentile overall) and developing in Algebra I (50th percentile overall). 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 is rated highly effective in PARCC absolute performance in ELA 10 (82nd percentile in its PI group with a mean scale score of 688) and effective in Algebra I (73rd percentile in its PI group, with a mean scale score of 700). However, the school was rated not effective in College and Career Readiness, which considers participation and success in career and college indicators (e.g., SAT, Advanced Placement, and Career and Technical Education) and enrollment in college. The school was also rated not

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".

effective in 4-year Cohort Graduation Rate, with only 66% of seniors in 2018 graduating within four years of entry into high school.

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. However, the school was rated developing in programming for students with disabilities, indicating the “school is working toward a trajectory of growth” for students with disabilities, “but in some instances has struggled to take measures that are appropriate and sufficient.” This is an area where the school must work to improve practice.

Findings (high 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 Algebra 1	Effective
	Average Mean Scale Score PARCC ELA 10	Highly Effective
1.2 Student Achievement Trend	Trend in Average Mean Scale Score PARCC Algebra 1	Developing
	Trend in Average Mean Scale Score PARCC ELA 10	Highly Effective
1.3 College and Career Readiness	Participation, success, and college enrollment	Not Effective
1.4 Fidelity to Charter/Application Overall	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.	Developing
1.5 Student Graduation Rate: 4-year Cohort Graduation Rate	Percent of diploma-track students who graduated from City Schools in 2017-18 with the cohort that entered in school year 2014-15 with a regular Maryland High School Diploma.	Not Effective
Academics Overall Rating		Developing

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

Sub-Category	Renewal Metric	City Schools Rating
2.1 SER, Highly Effective Instruction	School Effectiveness Review Score - Highly Effective Instruction	Effective
2.2 SER, Talented People	School Effectiveness Review Score - Talented People	Effective
2.3 SER, Vision and Engagement	School Effectiveness Review Score - Vision and Engagement	Effective
2.4 Parent, Staff and Student Satisfaction	Staff: School Survey Staff Rating	Not Effective
	Students: School Survey Student Rating	Not Effective
	Parents: School Survey Parent Rating	Developing
2.5 Cohort Retention	Cohort Retention Rating	N/A³
2.6 Student Attendance, Chronic Absence	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.	Not Effective
2.7 Suspensions	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.	Effective
2.8 Effective Programming for Students with Disabilities	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.	Developing
Climate Overall Rating		Developing

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

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>Meets Expectations</p>
<p>Financial Management Overall Rating</p>		<p>Meets Expectations</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>Effective</p>