



Delaware Department of Education

RENEWAL REPORT APRIL 30, 2016

PRESTIGE ACADEMY

Contents

Charter School Renewal Report..... 2

Academic Framework 2

 Changes in the Academic Framework..... 2

Academic Performance..... 3

 Delaware Academic Framework Report: 3

 Delaware School Success Framework..... 4

Organizational Framework..... 5

 Non-Material Violations..... 5

 Material Violations..... 6

Financial Framework..... 7

Charter School Renewal Report

Requirements under the law

The charter school law (14 *Del. C.* § 514A) outlines the provisions that the Delaware Department of Education (DDOE) follows for charter renewal and nonrenewal. The DDOE is required to review the preliminary performance of the charter school to determine its compliance with its charter and its satisfaction of the criteria set forth in this title for the purposes of renewal or nonrenewal¹. 14 *Del. C.* § 514A (c) states that,

(c) No later than April 30, the approving authority shall issue a charter school renewal report and charter renewal application guidance to any charter school whose charter will expire the following year. The renewal report shall summarize the charter school's performance record to date, based on the data required by 79 *Del. Laws*, c. 51 and the charter contract, and shall provide notice of any weaknesses or concerns perceived by the approving authority concerning the charter school that may jeopardize its position in seeking renewal if not timely rectified. The charter school shall have 10 working days to respond to the renewal report and submit any corrections or clarifications for the report.

Academic Framework

Changes in the Academic Framework

From School Year (SY) 2010-2011 through SY 2013-2014, the academic performance of all charter schools were evaluated using the Delaware Academic Framework Reports that were publishing annually. In July of 2015, the DDOE received approval from the United States Department of Education to use SY14/15 as a flexibility year for all schools in order to transition to a new accountability framework². This new accountability report is referred to as the Delaware School Success Framework (DSSF).

For the purposes of reporting the academic achievement for charter schools during this transition period, academic performance is broken down into reporting categories. These categories include:

- ❖ Academic Framework Reporting (SY10/11 through SY13/14): This report includes percentages reflecting: Student Progress Over Time (Growth), Student Achievement Status, State and Federal Accountability, Post-Secondary Readiness (High Schools Only), and Mission-Specific Academic Goals which were an optional measure.
- ❖ DSSF Reporting (SY14/15): This report includes two systems for ratings. Metric ratings represented by a one to five star rating for Academic Achievement, Academic Growth,

¹ A full copy of 14 *Del. C.* Chapter 5 can be found at: <http://delcode.delaware.gov/title14/c005/>

² US DOE Flexibility Letter can be found at http://www.doe.k12.de.us/cms/lib09/DE01922744/Centricity/domain/232/esea/DEESEA_Flex_Renewal_Letter_7-9-15.pdf.

Prestige Academy Charter School Renewal Report

On-Track to Graduation, and College and Career Readiness. This report also includes Academic Performance ratings in the four core subject areas (English Language Arts (ELA), Math, Science, and Social Studies) as well as Academic Growth, On Track to Graduation, and College and Career Preparation that are represented as a percentage.

Because these reports differ in how individual reporting categories are calculated, it would not be appropriate to incorporate the data from the DSSF into the Academic Framework utilized from 2010 through 2014. Because SY14/15 was a flexibility year, the charter school data is reported in relationship to the state for comparison purposes only.

Academic Performance

Delaware Academic Framework Report:

Year	1.a. Growth		1.b. Bottom 25%		1.c. Growth to Prof		2.a. Prof		2.b. Overall Subgroup		2.c. District		2.d. Similar Schools		3. AYP	4.a. SAT	4.b. Grad Rate	5.a. Mission Sp	Overall Rating/Scale	
	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Math	ELA						
2011-2012	D	D	M	D	D	D	D	F	M	D	M	D	M	D	M	N/A	N/A	N/A	D	55.6
2012-2013	D	M	M	M	D	M	D	F	D	D	D	D	D	D	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	D	55.9
2013-2014	D	F	M	D	D	D	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	D	D	N/A	N/A	N/A	D	39.1

Legend	E = Exceeds Standard	M = Meets Standard	D = Does Not Meet Standard	F = Falls Far Below Standard
--------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------

*Grey shading indicates that the number of students tested was insufficient to include results in the overall ratings; results are presented but not included in overall school rating.

According to the Delaware Academic Framework Report, Prestige Academy did not meet State Academic Standards three of the four years they were assessed. The last time the school met standard for their overall rating was in SY 10/11.

In 2013-2014, Prestige Academy showed an overall decline of 24.3 percentage points from its prior renewal.

Delaware School Success Framework

DSSF Year 2014/2015	Academic Performance % Proficiency				Academic Growth		Growth to proficiency		On Track to Graduation
	Math	ELA	Science	Studies	Math	ELA	Math	ELA	Attendance
Prestige Academy	12.8	16.7	14.2	22.9	46.1	47.6	1.1	15.6	95.2
Delaware	36	50.4	41.6	46.1			23.8	49.9	94.2

*Academic Growth has a norm of 50%.

According to the DSSF overall rating system, Prestige Academy scored the following ratings for overall school performance:

School Overall Performance



Academic Achievement

30% of Overall Performance

Students that are proficient have a greater likelihood of entry and success in education and career training beyond high school.



On Track to Graduation

10% of Overall Performance

Students who are on-track are more likely to complete high school on time, as well as succeed in education and training beyond high school.

Legend: What do the stars mean?

Far Below



Needs Improvement



Approaching



Meets



Exceeds



Academic Growth

40% of Overall Performance

Schools with strong growth demonstrate a greater ability to improve student learning over time.



College & Career Preparation

20% of Overall Performance

Students that maintain or grow to proficiency are more likely to be prepared for success in education and career training beyond high school.

Organizational Framework

Year	1a	1b	2	3a	3b	3c	4a	4b	4c	4d	5a	5b	6	Overall Rating
2011-2012	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	N/a	M	M	M	M	Meets Standard
2012-2013	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	D	M	M	M	M	Meets Standard
2013-2014	M	M	D	M	M	M	M	D	D	M	M	M	M	Meets Standard
2014-2015	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	D	M	M	M	M	Meets Standard

Legend	E = Exceeds Standard	M = Meets Standard	Standard	Standard
--------	----------------------	--------------------	----------	----------

From 2011 through 2015, Prestige Academy had an overall rating of ‘Meets Standard’ for the organizational framework reporting, however, there were five areas where Prestige Academy received a score of ‘does not meet standard’ noted within the annual reports.

Non-Material Violations

In 2014-2015, there was a non-material violation noted for Measure 1a. in relationship to the charter’s education program and compliance with federal regulations. It was noted that based on information available to the DOE, the charter school was implementing the essential terms of the education program in all material respects, including but not limited to Del. C., Title 14, Ch. 5, §512 (3), and the education program in operation reflected the essential terms as defined in the charter. While the charter school earned an overall rating of “Meets Standard” for the 2014-15 school year, the DOE noted the following non-material issues:

- Social Studies participation rate of 95% on state assessment not met (94.03%)
- Education of Homeless Students – Did not provide budget upon request.

There were also findings in relationship to meeting the financial reporting of Measure 2. In 2013-14, the school was found to be in non-compliance for:

- Monthly reconciliations were not provided to the Division of Accounting per regulation.
- Citizen Budget Oversight Committee meeting information was not posted per statutory requirements

Based on information available to the DOE during the 2014-15 school year, the charter school materially complied with applicable laws, rules, regulations and provisions of the charter relating to financial reporting requirements. While the charter school earned an overall rating of “Meets Standard” for the 2014-15 school year, the DOE noted the following non-material issues:

- Non-compliant PCard internal control policies (since corrected)

- Ongoing Charter School Office monitoring of the charter school's website found that documents relating to financial oversight were not posted as required by code at multiple points during the reporting period. These included monthly financial statements, audited financial statements, Citizen Budget Oversight Committee (CBOC) agendas, CBOC minutes, and CBOC meeting notice (since corrected)

In 2013-2014 Prestige also failed to meet standards for its annual attendance goals for Measure 4b. In 2013-2014 it was noted:

- Area of non-compliance for 2013-14: Noncompliant with the attendance goal of 95%.

It was later noted in the 2014-2015 Organizational Framework Report that based on information available to the DOE during the 2014-15 school year, the charter school materially complied with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter relating to attendance goals. While the charter school earned an overall rating of “Meets Standard” for the 2014-15 school year, the DOE noted the following non-material issue:

- Reporting requirements – failure to correctly report crimes as required by 14 Del. C. § 4112, and failure to code students as being placed in a Consortium Discipline Alternative Program as required by 14 DE Admin. C. 611.3.0 (since corrected)

Material Violations

From 2012 through 2015, Prestige has struggled with meeting Measure 4c by failing to materially comply with applicable laws, rules, regulations, and provisions of the charter (including the federal Highly Qualified Teacher requirements within Title II of the ESEA) relating to state certification requirements and background checks. This standard specifically noted the school’s failure to meet regulations for highly qualified teacher (HQT) requirements. The following was noted:

- Area of non-compliance for 2013-14: Highly Qualified Teacher (HQT) percentage did not meet the statutory requirement.
- 2014-2015 - Highly-Qualified Teacher (HQT) requirement not met (64.5%)

Financial Framework

Year	1a	1b	1c	1d	2a	2b	2c	2d	Overall Rating
2011-2012	M	M	M	M	NR	D	NR	M	Meets Standard
2012-2013	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	M	Meets Standard
2013-2014	M	M	D	M	D	M	D	D	Does Not Meet Standard
2014-2015	M	D	F	M	D	D	F	D	Falls Below Standard

Legend	E = Exceeds Standard	M = Meets Standard	D = Does Not Meet Standard	F = Falls Far Below Standard	NR= Not reported
--------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------------	------------------------------	------------------

For the Financial Reporting Framework, Prestige Academy was found to have met standards for two of the five years of review.

It was noted in 2010-2011 that the school struggled with Measure 1a due to the fact that Prestige Academy failed to meet the preferred result of 1.0 indicating that the school’s assets exceed its current liabilities.

It was also noted that the Prestige Academy failed to meet the 60 day threshold for cash on hand for required of Measure B (Days Cash) in both 2010-2011 and 2014-2015.

For Measure 1C, Enrollment Variance, it was noted the school did not meet standards in relationship to the enrollment variance when comparing actual versus authorized enrollment. (A school budgets based on projected enrollment but is funded based on actual enrollment; therefore, a school that fails to meet its enrollment targets may not be able to meet its budgeted expenses. The preferred result is more than 95%.) The results of this comparison in relationship to the desired 95% equated to:

- 2010-2011 – 81% - Does not meet standard
- 2013-2014- 91%- Does not meet standard
- 2014-2015 – 78% - Far below standard

For Measure 2b, Debt to Asset Ratio Measure, the school also failed to meet the .90 threshold three of the five years assessed.

- 2010-2011 – 1.02 - Far below standard
- 2013-2014- .92- Does not meet standard
- 2014-2015 – .98 - Does not meet standard

The 2c Cash Flow Measure as well as the 2d Debt Service Coverage Ratio found similar trends in the school’s ability to meet standards. For 2c Cash flow, a measure of the trend in the school’s cash balance over a period of time, Prestige did not meet standards in 2013-2014 and fell far

below standard in 2014-2015. For Measure 2d, Debt Service Coverage Ratio, the measure of the school's ability to cover its debt obligation in the current year (the preferred result is 1.1), Prestige Academy did not meet standards in 2010-11, 2013-14, and 2014-15.

It should be noted that Prestige Charter School has not met the required 80% enrollment threshold for the school year 2016-2017.

It should also be noted that the school is currently being financially monitored by the Department of Education due to concerns about its financial viability for this school year. Should Prestige Academy Charter School not make a deposit of funds sufficient to cover the school's end of year expenditures in May, the Department of Education may take measures to freeze the school's spending and establish payroll reserves.