New York State Education Department

Renewal

design; for example, career exploration is embedded in each curriculum and teachers carry out classroom and outside activities that support this theme.

Charter School for Applied Technologies (CSAT) staff have secured and maintain four ASPCA Paws for Life-certified therapy dogs to support students' social and emotional learning needs and literacy development. In addition to therapeutic check-ins to reduce student stress and anxiety, and improve school attendance, students read to the therapy dogs individually and in small groups to build confidence and engagement.

Renewal Outcomes

Pursuant to the Board of Regents Renewal Policy, the following are possible renewal outcomes:

- **Full-Term Renewal:** A school's charter may be renewed for the maximum term of five years. For a school to be eligible for a full-term renewal, during the current charter term the school must have compil3 ((t)1 (d)-0.7 (u8)-3.2 (n)-0J-0.001 Tc -0.04 Tw [A)1..3 (c)-1.9 (o)4. (o)-6.6 (u)2.2 (e)-36 (are)-3 (d)2.

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

Current Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2015 to 2016	Year 2 2016 to 2017	Year 3 2017 to 2018	Year 4 2018 to 2019	Year 5 2019 to 2020
Grade Configuration	K-Grade 12	K-Grade 12	K-Grade 12	K-Grade 12	K-Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	2,224	2,224	2,224	2,365	2,365

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and 12

c. **A map of the school** showing a basic floor plan, including classroom numbers, teacher names, and offices;
d. **Board materials**, strategic plan (if applicable), and a narrative describing the board's self-evaluation process;
e.

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

The Performance Framework, which is part of the oversight plan included in the Charter Agreement for

New York State Education Department
Charter School Performance Framework Rating

	Performance Benchmark	Level
Educational Success	**Benchmark 1: Student Performance:** The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic trends toward proficiency, proficiency, and high school graduation. At all grade levels and all assessments, scoring proficiently means achieving a performance level of 3 or higher (high school Regents and Common Core Regents exam score of 65 or higher).	Meets
	Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning: School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students' well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLS) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.	Meets
	Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Family Engagement: The school has systems in place to support students' social and emotional health and to provide for a safe and respectful learning environment. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school's academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.	Meets
ness	**Benchmark 4: Financial Condition:** The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.	Meets
	Benchmark 5: Financial Management: The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls and ounting practices.	Meets
Organizational Sc	**Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance**: The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.	Meets

provides easy and simultaneous access to all instructional leadership for responsive oversight. Over 99% of teachers' responses to the CSO's anonymous online survey agree that CSAT "has a documented curriculum that is aligned to the NYSLS."

Indicator b: During the onsite school leadership focus group interview, administrators described how CSAT's instructional [illegible]

communication through an array of online platforms to share information about trends as well as progress of specific students.

Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Family Engagement
The school has systems in place to support students' social and emotional health and to provide for a safe and respectful learning

further below, CSAT leadership has evolved the school's philosophy and methodology toward

Charter School

Composite Scores
2014-2015 to 2018-2019

Year	*Composite Score*
2014-2015	2.00
2015-2016	2.66
2016-2017	2.84
2017-2018	2.72
2018-2019	2.97

Benchmark 5: Financial Management

The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, including appropriate internal controls and procedures in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.

respectively. Overall, these statistics demonstrate a steadily increasing margin of variance to Buffalo Public Schools.

- **Indicator b:** The school has implemented extensive recruitment strategies and program services to attract and retain SWDs, ELLs/MLLs, and ED students. In its renewal application and during the renewal visit, the board as well as school leaders described CSAT's good faith efforts to increase ELL/MLL and SWD enrollment rates. This year, the school invested in significant marketing and promotional efforts to spread information about its program offerings to all community stakeholders, potential students, and their families in multiple languages and media formats. In addition, school leaders maintain relationships with community-based organizations, make presentations at places of worship, distribute informational materials and applications at area supermarkets, and various street fairs. If these strategies do not yield sufficient results, the board intends to consider utilizing a lottery preference to increase enrollment of ELL/MLL students and those with disabilities.
- **Indicator c:** The school has implemented a systematic process for evaluating recruitment and outreach strategies and program services for each of the three categories of students, and makes strategic improvements as needed. During onsite focus groups, both school leadership and board members described closely monitoring community outreach efforts and enrollment patterns to determine which methods prove most effective, and continuously seek to build relationships across the city to further these goals.

See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional information.

Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance
The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.

Finding: Meets

Element	Indicators
1.	

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 10:

1. Element***: Legal Compliance:***
   - **Indicator a:** Through a distributed leadership model that tasks various administrators with compliance-related responsibilities, CSAT has compiled a record of substantial compliance with applicable state and federal laws and the provisions of its charter. A CSO review of policies resulted in a number of corrections being required to align with law and regulation. The school made the needed changes and the revised policies were approved.
   - **Indicator b:** The school has undertaken appropriate corrective action when needed and has implemented necessary safeguards to maintain compliance with all legal requirements. To accomplish this, its trustees and administration avail themselves of services from Erie 1 BOCES and the school retains legal counsel through a local firm with deep expertise in school law and charter schools in particular.
   - **Indicator c:** The school has sought Board of Regents and/or Charter School Office approval for significant revisions since opening in 2001; but has sought no material changes over its current charter term.

Attachment 1: 2019-2020 Renewal Site Visit

Charter School for Applied Technologies

Benchmark 1

Indicator 1: All Schools

1.a.i. Accountability - ESEA Accountability Designation

This school is designated as a school in Good Standing under current New York State criteria as defined by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

1.b.i. Similar Schools Comparison - Comparative Proficiency Cchi4fie2904 0 0 11.-1.9 05atl-35853d26 (rk39a)-2.3

Table 2a: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes: Charter School, District, and NYS

	CS for Applied Technologies	Buffalo Public Schools	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	CS for Applied Technologies	Buffalo Public Schools	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS
2014-2015	14%	12%	+2	31%	-17	21%	15%	+6	38%	-17
2015-2016	18%	16%	+2	38%	-20	19%	16%	+3	39%	-20
2016-2017	24%	18%	+6	40%	-16	24%	17%	+7	40%	-16
2017-2018	28%	23%	+5	45%	-17	28%	21%	+7	45%	-17
2018-2019	30%	25%	+5	45%	-15	30%	21%	+9	47%	-17
2014-2015	3%	3%	0	7%	-4	10%	6%	+4	12%	-2
2015-2016	5%	4%	+1	9%	-4	11%	6%	+5	12%	-1
2016-2017	6%	5%	+1	11%	-5	11%	7%	+4	14%	-3
2017-2018	10%	9%	+1	16%	-6	15%	9%	+6	17%	-2
2018-2019	14%	10%	+4	15%	-1	17%	10%	+7	18%	-1
2014-2015	5%	3%	+2	10%	-5	0%	5%	-5	19%	-19
2015-2016	0%	3%	-3	13%	-13	0%	5%	-5	20%	-20
2016-2017	0%	2%	-2	12%	-12	0%	4%	-4	19%	-19
2017-2018	21%	11%	+10	25%	-4	7%	10%	-3	29%	-22
2018-2019	18%	14%	+4	25%	-7	14%	12%	+2	31%	-17
2014-2015	11%	8%	+3	-2-2	-2-2-2					

*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7) below.

Table2b: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes: Charter School, District, and NYS

		ELA					Math				
		CS for Applied Technologies	Kenmore-Tonawanda UFSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS	CS for Applied Technologies	Kenmore-Tonawanda UFSD	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS
All Students	2014-2015	14%	28%	-14	31%	-17	21%	36%	-15	38%	-17
	2015-2016	18%	30%	-12	38%	-20	19%	32%	-13	39%	-20
	2016-2017	24%	32%	-8	40%	-16	24%	34%	-10	40%	-16
	2017-2018	28%	38%	-10	45%	-17	28%	41%	-13	45%	-17
	2018-2019	30%	35%	-5	45%	-15	30%	44%	-14	47%	-17
SWD	2014-2015	3%	7%	-4	7%	-4	10%	15%	-5	12%	-2
	2015-2016	5%	10%	-5	9%	-4	11%	11%	0	12%	-1
	2016-2017	6%	9%	-3	11%	-5	11%	12%	-1	14%	-3
	2017-2018	10%	11%	-1	16%	-6	15%	14%	+1	17%	-2
	2018-2019	14%	10%	+4	15%	-1	17%	15%	+2	18%	-1
ELL/MLL	2014-2015	5%	4%	+1	10%	-5	0%	9%	-9	19%	-19
	2015-2016	0%	5%	-5	13%	-13	0%	7%	-7	20%	-20
	2016-2017	0%	12%	-12	12%	-12	0%	13%	-13	19%	-19
	2017-2018	21%	25%	-4	25%	-4	7%	27%	-20	29%	-22
	2018-2019	18%	14%	+4	25%	-7	14%	23%	-9	31%	-17
ED	2014-2015	11%	18%	-7	21%	-10	18%	24%	-6	27%	-9
	2015-2016	16%	19%	-3	27%	-11	17%	20%	-3	28%	-11
	2016-2017	21%	22%	-1	29%	-8	22%	23%	-1	29%	-7
	2017-2018	26%	29%	-3	36%	-10	26%	29%	-3	34%	-8
	2018-2019	30%	25%	+5	36%	-6	30%	33%	-3	37%	-7

*See NOTES (1), (2), (3), (6), and (7) below.

2.b.iii. Aggregate Grade Level Proficiency: See Tables 3a and 3b below.

Table 3a: Aggregate Grade Level Proficiency

	CS for Applied Technologies	Buffalo Public Schools	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS
2014-2015	18%	12%	+6	31%	

	CS for Applied Technologies	Buffalo Public Schools	Differential to District	NYS	Differential to NYS

*See NOTES (1), (6), and (7) below.

Table 3b: Aggregate Grade Level Proficiency

Table 5: Regents 4-Year Cohort Outcomes

	Charter Total Cohort	CS for Applied Technologies	NYS	Differential to NYS	Charter Total Cohort	CS for Applied Technologies	NYS	Differential to NYS	Charter Total Cohort	CS for Applied Technologies	NYS	Differential to NYS	Charter Total Cohort	CS for Applied Technologies	NYS	Differential to NYS
2012 Cohort	105	95%	85%	+10	9	67%	53%	+14	.	.	.	.	91	96%	79%	+17
2013 Cohort	125	89%	85%	+4	19	58%	55%	+3	.	.	.	.	112	90%	80%	+10
2014 Cohort	136	84%	84%	0	17	35%	54%	-19	.	.	.	.	109	83%	78%	+5
2015 Cohort	157	92%	84%	+8	14	50%	55%	-5	9	100%	55%	+45	124	94%	79%	+15
2012 Cohort	105	94%	78%	+16	9	56%	42%	+14	.	.	.	.	91	95%	70%	+25
2013 Cohort	125	89%	78%	+11	19	63%	42%	+21	.	.	.	.	112	88%	70%	+18
2014 Cohort	136	90%	77%	+13	17	71%	42%	+29	.	.	.	.	109	89%	69%	+20
2015 Cohort	157	92%	78%	+14	14	86%	43%	+43	9	100%	48%	+52	124	92%	70%	+22
2012 Cohort	105	97%	86%	+11	9	67%	52%	+15	.	.	.	.	91	98%	81%	+17
2013 Cohort	125	91%	85%	+6	19	68%	50%	+18	.	.	.	.				

*See NOTES (2), (3), (4), and (7) below.

3.b.i. and 3.b.ii. Graduation Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Cohort Graduation Rates: See Table below.

Table 6: High School Graduation Rates by Cohort

*See NOTES (2), (3), (5), and (7) below.

3.b.iii. and 3.b.iv. Graduation Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup On Track to Graduate – See Table 7 below.

Table 7: Third Year On-Track to Graduate – Target = 75%

*See NOTES ((2), (3), (4), (7), and (9) below.

3.b.v. and 3.b.vi. Graduation Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Student Persistence: See Table 9 below.

Table 8: High School 4-Year Persistence Rates – Target = 85%

	All Students			SWD								
CS for Applied Technologies	Original Cohort	Persistent	4 Year Persistance	Original Cohort	Persistent	4 Year Persistance	Original Cohort	Persistent	4 Year Persistance	Original Cohort	Persistent	4 Year Persistance
2013 Cohort	121	93	77%	22	14	64%	6	6	100%	102	82	80%
2014 Cohort	144	112	78%	18	15	83%	.	.	.	117	89	76%
2015 Cohort	156	119	76%	18	13	72%	8	8	100%	134	100	75%

*See NOTES (2), (3), (4), (5), (7), and (10) below.

Benchmark 9

Table 9a: Student Demographics comparison to Buffalo Public Schools

	SWD			ELL/MLL			ED		
	CS for Applied Technologies	Buffalo Public Schools	Differential to District	CS for Applied Technologies	Buffalo Public Schools	Differential to District	CS for Applied Technologies	Buffalo Public Schools	Differential to District
2015-2016	14%	22%	-8	3%	16%	-13	85%	82%	+3
2016-2017	14%	22%	-8	4%	16%	-12	88%	79%	+9
2017-2018	14%	23%	-9	6%	21%	-15	89%	82%	+7
2018-2019	13%	23%	-10	7%	22%	-15	77%	83%	-6

*See NOTES (2), (3), and (6) below.

Table 9b: Student Demographics comparison to Kenmore-Tonawanda Union Free School District

	SWD			ELL/MLL			ED		
	CS for Applied Technologies	Kenmore-Tonawanda UFSD	Differential to District	CS for Applied Technologies	Kenmore-Tonawanda UFSD	Differential to District	CS for Applied Technologies	Kenmore-Tonawanda UFSD	Differential to District
2015-2016	14%	20%	-6	3%	3%	0	85%	43%	+42
2016-2017	14%	20%	-6	4%	4%	0	88%	43%	+45
2017-2018	14%	20%	-6	6%	5%	+1	89%	50%	+39
2018-2019	13%	21%	-8	7%	4%	+3	77%	50%	+27

*See NOTES (2) and (6) below.

Table 10a: Retention – Aggregate and Subgroups comparison to Buffalo Public Schools

*See NOTES (2), (3), and (6) below.

Table 10b: Retention – Aggregate and Subgroups comparison to Kenmore Tonawanda Union Free School District

*See NOTES (2) and (6) below.

*NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on the NYS ELA and/or