

Office of Communications and School Performance **Department of Contracted School Services**

5225 W. Vliet Street Milwaukee, WI 53208

(414) 475-8140 • mps.milwaukee.k12.wi.us

Fax (414) 475-8471

| Charter School Renewal Recommendation | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Charter School | Kathryn T. Daniels University Preparatory Academy | |
| Date of Site Visit | December 6, 2019 | |

The renewal recommendation is based on a thorough review and analysis of information and data from the following:

- **Charter School Performance Summary**
- Application for Renewal
- School Site Visit

| Charter School Performance Summary | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--|--|
| Rating: | Met the Standard | Did Not Meet the Standard | | |
| Educational Performance | | X | | |
| Financial Performance | X | | | |
| Organizational Performance | | X | | |
| Summary Comments: | | | | |

The mission of Kathryn T. Daniels University Preparatory Academy (KTD) is to design a rigorous K-8 college preparatory program with highly skilled teachers and an unwavering commitment to utilize the most powerful instructional techniques and methodologies. The vision of KTD is to create a rich K-8 learning environment that integrates the performing arts and technology in order to prepare future leaders for service in our urban community and beyond.

Educational Performance:

As indicated in the Charter School Performance Summary, the Pupil Academic Achievement Report and the evidence provided by the school, KTD has failed to meet the majority of its educational performance measures as outlined under the contract. It has demonstrated a decline in several areas of the Wisconsin Student Assessment System (WSAS) including English Language Arts (ELA), mathematics and science. They have also shown a decline in attendance. KTD did meet the mobility rate measure, but showed slight improvements in the stability rate. Although it did not meet the local measures relating to the STAR assessment, it did demonstrate some growth, particularly in grades 3 through 5. Furthermore, KTD also demonstrated a decline in the State Report Card from Meeting Few Expectations in 2017-18 to Fails to Meet Expectations in 2018-19.

KTD acknowledged and accepted responsibility for these shortfalls. KTD seemed committed to working with staff and students improving student performance. KTD is particularly committed to working with students to address the social-emotional needs and other issues that students face in an effort to not only improve academic performance, but the whole child.

KTD has had instructional coaches in place for previous school years. They hired new instructional coaches for the 2019-20 school year that started in November 2019. The school also referenced the use of Saturday Academy to support the academic needs of students; however, it was noted that they focus on students who participate in extra-curricular activities and it does not appear to be students who have been identified for additional support. The implementation of Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Math (STEAM) has not been started and will be offered as a club for students in

the spring semester, particularly through a robotics program.

Financial Performance:

KTD has generally met the majority of the contract's financial measures. When issues have been raised, KTD has worked with its administration, its board and MPS to rectify outstanding issues as needed. The budget deficit from 2017-18 by the school, as indicated in the financial audit, was covered by the agency funds to maintain a balanced budget.

Organizational Performance:

KTD has met the majority of the organizational performance measures; however, concerns remain regarding employment qualifications and health and safety. KTD continues to struggle to recruit and retain highly qualified staff. There has been significant turnover in staff and administration. Due to this turnover, KTD has sought to hire additional staff to improve academic performance as well as to support staff. KTD's record relating to immunizations has continued to decline. While KTD acknowledged the concerns, the responses provided to the concerns were rather brief and limited and did not address the core issues.

KTD has a committed board and strong support of families, students and the community. KTD has taken advantage of its parent organization as well as the partnership with the Boys and Girls Club to provide opportunities for students and families. KTD has begun to develop additional partnerships to provide fine arts to students.

| Application for Renewal | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Met the Standard | Did Not Meet the Standard | | | |
| The Application for Renewal provides <i>clear</i> , <i>concise</i> and compelling information in the areas of Educational, Financial and Organizational Performance. The school has: Included ample evidence of increased student achievement or shown continuous improvement; Provided credible examples and documented evidence of its financial performance; and Illustrated sufficiently and convincingly that it is organizationally sound. The school's plans for continued success are clearly and effectively outlined with full details, descriptions, and explanations. | The Application for Renewal does not provide clear, concise and compelling information in the areas of Educational, Financial and Organizational Performance. The school did not satisfactorily address application components. Responses lack details. Descriptions and/or examples are underdeveloped. The school provided: ☐ Insufficient evidence of increased student achievement or continuous improvement; ☐ Unclear examples and evidence of its financial performance; and ☐ Inadequate evidence that it is organizationally sound. ☐ The school's plans for continued success are unclear and not fully described or developed. | | | |
| | X | | | |

Summary Comments:

The application for renewal does not provide clear and concise information regarding future goals and plans to increase academic performance. The school acknowledged its challenges relating to student proficiency on the WSAS and in the STAR assessment. The school has hired additional staff members to address these deficiencies and to help ensure greater fidelity in implementation of the educational programming. It should be noted that while some of these staff have been identified in the application, not all positions appear to be in place, and many have only been brought in recently (e.g., instructional coach and coach/mentor for the Principal).

The application provided little documentation to support strong financial performance and financial forecast moving forward, but it should be noted that the school has generally met these performance measures and has worked to address any discrepancies and deficiencies.

The school provided evidence relating to the organizational performance, specifically as it relates to the leadership to help implement change and development in the educational program. There is evidence of parental support and the Parent Advisory Board (PAB) has plans to become more active moving forward. The school had information relating to plans moving forward to improve academics and organizational performance that address academics, shape the whole child and would provide for improvement of systems moving forward. Concerns remain as to why the school has not already or previously implemented these plans. It is clear that the transition in leadership and constant turnover of staff had an impact on this process.

Another area of concern is declining enrollment and retention of students. Some of this is attributed to the turnover of staff as well as the competitive market; however, it would have been beneficial to receive more information regarding how this concern will be addressed moving forward.

| School Site Visit | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Met the Standard | Did Not Meet the Standard | | | |
| Charter school site visit provided excellent further evidence that the school is meeting performance standards. ☑ School presentations clearly and effectively communicated information from its Application for Renewal. ☑ School sufficiently addressed any issues/concerns raised by the MPS Charter School Contract Review Team members. ☑ School (if appropriate) provided sufficient supplementary information to further clarify performance results and ratings. ☑ Samples of student work and classroom visits reflect strongly and positively the school's teaching and learning practices. | Charter school site visit did not provide compelling evidence that the school is meeting performance standards. ☐ School presentations insufficiently communicated information from its Application for Renewal. ☐ School did not adequately address issues/ concerns raised by the MPS Charter School Contract Review Team members. ☐ School did not provide ample supplementary information to clarify performance results and ratings. ☐ Samples of student work and classroom visits did not necessarily positively reflect the school's teaching and learning practices. | | | |
| X | | | | |

Summary Comments:

The school visit consisted of testimony of parents, administrators, the governing body, teachers, community partners, student focus groups, classroom observations and performances by students. The school presentations communicated information from the school's Application for Renewal, and the samples of student work and classroom visits reflected the school's teaching and learning practices. However, the school did not adequately address concerns raised by the Review Team and did not provide supplementary information to clarify the reasons for low academic performance or plans to address the concerns.

KTD acknowledged shortfalls on academic performance measures. The administration and governing body seemed committed to making improvements in this area, including hiring an assessment coordinator and academic coach. However, much of the responses relating to poor academic performance revolved around addressing social-emotional supports around the students without addressing the strategies that would be utilized to improve the academic outcomes. The school indicated that there was more attention being given to data and more professional development with teaching staff to implement data-driven instruction and research-based strategies.

Students and families voiced appreciation for the school. They particularly appreciated the family environment and how the school engaged the whole child's needs. Students and parents expressed that the school was improving over time. Student testimony included the following:

"KT Daniels is a fun learning environment and they never let us fail and push us forward."

"At KT Daniels, everyone connects with each other on the same level, no one is higher or lower...everyone excels together."

The classroom visits provided evidence of objectives, expectations and posted schedules. Students appeared to be engaged and interested in the learning. When asked, students seemed to understand what they were working on and were respectful. Nearly every classroom had two adults present and roaming the classroom. Some classes utilized small group work and in those classes, even groups without direct adult supervision showed students were engaged, working together and supporting one another. Students were participating in African drum, African dance and tap dance. Schedules indicated that the school offered music and other programming and clubs relating to technology and the arts. Although the school's educational program and application referenced technology and each room had a least four computers and a SmartBoard, there was little use of technology demonstrated during the classroom visits. Furthermore, questions were raised as to why the dance, music and Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics (STEAM) programming are still in the early implementation phase or have yet to be implemented.

| | Charter School Review Team Renewal Recommendation *The recommendation by the Charter School Review Team is set forth below: | | | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Full-Term Term of 5 Years | To be eligible, schools must be in the last year of the contract term and have achieved the following: There is a strong and compelling record of evidence that the school met or exceeded the performance standards in the areas of Educational Performance, Financial Performance, and Organizational Performance. Guidelines for Recommending Five-Year Renewal: The Team determines that a school primarily merits Met the Standard ratings in the performance areas. A school that receives mixed ratings may be recommended for a full five-year renewal term if | | | |
| | sufficient additional evidence obtained from the school's Application for Renewal and School Site Visit make this a credible recommendation. To be eligible, schools must be in the last year of the contract term and have achieved the following: | | | |
| Short-Term Term of 3 Year | There is a strong and compelling record of evidence that the school met or exceeded a considerable number of the performance standards in the areas of Educational Performance, Financial Performance, and Organizational Performance and/or shows continuous, meaningful improvement toward meeting the performance standards. Guidelines for Recommending Three-Year Renewal: The Team determines that a school primarily merits Met the Standard ratings or demonstrates continuous and meaningful improvement in the performance areas. | | | |
| | A school that receives mixed ratings may be recommended for a three-year renewal term if evidence obtained from the school's Application for Renewal and School Site Visit make this a credible recommendation. | | | |
| Non- Renewal / Revocation | The school does not apply for renewal or the school's educational, financial, and/or organizational performance results do not meet defined standards and are deemed unsatisfactory. This would result in a recommendation for non-renewal/revocation. Guidelines for Recommending Non-Renewal / Revocation: The school receives a Did Not Meet the Standard in all three areas of performance. A school that receives mixed ratings may be recommended for non-renewal/revocation if | | | |
| Summary Comments | evidence obtained from the school's Performance Summary, Application for Renewal, and School Site Visit make this a credible recommendation. | | | |

Summary Comments:

*Although the Charter School Review Team recognizes the rubric for the charter school renewal recommendation as outlined above generally provides for a short-term renewal of a three-year term, the Team is recommending a one-year charter school renewal for the reasons outlined below.

The school community advocates for this school and supports the notion of it; however, the school is struggling to serve its students. Less than one percent of students are proficient in any subject area according to the state standards for their grade level and zero students are proficient in math and science. Furthermore, KTD does not fully take advantage of the flexibility that is afforded to charters:

freedom of curriculum choice, teacher training and backgrounds and community ties. For example, KTD uses MPS's curriculum and does not always employ and retain highly qualified teachers. The school claims to focus on arts and technology, and it is certainly growing in the area of arts (especially dance).

There are clear and strong concerns relating to academic performance and growth at KTD and there are some issues relating to organizational performance that need to be addressed moving forward. Of particular concern is the fact that many of the plans and approaches are only recently being implemented and it may take additional time to determine how successful they will be. The governing body has demonstrated a commitment to the school and making improvements in leadership and staffing that might make a difference. The leadership is clearly committed to making changes moving forward.

The school is aware of the need to improve academic performance and has hired instructional coaches to address this area of improvement as well as the systems that are in place. Attempts have been made to improve teacher licensing and address the staff retention challenges. Though the gap between current and expected performance is wide, the Team recommends a short renewal period to assess improvement and measure performance, given the apparent commitment to students and the level of parental involvement.

KTD has experienced significant staff turnover throughout its existence. The issue of finding qualified leaders and teachers presses KTD as it does all MPS schools, and this is an enormous hurdle in creating a school that grows successful and prepared students. The new principal shows promise because of her experiences, commitment to teaching, and creative approaches to learning. However, there is no denying that KTD has challenges and that the leader is supported by an experienced leadership staff that will assist her in moving students forward. It is for this reason that the Charter School Review Team has recommended a one-year charter school renewal for Kathryn T. Daniels University Preparatory Academy.

MPS Charter School Review Team Members

Richard Anderson MPS Contracted School Services

Mickell Daniels Community Member

Janessa Doucette MPS Research and Assessment
Lisa Haar MPS School Performance Coordinator
Marva Herndon Milwaukee Board of School Directors

Ashley Hughes MPS Finance Felecia Jasper-Mitchel MPS Finance

Suzanne Maldonado Community Member

Andrew Muriuki MPS Research and Assessment

Anthony Smith Community Member

Sequanna Taylor Milwaukee Board of School Directors

Teresa Wozniak MPS Specialized Services

Signature: <u>Bridget Schock</u> Date: <u>December 6, 2019</u>

Bridget Schock, Contracted School Services