

Penfield Montessori Academy

Annual Performance Framework Report

I. Academic Performance Data

| Penfield Montessori Academic Performance Framework | | | Overall Percentage: 8.3% | |
|--|---------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| A.1. School Report Card - Receive 3, 4, or 5 stars or a Satisfactory using the Alternate Rating | | Satisfactory Progress | Needs Improvement | |
| A.2. State ELA Assessment - % scoring proficient or above is at least the average of the % proficient or above in the local district and the State | | | | |
| A.3. State Math Assessment - % scoring proficient or above is at least the average of the % proficient or above in the local district and the State | | | | |
| A.4. State ELA Assessment (local/comparable) - % scoring proficient/advanced is the same or higher than neighborhood and demographically comparable schools | | | | |
| A.5. State Math Assessment (local/comparable) - % scoring proficient/advanced is the same or higher than neighborhood and demographically comparable schools | | | | |
| A.6. MAP RIT Growth Reading - 50% or greater meeting growth norm | | 30.8% | 41.3% | |
| A.7. MAP RIT Growth Math - 50% or greater meeting growth norm | | 21.4% | 45.7% | |
| A.8. MAP Reading RIT Growth for Subgroups - Significant subgroups (i.e. racial/ethnic minorities, Special Education) meeting 110% of growth norm | | African American: 55.3% | African American: 89.4% | |
| A.9. MAP Math RIT Growth for Subgroups - Significant subgroups (i.e. racial/ethnic minorities, Special Education) meeting 110% of growth norm | | African American: 43.9% | African American: 91.8% | |
| A.10. Attendance - Attendance at least the average of the local district and State attendance rates (note that this data is lagged one year due to reporting timelines) | | 90.9% | 88.8% | |
| | | MPS: 89.1% | MPS: 89.3% | |
| | | State: 94.1% | State: 94.3% | |
| | | MPS & State Ave: 91.6% | MPS & State Ave: 91.8% | |
| % of Standards Met | | 16.7% | 0.0% | |

School comments to **2016-17** academic performance data including any action steps being taken or planned: N/A

School concerns to **2016-17** academic performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.): N/A

School comments to **2017-18** academic performance data including any action steps being taken or planned:

We have taken several steps as a school to respond to our need to boost academic outcomes.

In our Annual Growth Plan for the 2018-19 school year, we have demonstrated our commitment to changing the academic trajectory of our students. In previous years, we focused on the number of students on grade level. This year, we are focused more on individualized growth goals and looking closely at what skills each child needs to meet their goals. We have started several literacy-focused pilot programs, including new programs for children who are whole-word (rather than phonetic) readers, a supplementary letter sound instruction program, and increasing the number of staff who are Orton-Gillingham trained. We are also including more explicit literacy skills instruction for our elementary-aged children who did not have a full three years in the Children's House to receive foundational skills instruction. A dedicated half-time classroom assistant is implementing literacy small groups throughout the morning to remediate literacy skills.

While not an excuse, it is notable to point out that 40% of our students have IEPs with significant learning differences. We certainly uphold high standards for all of our children regardless of diagnosis, but we also recognize that many of these children receive a non-standard curriculum because of the complexity of their needs. For example, in one of our classrooms last year, 3 out of 4 tested students were in the first percentile largely because of their limited verbal skills. The focus for these students was on learning to communicate their needs while addressing academic content. The multiple-choice format of standardized testing creates an almost impossible situation for them to demonstrate their abilities; however, it seems too early in their academic trajectory to not test them.

We would also note that, while our growth data for the specific subgroup of African American children is below the expectation, it is still higher than our school wide average, indicating that our teaching staff is aware of and takes seriously the issue of educational inequity and takes action in their instruction to ensure that they are meeting all students' needs.

Finally, we continue to take action on our attendance issues by speaking regularly with families about attendance, sending home reminders and phone calls regarding student absences, and making attendance and tardy data a more noticeable section on our trimester report cards.

School concerns to **2017-18** academic performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.):

School comments to **2018-19** academic performance data including any action steps being taken or planned: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

School concerns to **2018-19** academic performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.): [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

II. Financial Performance Data

| Penfield Montessori Financial Performance Framework | | | Overall Percentage: 41.7% | |
|---|---------|---------|---------------------------|---------|
| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
| F.1. Current Ratio - Current ratio (assets to liabilities) is ≥ 1.1 or current ratio is between 1.0 and 1.1 and current year ratio is higher than last year's | 0.28 | 0.60 | 0.96 | |
| F.2. Enrollment Variance - Average of actual September and January enrollment counts divided by projected budgeted FTE is $\geq 95\%$ | 60% | 87% | 86% | |
| F.3. Default - Not in default of loan covenants and not delinquent with debt service payments | No | No | No | |
| F.4. Debt to Asset Ratio - Total liabilities to total assets ratio $< .9$ | 3.59 | 0.06 | 0.11 | |
| % of Standards Met | 25.0% | 50.0% | 50.0% | |

School comments to **2016-17** financial performance dating including any action steps being taken or planned: **F.1. Penfield Montessori Academy (PMA) is not meeting the current ratio benchmark in the school's first year of operations due to the following: cash needed for operations is provided to PMA from the fundraising entity, Friends of Penfield, Inc., from restricted contributions received to support PMA. These funds are released as needed (as restrictions are met) and therefore the cash balance will remain insignificant (cash comes in as it is needed to go out in payments). This will affect the current ratio on an on-going basis until the use of restricted funds are not such a significant part of the revenue stream of PMA. F.2. Enrollment Variance was high due to a significant number of no shows the first day of school. Additional points of contact with incoming families were added throughout the spring and summer of 2017. F.3. Confirming – the No answer means that we are not in default of loan covenants and we have not been delinquent in debt service payment. F.4 Penfield Montessori Academy (PMA) is not meeting the Debt to Asset Ratio benchmark in the school's first year of operations due to the following: Liabilities much higher than assets due to the factors mentioned in F.1 above regarding cash balance. Low cash balances due to release of restricted assets on an as-needed basis. When the liabilities are due for payment, restricted cash will be released to reduce the liabilities but not increase the assets beyond what is needed to meet the needs of PMA. This ratio will strengthen over time as PMA becomes less reliant on restricted funds.**

School concerns to **2016-17** financial performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.):

School comments to **2017-18** financial performance dating including any action steps being taken or planned:

F.1. Penfield Montessori Academy (PMA) is not meeting the current ratio benchmark due to the timing of the movement of cash needed for operations. The long term asset (Beneficial Interest asset) holds funds raised and to be provided to PMA from Friends of Penfield, Inc., from restricted contributions received to support PMA. These funds are released as needed (as restrictions are met) and therefore the cash balance will remain insignificant (cash comes in as it is needed). This will affect the current ratio on an on-going basis until the use of restricted funds are not a significant part of the revenue stream of PMA.

F.2. Penfield Montessori Academy (PMA) was short the equivalent of eight FTEs. Half of this was due to the fact that the percentage of K3s enrolled with IEPs was lower than expected. As PMA has more historical data, it is expected that enrollment estimates will become more accurate.

F.3. Confirmation – the No answer means that we are not in default of loan covenants and we have not been delinquent in debt service payment.

F.4 Penfield Montessori Academy (PMA) is now in compliance with the Debt to Asset Ratio benchmark due to the following: Total Assets now include the Beneficial Interest noncurrent asset of over \$3 million for funds held by another entity for the benefit of PMA.

School concerns to **2017-18** financial performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.):

School comments to **2018-19** financial performance dating including any action steps being taken or planned: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

School concerns to **2018-19** financial performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.): [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

III. Organizational Performance Data

Penfield Montessori Organizational Performance Framework

Overall Percentage: 95.0%

| | 2016-17 | 2017-18 | 2018-19 | 2019-20 |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|---------|
| O.1. Implementing education program as outlined in contract | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.2. Contract compliance around instructional days or minutes required, graduation and promotion requirements, and state assessments | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.3. Fair and equitable admissions, lottery, waiting list, and enrollment | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.4. Contract compliance for Students with Disabilities | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.5. Contract compliance for English Language Learners | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.6. On time submission of financial reports to OCS and DPI | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.7. School receives an unqualified audit opinion devoid of significant findings and conditions, material weaknesses, or significant internal control weaknesses | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.8. School submits required reports around board bylaws, open meeting laws, and board composition | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.9. Contract compliance for oversight of schools with charter management organizations | N/A | N/A | N/A | |
| O.10. Adequate and appropriately maintained facilities | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.11. Contract compliance for safety and health-related services including food service requirements, nursing services and dispensing of pharmaceuticals, and background checks of all applicable individuals | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.12. Surveys Indicate A Safe Environment - Avg score 3 or higher on graded school safety items on parent, student, and staff surveys. At least 80% completion rate for staff and students and 50% for parents. | Parent: 3.69; 68.4% | Parent: 3.52; 76.5% | Parent: 3.73; 66.4% | |
| | Staff: 2.92; 87.5% | Staff: 2.47; 100.0% | Staff: 2.89; 52.9% | |
| O.13. Contract compliance for DPI reporting requirements | Yes | Yes | Yes | |
| O.14. Contract compliance for any other OCS requirements | N/A | N/A | On-time: 72% | |
| | | | Accurate: 92% | |
| | | | Complete: 96% | |
| % of Standards Met | 95.8% | 95.8% | 93.6% | |

School's comments to **2016-17** organizational performance data including action steps being taken or planned: O.12. The average score on staff surveys indicating a safe environment were below the acceptable score of 3. An offshoot of the Penfield Children's Center Behavior Clinic was embedded in the school bringing a full-time school counselor and counselor-in-training to the site. This increased the school's ability to handle students in crisis.

School concerns to **2016-17** organizational performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.):

School's comments to **2017-18** organizational performance data including action steps being taken or planned: The average score on staff surveys indicating a safe environment was below the acceptable score of 3.

In seeking to understand this data, three key points came up: student safety, access to the building, and building safety in the case of threatening events. Several steps have been taken to respond to all three concerns.

First, regarding student safety, two of our staff were sent to the CPI Seclusion and Restraint Train-the-Trainer workshop. They then returned and ensured that 100% of our teaching staff were trained on appropriate use of CPI. The access to in-house trainers allows us to train new staff who start throughout the year and to ensure that the entire staff is on the same page in terms of safety.

We have also created several alternative 'break' spaces for students who were at risk to harm themselves or others. We have a "Peace Room" for any children who need a sensory break from their classrooms and a "Learning Lab" where elementary-aged children can go when they need to complete their work in a less stimulating space. Access to these rooms is a choice that can be made by the child when they begin to show signs of disregulation; it is not a punishment, but a proactive option meant to prevent emotional distress.

The second major safety concern was staff access to the building. In previous years, staff without administrative access had to wait for someone inside the building to let them in by responding to the doorbell. This year, we have provided 100% of staff with a key fob that allows them to safely access the building without waiting for another staff member. Many staff have reported anecdotally that this has improved their sense of security entering and exiting the building.

The final concern was safety in the case of events such as an intruder, a weather event, etc. To ameliorate this concern, a new and more detailed manual was written over the summer, creating more specific procedures for these events based on the special needs of our student population. This manual was gone over in detail during our August inservice.

School concerns to **2017-18** organizational performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.):

School's comments to **2018-19** organizational performance data including action steps being taken or planned: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

School concerns to **2018-19** organizational performance data (i.e. questioning accuracy, corrections made, but not noted, etc.): [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)