



TO: P-12 Education Committee

FROM: Elizabeth Berlin *Elizabeth Berlin*

SUBJECT: Renewal Recommendations for Charter Schools
Authorized by the New York City Department of Education

DATE: May 3, 2019

AUTHORIZATION(S): *MaryEllen Elia*

SUMMARY

Issue for Decision

Should the Board of Regents approve the proposed renewal charters for the following charter schools authorized by the New York City Department of Education Chancellor pursuant to Article 56 of the Education Law:

1. **Challenge Preparatory Charter School** (full-term, five-year renewal and a revision to expand grade levels served to K through Grade 12 from their existing K through Grade 8 and expand enrollment from 792 to 1296 students)
2. **Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy Charter School** (full-term, five-year renewal)
3. **Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School** (full-term, five-year renewal and a revision to decrease enrollment from 1250 to 1150 students)
4. **Hebrew Language Academy Charter School** (short-term, three-year renewal)
5. **Hellenic Classical Charter School** (full-term, five-year renewal and a revision to increase enrollment from 480 to 498 students)
6. **KIPP Academy Charter School** (full-term, five-year renewal)
7. **Riverton Street Charter School** (full-term, five-year renewal)
8. **Summit Academy Charter School** (full-term, five-year renewal with a revision to engage in a school restructuring contemporaneous with the renewal)

Reason(s) for Consideration

Required by State statute.

Proposed Handling

This issue will be before the P-12 Education Committee and the Full Board for action at the May 2019 Regents meeting.

Procedural History

The New York City Department of Education Chancellor (NYCDOE) made the renewal recommendations being presented to the Board of Regents for approval and issuance as required by Article 56 of the Education Law.

Background Information

Education Law §2852(2) requires the chartering entity (in this case the NYCDOE) to make the following findings when considering a charter renewal application:

- (a) The charter school described in the application meets the requirements set out in this article and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations;
- (b) The applicant can demonstrate the ability to operate the school in an educationally and fiscally sound manner;
- (c) Granting the application is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty-one of this article; and
- (d) In a school district where the total enrollment of resident students attending charter schools in the base year is greater than five percent of the total public school enrollment of the school district in the base year (i) granting the application would have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the proposed charter school or (ii) the school district in which the charter school will be located consents to such application.

Related Regents Items

Challenge Preparatory Charter School

February 2010 Initial Charter

<https://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2010Meetings/February2010/0210emsca6.htm>

April 2012 Revision to expand enrollment

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/documents/meetings/2012Meetings/April2012/412p12a1.pdf>

January 2015 First Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/115p12a4.pdf>

Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy Charter School

February 2004 Initial Charter

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/documents/meetings/2004Meetings/February2004/0204emscvesida3.htm>

April 2007 Revision

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2007Meetings/April2007/0407bra4.html>

February 2009 Administrative Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2009Meetings/February2009/0209emsca6.htm>

June 2009 First Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2009Meetings/June2009/0609emsca2.htm>

May 2014 Second Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/514p12a4.pdf>

Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School

April 2005 Initial Charter

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/documents/meetings/2005Meetings/April2005/0405emscvesida1.htm>

April 2010 First Renewal Charter

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2010Meetings/April2010/0410emsca8.htm>

February 2015 Second Renewal Charter

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/215p12a10.pdf>

March 2016 Revision

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/316p12a6.pdf>

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School

January 2009 Initial Charter

<https://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2009Meetings/January2009/0109emsca10.htm>

January 2014 First Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/114p12a5%5B1%5D.pdf>

March 2015 Second Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/meetings/Mar%202015/315p12a6.pdf>

Hellenic Classical Charter School

January 2005 Initial Charter

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/documents/meetings/2005Meetings/February2005/0205emscvesida3.htm>

June 2008 Revision

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2008Meetings/June2008/0608emsca4.htm>

February 2010 First Renewal

<https://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2010Meetings/February2010/0210emsca12.htm>

January 2015 Second Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/115p12a4.pdf>

KIPP Academy Charter School

May 2000 Conversion

Materials Not Available Online

May 2005 First Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/documents/meetings/2005Meetings/May2005/0505emscvesida7.htm>

July 2009 Revision

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2009Meetings/July2009/0709bra18.htm>

May 2010 Second Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2010Meetings/May2010/0510emsca5.htm>

April 2015 Third Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/meetings/Apr%202015/415p12a7Revision2.pdf>

Riverton Street Charter School

January 2010 Initial Charter

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2010Meetings/January2010/0110emsccommitteerep.htm>

July 2010 Revision

<https://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/documents/meetings/2010Meetings/July2010/0710p12a16.doc>

January 2015 First Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/report/jan-2015/p-12-education>

Summit Academy Charter School

December 2008 Initial Charter

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2008Meetings/December2008/1208emsca19.htm>

December 2013 First Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/1213p12a3%5B1%5D.pdf>

April 2017 Second Renewal

<http://www.regents.nysed.gov/common/regents/files/417p12a6.pdf>

Recommendations

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and issues the renewal charter of the **Challenge Preparatory Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2024**.

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and issues the renewal charter of the **Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2024**.

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and

issues the renewal charter of the **Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy II Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2024**.

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and issues the renewal charter of the **Hebrew Language Academy Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2022**.

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and issues the renewal charter of the **Hellenic Classical Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2024**.

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and issues the renewal charter of the **KIPP Academy Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2024**.

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and issues the renewal charter of the **Riverton Street Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2024**.

VOTED: That the Board of Regents finds that the proposed charter school: (1) meets the requirements set out in Article 56 of the Education Law, and all other applicable laws, rules and regulations; (2) will operate in an educationally and fiscally sound manner; (3) is likely to improve student learning and achievement and materially further the purposes set out in subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty of Article 56 of the Education Law; and (4) will have a significant educational benefit to the students expected to attend the charter school, and the Board of Regents therefore approves and issues the renewal charter of the **Summit Academy Charter School** as proposed by the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education, and that its provisional charter be extended for a term up through and including **June 30, 2024**.

Timetable for Implementation

The Regents action for the above-named charter schools will become effective immediately.

Challenge Preparatory Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a full-term renewal for a period of five years for Challenge Preparatory Charter School. The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2024, and the school would be permitted to revise its charter to expand to serve 1296 students in K- Grade 12.

Challenge Preparatory Charter School (Challenge Prep) is meeting most benchmarks set forth in the New York City Department of Education Accountability Framework. The school is implementing the mission, key design elements, education program and organizational plan set forth in the charter.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	Challenge Preparatory Charter School
Board Chair	Frederica Jeffries
District of location	NYC CSD 27 (Queens)
Opening Date	Fall 2010
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Charter February 9, 2010 – February 8, 2015 • First Renewal February 9, 2015 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K - Grade 8/ 792 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K - Grade 12/ 1296 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	None
Facilities	710 Hartman Lane, Queens (Private Space) 1526 Central Avenue, Queens (Private Space) 12-79 Redfern Avenue, Queens (Private Space)
Mission Statement	<i>Our mission is to prepare students to excel academically and compete successfully for admission to high-performing public, private and parochial high schools in NYC. Challenge Prep offers a rigorous academic curriculum within a safe and supportive school environment. We cultivate intellectual, social, emotional and ethical development of our students and support them in achieving mastery of the 28 NYS Learning Standards and the Common Core Learning Standards.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Powerful use of ongoing assessments • More time on task • Response to intervention • College focus • Rigorous standards-based curriculum • Excellent teaching • Parents as partners
Requested Revisions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand grade levels served to K through Grade 12 from their existing K through Grade 8 • Expand enrollment from 792 to 1296 students

Challenge Preparatory Charter School is a community school designed to address the academic needs of children and youth in Greater Far Rockaway. Challenge Prep's NYS exam results in ELA and Math far exceeded the results of all but one of the 13 demographically-similar Greater Far Rockaway district schools enrolling K-8 students in 2016 and 2017. Challenge Prep has consistently provided families with an academically successful charter school alternative to Greater Far Rockaway district schools. The school has strong ties to the community, evidenced by partnerships and firm commitments from stakeholders in the JFK Vision Plan to partner on Career and Technical Education elements of the proposed high school.

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
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 6	K – Grade 7	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8
Total Approved Enrollment	600	696	792	792

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 9	K – Grade 10	K – Grade 11	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	912	1032	1152	1272	1296

Background

The Board of Regents granted an initial charter to Challenge Prep in February 2010. Challenge Prep opened for instruction in September 2010 initially serving 120 students in K through Grade 1. Challenge Prep's charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2015. In 2012, the school revised their charter to increase enrollment from 360 to 504 students.

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

Challenge Preparatory Charter School offers curricula and coursework aligned to the New York State Learning standards in ELA, math Social Studies and Science. In addition, the school offers Art, Physical Education, Media, Music, Health, Dance and Spanish. Students receive 320 minutes of ELA and Math instruction weekly at the Middle School level and students at all grades are offered Saturday Academy.

The school offers Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) sections on grades K-5 and provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) push in and pull out services at the middle school grades to integrate the Individualized Education Program (IEP) into the instruction students receive throughout the day. The school employs multiple English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers to work with English Language Learners (ELLs)/Multi-lingual Learners (MLLs) students.

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and state average.

Challenge Prep’s ELA proficiency rate is on par with the host district and State. In math, Challenge Prep is approaching the host district.

Table 1a: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students

All Students	ELA					Math				
	Challenge Prep CS	CSD 27	Variance to CSD 27	NYS	Variance to NYS	Challenge Prep CS	CSD 27	Variance to CSD 27	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	43%	37%	+6	38%	+5	41%	37%	+4	39%	+2
2016-2017	35%	37%	-2	40%	-5	32%	37%	-5	40%	-8
2017-2018	45%	45%	0	45%	0	36%	40%	-4	45%	-9

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in Grades 3-8 at Challenge, CSD 27, and the state who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school’s performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

Table 1b: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: School, Peninsula and Mainland Level Aggregates

All Students	ELA					Math				
	Challenge Prep CS	CSD 27- Peninsula Only	Variance to Peninsula CSD 27	CSD 27 Mainland Only	Variance to Mainland CSD 27	Challenge Prep CS	CSD 27- Peninsula Only	Variance to Peninsula CSD 27	CSD 27 Mainland	Variance to Mainland CSD 27
2017-2018	45%	37%	+8	49%	-4	36%	31%	+5	47%	-11

In both ELA and Math, Challenge Prep’s special populations are outperforming the host district, and have been consistently.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	ELL/MLL (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2015-2016	15% (+6)	14% (+10)	42% (+8)
	2016-2017	14% (+5)	17% (+11)	36% (+3)
	2017-2018	19% (+5)	10% (+1)	45% (+3)
Mathematics	2015-2016	24% (+9)	43% (+31)	39% (+5)
	2016-2017	14% (+1)	25% (+12)	32% (-2)
	2017-2018	21% (+5)	22% (+6)	37% (+0)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups at Challenge, CSD 27, and the state who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school’s performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, Challenge Prep is *In Good Standing*.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

Challenge Prep appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school's capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to-asset ratio, are measures of the charter school's capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.¹

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed Challenge Preparatory Charter School's Fiscal Year 2016, 2017 and 2018 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

Challenge Preparatory Charter School has strong enrollment and backfills students at all grades from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is coming close to but not yet meeting its targets for students with disabilities (SWDs) or English language learners/Multilingual Learners (ELLs/MLLs). The school is meeting its targets economically disadvantaged (ED) students. (see Table 3). The school had slightly increasing enrollment rates of SWDs and ED students and have maintained their percentage of ELL/MLL student enrollment over the charter term.

The school is making good faith efforts to recruit, serve, and retain at-risk students² and has submitted a letter of intent to implement a lottery preference for ELL/MLLs in the next lottery. Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL, and SWD populations include:

- Advertising in local publications in Spanish;
- Ensuring that a Spanish language translator was present for all school tours and Family Nights;
- Attending community events geared towards potential ELL students and economically disadvantaged students for recruitment

¹ These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

² Education Law §2854(2)(a) requires that schools demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of students with disabilities, FRPL eligible students and English language learners when compared to the enrollment figures for such students in the school district in which the charter is located. SUNY and the Regents were charged with setting specific enrollment and retention targets for each charter school, and have done so. Education Law §2852(9-a)(b)(i). All charter schools that were initially chartered after August 2010 or renewed after January 1, 2011, are expected to meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets set by the Regents and SUNY. When submitting an application for renewal of the charter, schools are required to provide information detailing the means by which they will meet the enrollment and retention targets (Education Law §2851(4)(e)), and this information is considered by the Regents in the review of the school's performance over the charter term. A school's plan to change its enrollment practices, whether by weighting the lottery or preferencing, may also be considered when determining whether the school will meet the targets in the upcoming charter term. A school's repeated failure to meet or exceed its enrollment and retention targets, when combined with a failure to show that extensive efforts to meet the targets have been made, may be cause for termination or revocation of the charter pursuant to section Education Law §2855(1)(e).

Table 3: Student Demographics – Charter School Compared to District of Location

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
Student Population	Challenge Prep CS	CSD 27	Variance	Challenge Prep CS	CSD 27	Variance
Students with Disabilities	15%	20%	-5	17%	21%	-4
ELL/MLL	4%	14%	-10	4%	16%	-12
Economically Disadvantaged	83%	76%	+7	85%	80%	+5

Student Retention

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 84% of students were retained in Challenge Preparatory Charter School compared with 87% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

Challenge Preparatory Charter School operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for students with disabilities, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on November 27, 2018. Twenty-four people attended, and seven spoke. Seven were in favor of the renewal and none were opposed.

Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a full-term renewal for a period of five years for Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School. The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2024.

Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School (Promise Academy I) is meeting most benchmarks set forth in the New York City Department of Education Accountability Framework. The school is implementing the mission, key design elements, education program and organizational plan set forth in the charter.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School
Board Chair	Geoffrey Canada
District of location	NYC CSD 5 (Manhattan)
Opening Date	Fall 2004
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Charter: February 23, 2004 – February 22, 2009 • Administrative Renewal: February 23, 2009 – August 10, 2009 • First Renewal: August 11, 2009 – August 10, 2014 • Second Renewal: August 11, 2014 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K-Grade 12/ 1250 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K-Grade 12/ 1250 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	Harlem Children’s Zone
Facilities	245 West 129th Street, New York (Public Space)
Mission Statement	<i>Promise Academy I’s mission is to give children in Harlem high-quality, well-rounded education while providing a positive atmosphere where children know they are cared for.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data driven instruction • Professional development • College readiness • Parent engagement • Academic coaches • Recruitment • Pipeline services
Requested Revisions	None

Promise Academy I’s approach is to address the whole child, and to do so over years and years. That means offering a high-quality education and doing whatever it takes to address any issues – even those outside the classroom - that can hinder a child’s success. The school has hundreds of experienced faculty dedicated to fostering students’ intelligence, health, character and civic-mindedness.

Current Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2014 to 2015	Year 2 2015 to 2016	Year 3 2016 to 2017	Year 4 2017 to 2018	Year 5 2018 to 2019
Grade Configuration	K- Grade 11	K- Grade 12	K- Grade 12	K- Grade 12	K- Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	1021	1175	1225	1250	1250

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	K- Grade 12	K- Grade 12	K- Grade 12	K- Grade 12	K- Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	1250	1250	1250	1250	1250

Background

The Board of Regents granted an initial charter to Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School in February 2004. Promise Academy I opened for instruction in September 2004 initially serving 200 students in K and Grade 6. Promise Academy I’s charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2009 and 2014. In 2007, the Board of Regents approved a material revision to change the enrollment pattern.

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School offers curricula and coursework aligned to New York State Learning standards in ELA, math, Social Studies and Science. In addition, the school offers Spanish, Physical Education, Art and Music.

The school offers as Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) to Students with Disabilities. The school employs multiple English as a Second Language (ESL) and English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (ELL/MLL) teachers to work with ELL/MLL students.

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and State average.

Promise Academy I has consistently outperformed the host district as well as the State in both math and ELA proficiency levels.

**Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students:
School, District & State Level Aggregates**

All Students	ELA					Math				
	HCZ I CS	CSD 5	Variance to CSD 5	NYS	Variance to NYS	HCZ I CS	CSD 5	Variance to CSD 5	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	39%	21%	+18	38%	+1	56%	17%	+39	39%	+17
2016-2017	47%	24%	+23	40%	+7	62%	17%	+45	40%	+22
2017-2018	55%	29%	+26	45%	+10	64%	22%	+42	45%	+19

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in grades 3-8 at HCZ I CS, CSD 5, and at the state who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

In Math, all special populations at Promise Academy I are outperforming peers in the host district. In ELA, special populations outperform peers in the host district except for one year in which ELL/MLLs did not.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	English Language Learners (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2015-2016	16% (+11)	11% (+10)	38% (+18)
	2016-2017	22% (+14)	0% (-2)	46% (+25)
	2017-2018	32% (+20)	25% (+18)	52% (+27)
Mathematics	2015-2016	32% (+26)	11% (+5)	56% (+41)
	2016-2017	38% (+31)	30% (+23)	61% (+45)
	2017-2018	37% (+27)	44% (+37)	64% (+44)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups in grades 3-8 at HCZ I CS, CSD 5, and at the state who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

Student Performance – High School

Promise Academy I offers courses that lead to Regents exams in Common Core Algebra and Algebra II, Geometry, Chemistry, Physics, US History, ELA, Earth Science, Living Environment, and Global History I and II. AP courses are available in Biology, English and US History. High school students have access to college coursework through the Bard Early College program. College Readiness is also taught, along with Band, Chorus, and Visual Arts.

The school’s four-year Regents cohort outcomes have been above the State average throughout the charter term. The same is true for graduation rates. Regents outcomes for Students with Disabilities (SWDs) and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students have also exceeded state-wide outcomes. Graduation rates for SWDs and ED students are far above the rate for peers across the State.

Table 3a: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for All Students: School & State Level Aggregates

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2012 Cohort			2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State
ELA	100%	85%	+15	100%	85%	+15	97%	84%	+13
Global History	94%	78%	+16	87%	78%	+9	89%	77%	+12
Math	100%	86%	+14	94%	85%	+9	97%	83%	+14
Science	100%	84%	+16	100%	84%	+16	100%	83%	+17
US History	87%	81%	+6	100%	81%	+19	94%	80%	+14

Table 3b: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for Sub-Groups: School & State Level Aggregates

Subject	Cohort and School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the State)	English Language Learners (Variance to the State)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the State)
ELA	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	s	N/A	100% (+21)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	100% (+20)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	100% (+48)	s	97% (+19)
Global History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	s	N/A	92% (+22)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	85% (+15)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	67% (+27)	s	89% (+20)
Math	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	s	N/A	100% (+19)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	93% (+13)

	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	89% (+42)	s	97% (+20)
Science	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	s	N/A	100% (+22)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	100% (+22)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	100% (+50)	s	100% (+24)
US History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	s	N/A	89% (+15)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	100% (+26)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	89% (+43)	s	94% (+22)

Outcomes for cohorts of fewer than six students are suppressed and indicated with an s.

Table 4a: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for All Students

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2012 Cohort			2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	98%	82%	+16	100%	82%	+18	96%	83%	+13
Local Diplomas	6%	5%	+1	9%	5%	+4	4%	6%	-2
Regents Diplomas	93%	46%	+47	91%	44%	+47	92%	43%	+49
Advanced Regents Diplomas	0%	31%	-31	0%	33%	-33	0%	33%	-33

Table 4b: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for Students with Disabilities

4-Yr Cohort: Sub-Groups	2012 Cohort Students with Disabilities			2013 Cohort Students with Disabilities			2014 Cohort Students with Disabilities		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	s	55%	-	s	57%	-	100%	59%	+41
Local Diplomas	s	23%	-	s	24%	-	11%	25%	-14
Regents Diplomas	s	30%	-	s	29%	-	89%	30%	+59
Advanced Regents Diplomas	s	3%	-	s	4%	-	0%	3%	-3

Outcomes for cohorts of fewer than six students are suppressed and indicated with an s.

Table 4c: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for Economically Disadvantaged

4-Yr Cohort: Sub-Groups	2012 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged			2013 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged			2014 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	100%	75%	+25	100%	76%	+24	95%	76%	+19
Local Diplomas	8%	6%	+2	11%	7%	+4	3%	8%	-5
Regents Diplomas	92%	51%	+41	89%	50%	+39	92%	49%	+43
Advanced Regents Diplomas	0%	18%	-18	0%	19%	-19	0%	19%	-19

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School is *In Good Standing*.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school’s independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school’s capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to asset ratio, are measures of the charter school’s capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.³

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School’s audited financial statements for Fiscal Year 2016 through Fiscal Year 2018 to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

Promise Academy I has strong enrollment and backfills students on all grades from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is meeting its targets for enrolling ED students. The school is approaching its targets for SWDs and ELL/MLLs. (see Table 5). The school has had consistent percentages of these groups over the charter term.

³ These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

The school is making good faith efforts to recruit, serve, and retain at-risk students⁴ and has submitted a letter of intent to implement a lottery preference for ELL/MLL s in the next lottery.

Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL/MLL, and SWD populations include:

- Increasing the number of postcards sent and targeting areas where residents are historically underserved;
- Moving the lottery date to accommodate more working families;
- Distributing and maintaining information/documents in a variety of languages on hand at each site, so that interested parents who walk in for information can readily have access to it;
- Conducting orientation sessions explaining the ESL identification to early childhood parents prior to their children transitioning to kindergarten at HCZ PAI; and
- Having a translator sit down with parents to complete the Home Language Survey.

Table 5: Student Demographics –HCZ I Charter School Compared to District of Location

Student Population	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	HCZ I CS	CSD 5	Variance	HCZ I CS	CSD 5	Variance
Students with Disabilities	18%	24%	-6	20%	26%	-6
English Language Learners	4%	11%	-7	6%	13%	-7
Economically Disadvantaged	87%	82%	+5	87%	83%	+4

Student Retention

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 92% of students were retained in Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School compared with 80% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for students with

⁴ Education Law §2854(2)(a) requires that schools demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of students with disabilities, FRPL eligible students and English language learners when compared to the enrollment figures for such students in the school district in which the charter is located. SUNY and the Regents were charged with setting specific enrollment and retention targets for each charter school, and have done so. Education Law §2852(9-a)(b)(i). All charter schools that were initially chartered after August 2010 or renewed after January 1, 2011, are expected to meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets set by the Regents and SUNY. When submitting an application for renewal of the charter, schools are required to provide information detailing the means by which they will meet the enrollment and retention targets (Education Law §2851(4)(e)), and this information is considered by the Regents in the review of the school’s performance over the charter term. A school’s plan to change its enrollment practices, whether by weighting the lottery or preferencing, may also be considered when determining whether the school will meet the targets in the upcoming charter term. A school’s repeated failure to meet or exceed its enrollment and retention targets, when combined with a failure to show that extensive efforts to meet the targets have been made, may be cause for termination or revocation of the charter pursuant to section Education Law §2855(1)(e).

disabilities, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on January 15, 2019. Eleven people attended, and six spoke. Six were in favor of the renewal and none were opposed.

Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy II Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a full-term renewal for a period of five years for Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy II Charter School (Promise Academy II). The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2024. Promise Academy II is meeting most benchmarks set forth in the New York City Department of Education Accountability Framework. The school is implementing the mission, key design elements, education program and organizational plan set forth in the charter.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy II Charter School
Board Chair	Geoffrey Canada
District of location	NYC CSD 5 (Manhattan)
Opening Date	Fall 2005
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Charter: April 15, 2005 – April 14, 2010 • First Renewal: April 15, 2010 – June 30, 2015 • Second Renewal: July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 12/ 1250 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 12/ 1150 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	Harlem Children’s Zone
Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2005 Madison Avenue, Manhattan (Public Space) • 35 East 125th Street, Manhattan (Private Space)
Mission Statement	<i>The mission of the Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy Charter School (HCZ Promise Academy) is to provide high quality, standards-based academic programs for students, grades K-12, from underserved communities and underperforming school districts, and to provide students with the skills they need to be accepted by and succeed in college.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data driven instruction • Professional development • College readiness • Parent engagement • Academic coaches • Recruitment • Pipeline services
Requested Revisions	A decrease enrollment from 1250 to 1150 students.

Promise Academy II’s approach is to address the whole child, and to do so over years and years. That means offering a high-quality education and doing whatever it takes to address any issues – even those

outside the classroom - that can hinder a child’s success. The school has hundreds of experienced faculty dedicated to fostering students’ intelligence, health, character and civic-mindedness.

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
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 11	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	950	1050	1150	1250

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	1150	1150	1150	1150	1150

Background

The Board of Regents granted an initial charter to Promise Academy II in April 2005. The school opened for instruction in September 2005 initially serving 80 students in K and Grade 1. Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy II Charter School’s charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2010 and 2015. The Board of Regents approved a revision to expand enrollment in March 2016.

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

Promise Academy II Charter School offers curricula and coursework aligned to the New York State Learning Standards in ELA, math, Social Studies and Science. In addition, the school offers Spanish, Physical Education, Art and Music.

The school offers as Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) to Students with Disabilities (SWDs). The school employs multiple English as a Second Language (ESL) and English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (ELL/MLL) teachers to work with ELL/MLL students.

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and State average.

Promise Academy II has consistently outperformed the host district as well as the State in both math and ELA proficiency levels.

**Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students:
School, District & State Level Aggregates**

All Students	ELA					Math				
	HCZ II CS	CSD 5	Variance to CSD 5	NYS	Variance to NYS	HCZ II CS	CSD 5	Variance to CSD 5	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	51%	21%	+30	38%	+13	67%	17%	+50	39%	+28
2016-2017	50%	24%	+26	40%	+10	66%	17%	+49	40%	+26
2017-2018	54%	29%	+25	45%	+9	70%	22%	+48	45%	+25

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in grades 3-8 at HCZ II CS, CSD 5, and at the state who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

In both ELA and Math, all special populations at Promise Academy II are outperforming peers in the host district.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	English Language Learners (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2015-2016	24% (+19)	27% (+26)	50% (+30)
	2016-2017	14% (+7)	18% (+16)	48% (+26)
	2017-2018	21% (+9)	11% (+4)	51% (+26)
Mathematics	2015-2016	42% (+35)	60% (+54)	68% (+53)
	2016-2017	22% (+15)	73% (+66)	64% (+48)
	2017-2018	35% (+25)	67% (+60)	68% (+49)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups in grades 3-8 at HCZ II CS, CSD 5, and at the state who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

Student Performance – High School

Promise Academy II offers courses that lead to Regents exams in Common Core Algebra and Algebra II, Geometry, Chemistry, Physics, US History, ELA, Earth Science, Living Environment, and Global History I and II. AP courses are available in Biology, English and US History. High school students have access to college coursework through the Bard Early College Program. College Readiness is also taught, along with Band, Chorus, and Visual Arts.

The school's four-year Regents cohort outcomes have been above the State average throughout the charter term. The same is true for graduation rates. Regents outcomes for Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students have exceeded state-wide outcomes. Graduation rates for ED students are far above the rate for peers across the state.

Table 3a: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for All Students: School & State Level Aggregates

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State
ELA	100%	85%	+15	100%	84%	+16
Global History	97%	78%	+19	100%	77%	+23
Math	100%	85%	+15	100%	83%	+17
Science	100%	84%	+16	100%	83%	+17
US History	100%	81%	+19	100%	80%	+20

Table 3b: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for Sub-Groups: School & State Level Aggregates

Subject	Cohort and School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the State)	English Language Learners (Variance to the State)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the State)
ELA	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	100% (+20)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	s	N/A	100% (+22)
Global History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	96% (+26)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	s	N/A	100% (+31)
Math	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	100% (+20)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	s	N/A	100% (+23)
Science	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	100% (+22)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	s	N/A	100% (+24)
US History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	N/A	N/A	N/A
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	100% (+26)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	s	N/A	100% (+28)

Outcomes for cohorts of fewer than six students are suppressed and indicated with an s.

Table 4a: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for All Students

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	100%	82%	+18	96%	83%	+13
Local Diplomas	0%	5%	-5	0%	6%	-6
Regents Diplomas	93%	44%	+49	92%	43%	+49
Advanced Regents Diplomas	7%	33%	-26	4%	33%	-29

Table 4b: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for Economically Disadvantaged

4-Yr Cohort: Sub-Groups	2013 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged			2014 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	100%	76%	+24	95%	76%	+19
Local Diplomas	0%	7%	-7	0%	8%	-8
Regents Diplomas	92%	50%	+42	90%	49%	+41
Advanced Regents Diplomas	8%	19%	-11	5%	19%	-14

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, Harlem Children’s Zone Promise Academy II Charter School is *In Good Standing*.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

Promise Academy II appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school’s independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school’s capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to asset ratio, are measures of the charter school’s capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.⁵

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed Promise Academy II’s audited financial statements for Fiscal Year 2016 through Fiscal Year 2018 to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

⁵ These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

Promise Academy II has strong enrollment and backfills students on all grades from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is meeting its targets for enrolling ED students. The school is approaching its targets for SWDs and ELL/MLL. (see Table 5). The school has had consistent percentages of these groups over the charter term.

The school is making good faith efforts to recruit, serve, and retain at-risk students⁶ and has submitted a letter of intent to implement a lottery preference for ELL/MLL s in the next lottery.

Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL/MLL, and SWD populations include:

- Increasing the number of postcards sent and targeting areas where residents are historically underserved;
- Moving the lottery date to accommodate more working families;
- Distributing and maintaining information/documents in a variety of languages on hand at each site, so that interested parents who walk in for information can readily have access to it;
- Conducting orientation sessions explaining the English as a Second Language (ESL) identification to early childhood parents prior to their children transitioning to kindergarten at HCZ PAI; and
- Having a translator sit down with parents to complete the Home Language Survey.

Table 5: Student Demographics – HCZ II Charter School Compared to District of Location

Student Population	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	HCZ II CS	CSD 5	Variance	HCZ II CS	CSD 5	Variance
Students with Disabilities	15%	24%	-9	19%	26%	-7
English Language Learners	5%	11%	-6	5%	13%	-8
Economically Disadvantaged	83%	82%	+1	83%	83%	0

Student Retention

⁶ Education Law §2854(2)(a) requires that schools demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of students with disabilities, FRPL eligible students and English language learners when compared to the enrollment figures for such students in the school district in which the charter is located. SUNY and the Regents were charged with setting specific enrollment and retention targets for each charter school, and have done so. Education Law §2852(9-a)(b)(i). All charter schools that were initially chartered after August 2010 or renewed after January 1, 2011, are expected to meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets set by the Regents and SUNY. When submitting an application for renewal of the charter, schools are required to provide information detailing the means by which they will meet the enrollment and retention targets (Education Law §2851(4)(e)), and this information is considered by the Regents in the review of the school's performance over the charter term. A school's plan to change its enrollment practices, whether by weighting the lottery or preferencing, may also be considered when determining whether the school will meet the targets in the upcoming charter term. A school's repeated failure to meet or exceed its enrollment and retention targets, when combined with a failure to show that extensive efforts to meet the targets have been made, may be cause for termination or revocation of the charter pursuant to section Education Law §2855(1)(e).

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 90% of students were retained in Promise Academy II compared with 80% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

Promise Academy II operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for students with disabilities, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on January 16, 2019. Twenty-four people attended, and ten spoke. Ten were in favor of the renewal and none were opposed.

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a short-term renewal for a period of three years for Hebrew Language Academy Charter School. The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2022.

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is meeting most benchmarks set forth in the New York City Department of Education Accountability Framework. The school is implementing the mission, key design elements, education program and organizational plan set forth in the charter.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	Hebrew Language Academy Charter School
Board Chair	Shari Lipner
District of location	NYC CSD 22 (Brooklyn)
Opening Date	Fall 2009
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial: January 6, 2009 -- January 12, 2014 • First Renewal: January 13, 2014 -- June 30, 2015 • Second Renewal: July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K - Grade 8/ 783 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 8/ 783 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	Hebrew Language Academy Charter Schools
Facilities	2186 Mill Avenue, Brooklyn (Private Space)
Mission Statement	<i>Hebrew Language Academy is an exceptional, diverse public charter school that teaches Modern Hebrew to children of all backgrounds and prepares them to be successful global citizens</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research-Based ELA Instruction and Differentiation • Research-Based Math Instruction and Differentiation • Support for at-risk Students • Immersive Hebrew Instruction • Social and Emotional Learning • Professional Development
Requested Revisions	None

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School (HLA) has drastically expanded its use of technology to the level of 1:1 student device ratio for the 2017-2018 school year for grades 3-8, and added class sets of computers or Ipads for K- Grade 2. Technology based components are built into skill-based lessons to allow students to continue growing in their technological efficacy. This also supports the move that the Charter Management Organization (CMO) has made to bring the school forward as an organization that now employs Computer Based testing (CBT) for the testing grades.

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
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8
Total Approved Enrollment	783	783	783	783

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8
Total Approved Enrollment	783	783	783

Background

The Board of Regents granted an initial charter to HLA in January 2009. The school opened for instruction in August 2009 initially serving 150 students in Grades K through 1. HLA’s charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2014 and 2015.

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

HLA Charter School offers curricula and coursework aligned to the New York State Learning Standards in ELA, math Social Studies and Science. In addition, the school offers Hebrew, Hebrew Music, Physical Education, and Music. The school provides immersive Hebrew language instruction every day to all students.

The school offers Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) sections on all grades, as well as providing Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) push in and pull out services. The school employs multiple English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers to work with English language learners (ELLs)/Multi-lingual learners (MLLs).

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and State average.

In ELA, HLA has approached the host district’s proficiency rates and state proficiency rates. In math, HLA has consistently outperformed both the host district and the State.

Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students:

School, District & State Level Aggregates

All Students	ELA					Math				
	HLA CS	CSD 22	Variance to CSD 22	NYS	Variance to NYS	HLA CS	CSD 22	Variance to CSD 22	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	42%	44%	-2	38%	+4	54%	43%	+11	42%	+12
2016-2017	35%	43%	-8	39%	-4	47%	45%	+2	43%	+4
2017-2018	42%	49%	-7	45%	-3	51%	46%	+5	45%	+6

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in grades 3-6 (2015-2016), 3-7 (2016-2017), and 3-8 (2017-2018) at HLA CS, CSD 22, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

In math, all special populations at HLA are outperforming the host district. In ELA, SWDs and ELLs/MLLs outperform the host district and ED students are approaching the target.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	ELL/MLL (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2015-2016	20% (+7)	0% (-4)	34% (-3)
	2016-2017	4% (-8)	17% (+12)	29% (-7)
	2017-2018	26% (+7)	18% (+7)	39% (-5)
Mathematics	2015-2016	30% (+14)	13% (-2)	44% (+7)
	2016-2017	25% (+10)	50% (+33)	38% (-1)
	2017-2018	50% (+31)	47% (+27)	47% (+7)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups in grades 3-6 (2015-2016), 3-7 (2016-2017), and 3-8 (2017-2018) at HLA CS, CSD 22, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or State averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, HLA is *In Good Standing*.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

HLA appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school's capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to-asset ratio, are measures of the charter school's capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.⁷

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed HLA's audited financial statements from Fiscal Year 2016, Fiscal Year 2017 and Fiscal Year 2018 to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

The school has strong enrollment and backfills students at all grades from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is meeting its targets for enrolling SWDs. The school is coming close to but not yet meeting its targets for ED students or ELL/MLL. (see Table 3). The school has increased its percentages of ED students, and has had consistent percentages of SWDs and ELL/MLL students. HLA has submitted a letter of intent to implement a lottery preference for ELL/MLLs in the next lottery.

Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL/MLL, and SWD populations include:

- Engaging in an extensive media campaign with advertisement online, in print and on the radio in multiple languages
- Conducting outreach to Community-Based Organizations, NYCHA tenant organization leaders as well as many Headstart, Pre—K and day care programs, including holding information sessions in these venues
- Posting lottery application in Spanish, Chinese, Creole, Russian, Hebrew and English
- Including information in application materials detailing HLA's ELL/MLL program, how it supports children's acquisition of English and how the study of a third language, that of Hebrew, would positively impact their child's ability to become secure in English
- Informing prospective parents of the school's range of academic interventions

Table 3a: Student Demographics – Charter School Compared to District of Location

⁷ These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
Student Population	HLA CS	CSD 22	Variance	HLA CS	CSD 22	Variance
Students with Disabilities	20%	20%	0	24%	21%	+3
ELL/MLL	8%	19%	-11	8%	21%	-13
Economically Disadvantaged	63%	68%	-5	69%	73%	-4

Table 3b: Student Demographics – Charter School Compared to District of Location within Set Radii

	2017-2018						
Student Population	HLA CS	CSD 22, <0.5 Mile Radius	Variance	CSD 22, 1 Mile Radius	Variance	CSD 22, 2 Mile Radius	Variance
ELL/MLL	6%	5%	+1	6%	0	11%	-5

Note: Values taken from the NYC DOE Demographics snapshot and may differ from values presented elsewhere due to different sourcing and definitions. Comparative values are averaged at the school level and taken from schools serving grades K-8 in CSD 22.

Student Retention

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 73% of students were retained in HLA compared with 89% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for students with disabilities, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on December 11, 2018. Forty-five people attended, and seventeen spoke. Seventeen were in favor of the renewal and revision and none were opposed.

Hellenic Classical Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a full-term renewal for a period of five years for Hellenic Classical Charter School. The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2024.

Hellenic Classical Charter School (Hellenic) is meeting most benchmarks set forth by the New York City Department of Education Accountability Framework. The school is implementing the mission, key design elements, education program and organizational plan set forth in the charter.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	Hellenic Classical Charter School
Board Chair	Charles Capetanakis
District of location	NYC CSD 15 (Brooklyn)
Opening Date	Fall 2005
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial: July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2010 • First Renewal: February 9, 2010 – February 8, 2015 • Second Renewal: February 9, 2015 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 8/ 480 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 8/ 498 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	None
Facilities	646 Fifth Avenue, Brooklyn (Private Space)
Mission Statement	<i>The Hellenic Classical Charter School will provide all students with a rigorous classical education in a challenging and engaging learning environment. The school will use a standards based curriculum and will enhance instruction with the study of the Greek and Latin languages. The school will utilize didactic instruction, coaching and Socratic questioning. All students will leave the school prepared intellectually, socially, and emotionally to gain entry to and succeed in the best high schools in New York City and contribute to the global community as responsible citizens.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous classical education • Classical study of Greek and Latin language • Prepare students to gain entry into and succeed in the best high schools in New York City • Socratic method of teaching (Paideia) • Collaborative professional learning community • Student-led instruction • Parents as partners
Requested Revisions	Increase enrollment from 480 to 498 students.

Hellenic has been designated a High Performing Reward School by the NYSED for 4 consecutive years based on students’ performance on state assessments. Hellenic was among the top 20 percent of schools in the state for ELA and math performance for 2015-16 and 2016-17. Hellenic had no gaps in student performance on any accountability measure between students from subgroups.

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
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8
Total Approved Enrollment	480	480	480	480

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8
Total Approved Enrollment	498	498	498	498	498

Background

The Board of Regents granted an initial charter to Hellenic in January 2005. Hellenic opened for instruction in September 2005 initially serving 150 students in K through Grade 3. Hellenic’s charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2010. A revision to the school’s curriculum, assessment, and accountability was made in 2008.

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

Hellenic offers NYS Common Core-aligned curricula in English Language Arts, math, Science, Social Studies, Physical Education, as well as Greek, Latin, Music, Art, and Technology. Students regularly participate in and facilitate Socratic seminars. Advanced courses for high school credit are offered as well as free Specialized High School Admissions Test (SHSAT) practice.

Hellenic provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) to Students with Disabilities (SWDs). English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers are employed to provide services to students who are English language learner/multi-lingual learner (ELL/MLL). SETSS and services to ELL/MLLs are both provided via push-in and pull-out models. Teacher assistants provide additional supports in K through Grade 2.

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and State average. Hellenic has consistently outperformed the host district as well as the State in both math and ELA proficiency levels.

**Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students:
School, District & State Level Aggregates**

All Students	ELA					Math				
	Hellenic CS	CSD 15	Variance to CSD 15	NYS	Variance to NYS	Hellenic CS	CSD 15	Variance to CSD 15	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	59%	50%	+9	38%	+21	68%	51%	+17	39%	+29
2016-2017	63%	53%	+10	40%	+23	68%	53%	+15	40%	+28
2017-2018	70%	57%	+13	45%	+25	75%	56%	+19	45%	+30

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in grades 3-8 at Hellenic CS, CSD 15, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or State averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

SWDs and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students at Hellenic have consistently outperformed their host district peers. ELL/MLLs have outperformed their host CSD peers in some years, but not all.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	English Language Learners (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2015-2016	27% (+9)	29% (+21)	52% (+19)
	2016-2017	12% (-7)	0% (-9)	61% (+25)
	2017-2018	38% (+13)	0% (-11)	66% (+24)
Mathematics	2015-2016	33% (+14)	29% (+6)	61% (+24)
	2016-2017	42% (+23)	25% (+2)	63% (+25)
	2017-2018	42% (+17)	14% (-9)	70% (+28)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups in grades 3-8 at Hellenic CS, CSD 15, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school’s performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, Hellenic is *In Good Standing as a High Performing Reward School*.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

Hellenic appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school’s independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school’s capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to-asset ratio, are measures of the charter school’s capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.⁸

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed Hellenic’s audited financial statements from Fiscal Year 2016 to Fiscal Year 2018 to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any significant deficiencies in any year of the charter term.

⁸ These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

Hellenic has strong enrollment and backfills students at all grades from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is not yet meeting its targets for ELL/MLLs but is meeting its targets for ED students and is approaching the target for SWDs (see Table 5). Hellenic’s enrollment of ELL/MLLs is increasing, and in 2018-2019 Kindergarten saw a 13% enrollment of ELL/MLLs versus 22% for the same grade in CSD 15. For the 2019-2020 lottery, after siblings and pre-K seats, 100% of the remaining seats went to ELL/MLL students (thirty seats out of fifty-six total). Considering that Kindergarten seats must first go to siblings and Pre-K applicants, the school has requested an increase in authorized enrollment to be able to offer more seats to ELL/MLL students from the lottery and waitlist. The school is making good faith efforts to recruit, serve, and retain at-risk students⁹; the school currently has a lottery preference for ELL/MLL students and has submitted a letter of intent to implement a set aside preference for ELL/MLL students and SWDs in the next lottery.

Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL/MLL, and SWD populations include:

- Visiting feeder schools;
- Conducting three open houses per year with multilingual staff present;
- Advertising in local newspapers in English and Spanish; and
- Ensuring that recruitment and application materials (including the website) are in English and Spanish.

Table 5: Student Demographics –Charter School Compared to District of Location

Student Population	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Hellenic CS	CSD 15	Variance	Hellenic CS	CSD 15	Variance
Students with Disabilities	9%	21%	-12	9%	22%	-13
English Language Learners	6%	25%	-19	5%	25%	-20
Economically Disadvantaged	61%	49%	+12	57%	55%	+2

⁹ Education Law §2854(2)(a) requires that schools demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of students with disabilities, FRPL eligible students and English language learners when compared to the enrollment figures for such students in the school district in which the charter is located. SUNY and the Regents were charged with setting specific enrollment and retention targets for each charter school, and have done so. Education Law §2852(9-a)(b)(i). All charter schools that were initially chartered after August 2010 or renewed after January 1, 2011, are expected to meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets set by the Regents and SUNY. When submitting an application for renewal of the charter, schools are required to provide information detailing the means by which they will meet the enrollment and retention targets (Education Law §2851(4)(e)), and this information is considered by the Regents in the review of the school’s performance over the charter term. A school’s plan to change its enrollment practices, whether by weighting the lottery or preferencing, may also be considered when determining whether the school will meet the targets in the upcoming charter term. A school’s repeated failure to meet or exceed its enrollment and retention targets, when combined with a failure to show that extensive efforts to meet the targets have been made, may be cause for termination or revocation of the charter pursuant to section Education Law §2855(1)(e).

Student Retention

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 97% of students were retained in Hellenic compared with 89% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

Hellenic operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for SWDs, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on December 18, 2018. Eleven people attended, and six spoke. Six were in favor of the renewal and none were opposed.

KIPP Academy Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a full-term renewal for a period of five years for KIPP Academy Charter School. The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2024.

KIPP Academy Charter School (KIPP Academy) is meeting most benchmarks set forth in the New York City Department of Education Accountability Framework. The school is implementing the mission, key design elements, education program and organizational plan set forth in the charter.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	KIPP Academy Charter School
Board Chair	Rafael Mayer
District of location	NYC CSD 9 (the Bronx)
Opening Date	Fall 2000
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Charter: May 15, 2000 – May 16, 2005 • First Renewal: May 17, 2005 – May 16, 2010 • Second Renewal: May 17, 2010 – May 16, 2015 • Third Renewal: May 17, 2015 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 12/ 1220 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 12/ 1220 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	KIPP NYC
Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 730 Concourse Village West, Bronx (Public Space) • 250 East 156 Street, Bronx (Public Space) • 201 East 144th Street, Bronx (Private Space)
Mission Statement	<i>Our mission is to teach our students to develop the academic and character skills necessary to succeed in high school and college, to be self-sufficient, successful, and happy in the competitive world, and to build a better tomorrow for themselves and us all.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High expectations • Empowered staff • More time • Character counts • Through college and beyond
Requested Revisions	None

KIPP Academy has exceeded its internal goals with a 97% graduation rate and a 91% college matriculation rate as of August 2017. By December 2017, 97% of the class of 2018 had applied to college and 96% of Juniors had taken a mock SAT exam (making considerable gains in points from previous administrations).

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
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	1220	1220	1220	1220

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12	K – Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	1220	1220	1220	1220	1220

Background

The Board of Regents approved KIPP Academy to convert on May 4, 2000 and started serving students as a charter school initially serving 140 students in Grades 5 and 6. KIPP Academy’s charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2005, 2010 and 2015. A revision was approved in 2009 to serve K through Grade 12 and add a Memorandum of Understanding with KIPP NYC.

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

KIPP Academy Charter School offers curricula and coursework aligned to the New York Learning Standards in ELA, math, Social Studies and Science. In addition, the school offers Physical Education, Music, Theatre, Dance, and Art. The school has an extended day and year and holds half-day classes on some Saturdays.

The school offers Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) sections in K through Grade 4 and Grades 9 through 11. The school provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) push in and pull out services to Students with Disabilities (SWDs) in Grades 5 through 8, and 12:1:1 sections in grades 9, 11 and 12. All staff receive professional development to provide staff members with tools that they can implement in the classroom to meet the needs of their English language learners/ Multilingual learners (ELL/MLLs).

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and State average.

KIPP Academy has far exceeded both the host CSD as well as the State in ELA and math proficiency rates for the past three years.

Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: School, District & State Level Aggregates

All Students	ELA					Math				
	KIPP Academy	CSD 7	Variance to CSD 7	NYS	Variance to NYS	KIPP Academy	CSD 7	Variance to CSD 7	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	43%	19%	+24	38%	+5	53%	16%	+37	39%	+14
2016-2017	50%	22%	+28	40%	+10	58%	18%	+40	40%	+18
2017-2018	64%	28%	+36	45%	+19	72%	23%	+49	45%	+27

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in grades 3-8 at KIPP Academy CS, CSD 7, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or State averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

The school's performance with all special populations has consistently exceeded that of the host CSD.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	English Language Learners (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2015-2016	14% (+9)	12% (+8)	44% (+25)
	2016-2017	15% (+9)	27% (+21)	50% (+28)
	2017-2018	31% (+21)	20% (+13)	62% (+34)
Mathematics	2015-2016	23% (+17)	24% (+17)	54% (+38)
	2016-2017	24% (+17)	43% (+34)	58% (+40)
	2017-2018	42% (+32)	60% (+47)	72% (+49)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups in grades 3-8 at KIPP Academy CS, CSD 7, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or State averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

KIPP Academy offers courses that lead to Regents exams in Common Core Algebra and Algebra II, Geometry, Chemistry, Physics, US History, ELA, Earth Science, Living Environment, and Global History I and II. AP courses are available in Biology, English and US History. High school students have access to college coursework through the Syracuse University and College Now programs. Many Advanced Placement courses are available. Students also receive leadership training at the high school level.

Student Performance – High School

KIPP Academy Charter School has far exceeded the State in Regents outcomes for the past three cohorts of students.

Table 3a: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for All Students: School & State Level Aggregates

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2012 Cohort			2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State
ELA	100%	85%	+15	100%	85%	+15	97%	84%	+13
Global History	100%	78%	+22	99%	78%	+21	95%	77%	+18
Math	100%	86%	+14	100%	85%	+15	100%	83%	+17
Science	100%	84%	+16	100%	84%	+16	99%	83%	+16
US History	98%	81%	+17	97%	81%	+16	95%	80%	+15

KIPP Academy’s population of SWDs and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students have far exceeded the State in Regents outcomes. Graduation rates have exceeded the State for all years, and for SWDs and ED students. Overall, groups of special populations have been granted more Advanced Regents Diplomas than the state-wide rates.

Table 3b: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for Sub-Groups: School & State Level Aggregates

Subject	Cohort and School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the State)	English Language Learners (Variance to the State)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the State)
ELA	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	100% (+49)	s	100% (+21)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	100% (+46)	s	100% (+20)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	78% (+26)	N/A	96% (+18)
Global History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	100% (+60)	s	100% (+30)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	100% (+60)	s	98% (+28)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	89% (+49)	N/A	93% (+24)
Math	2012 Cohort	100% (+49)	s	100% (+19)

	(2015-2016)			
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	100% (+51)	s	100% (+20)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	100% (+53)	N/A	100% (+23)
Science	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	100% (+50)	s	100% (+22)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	100% (+50)	s	100% (+22)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	89% (+39)	N/A	98% (+22)
US History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	100% (+53)	s	100% (+26)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	100% (+52)	s	95% (+21)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	78% (+32)	N/A	93% (+21)

Outcomes for cohorts of fewer than six students are suppressed and indicated with an s.

Table 4a: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for All Students

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2012 Cohort			2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	98%	82%	+16	95%	82%	+13	96%	83%	+13
Local Diplomas	2%	5%	-3	0%	5%	-5	4%	6%	-2
Regents Diplomas	34%	46%	-12	32%	44%	-12	45%	43%	+2
Advanced Regents Diplomas	63%	31%	+32	62%	33%	+29	47%	33%	+14

Table 4b: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for Students with Disabilities

4-Yr Cohort: Sub-Groups	2012 Cohort Students with Disabilities			2013 Cohort Students with Disabilities			2014 Cohort Students with Disabilities		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	90%	55%	+35	100%	57%	+43	67%	59%	+8
Local Diplomas	10%	23%	-13	0%	24%	-24	11%	25%	-14
Regents Diplomas	30%	30%	0	64%	29%	+35	44%	30%	+14
Advanced Regents Diplomas	50%	3%	+47	36%	4%	+32	11%	3%	+8

Table 4c: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for Economically Disadvantaged

4-Yr Cohort: Sub-Groups	2012 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged			2013 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged			2014 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	97%	75%	+22	95%	76%	+19	96%	76%	+20
Local Diplomas	0%	6%	-6	0%	7%	-7	5%	8%	-3
Regents Diplomas	36%	51%	-15	36%	50%	-14	42%	49%	-7
Advanced Regents Diplomas	62%	18%	+44	59%	19%	+40	47%	19%	+28

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, KIPP Academy is *In Good Standing*.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

KIPP Academy Charter School appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school’s independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school’s capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to asset ratio, are measures of the charter school’s capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.¹⁰

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed KIPP Academy’s audited financial statements from Fiscal Year 2016 through Fiscal Year 2018 to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses in any year.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

KIPP Academy has strong enrollment and backfills students on all grades from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is approaching targets for special population subgroups – ED, SWDs, and ELL/MLLs (see Table 5). The school has had consistent percentages of these groups over the charter term. The school is making good faith efforts to recruit, serve, and retain at-risk students¹¹ and has submitted a letter of intent to implement a lottery preference for SWDs and ELL/MLL students in the next lottery.

¹⁰ These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

¹¹ Education Law §2854(2)(a) requires that schools demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of students with disabilities, FRPL eligible students and English language learners when compared to the enrollment figures for such students in the school district in which the charter is located. SUNY and the Regents were charged with setting specific enrollment and retention targets for each charter school, and have done so. Education Law §2852(9-a)(b)(i). All charter

Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL/MLL, and SWD populations include:

- Affording a preference for students who qualify for free/ reduced price lunch program;
- Targeting students in high needs communities;
- Conducting outreach to immigrant communities by bi-lingual staff and bi-lingual materials; and
- Detailing the special education services offered.

Table 5: Student Demographics – KIPP Academy Compared to District of Location

Student Population	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	KIPP Academy	CSD 7	Variance	KIPP Academy	CSD 7	Variance
Students with Disabilities	19%	26%	-7	20%	27%	-7
English Language Learners	13%	21%	-8	15%	23%	-8
Economically Disadvantaged	87%	92%	-5	89%	94%	-5

Student Retention

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 94% of students were retained in KIPP Academy compared with 83% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

KIPP Academy operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for students with disabilities, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on January 31, 2019. Thirteen people attended, and eight spoke. Eight were in favor of the renewal and none were opposed.

schools that were initially chartered after August 2010 or renewed after January 1, 2011, are expected to meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets set by the Regents and SUNY. When submitting an application for renewal of the charter, schools are required to provide information detailing the means by which they will meet the enrollment and retention targets (Education Law §2851(4)(e)), and this information is considered by the Regents in the review of the school’s performance over the charter term. A school’s plan to change its enrollment practices, whether by weighting the lottery or preferencing, may also be considered when determining whether the school will meet the targets in the upcoming charter term. A school’s repeated failure to meet or exceed its enrollment and retention targets, when combined with a failure to show that extensive efforts to meet the targets have been made, may be cause for termination or revocation of the charter pursuant to section Education Law §2855(1)(e).

Riverton Street Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a full-term renewal for a period of five years for Riverton Street Charter School. The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2024.

Riverton Street Charter School (Riverton) is meeting most benchmarks set forth in the New York City Department of Education Accountability Framework. The school is implementing the mission, key design elements, education program and organizational plan set forth in the charter.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	Riverton Street Charter School
Board Chair	Keisha Phillips-Kong
District of location	NYC CSD 29 (Queens)
Opening Date	Fall 2010
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Charter: January 12, 2010 – January 11, 2015 • January 12, 2015 -- June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 8/ 990 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 8/ 990 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	National Heritage Academies
Facilities	118-34 Riverton Street, Queens (Private Space)
Mission Statement	<i>The mission of Riverton Street Charter School is to instill in each student a passion for learning and hard work that will result in significant contributions to our school, our families, and our community. Parents and educators join together in creating a strong academic base in which students will be expected to achieve high academic levels in an environment that values compassion and respect.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family involvement • Strong cultural & community relationships • Solid student values & social Responsibility
Requested Revisions	None

Each year, since 2013-14, Riverton has outpaced CSD 29 and city averages in ELA, math, and science in all grades, usually by double-digit margins. The school surpassed city and district averages in the percent of students scoring at or above level three in most grades and subjects. In each of the last five years, Riverton met the goal of having over 50 percent of first- and second-graders at the school for two or more years perform at or above the 50th percentile on the spring NWEA test.

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
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8
Total Approved Enrollment	990	990	990	990

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8	K – Grade 8
Total Approved Enrollment	990	990	990	990	990

Background

The Board of Regents granted an initial charter to Riverton in January 2010. A revision to expand enrollment was made in July 2010. The school opened for instruction in September 2010 initially serving 196 students in K through Grade 3. Riverton’s charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2015.

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

Riverton offers curricula and coursework aligned to the New York State Learning Standards in ELA, math Social Studies and Science. In addition, the school offers Art, Physical Education, Mandarin, Music, and Chess. Riverton Street Charter School also offers an afterschool program.

The school offers Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) sections in K through Grade 5, as well as 12:1:1 sections on each grade. The school provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) push in and pull out services to Students with Disabilities (SWDs) on all grades. All staff receive professional development to provide staff members with tools that they can implement in the classroom to meet the needs of their English language learners/ Multilingual learners (ELL/MLLs).

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and State average.

Riverton has consistently outperformed the host district as well as the State in both math and ELA proficiency levels.

**Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students:
School, District & State Level Aggregates**

All Students	ELA					Math				
	Riverton CS	CSD 29	Variance to CSD 29	NYS	Variance to NYS	Riverton CS	CSD 29	Variance to CSD 29	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	40%	33%	+7	38%	+2	42%	26%	+16	39%	+3
2016-2017	44%	35%	+9	40%	+4	42%	26%	+16	40%	+2
2017-2018	52%	40%	+12	45%	+7	51%	31%	+20	45%	+6

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in grades 3-8 at Riverton, CSD 29, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or State averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

The school's performance with SWDs and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students has consistently exceeded that of the host CSD.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	English Language Learners (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2015-2016	9% (+2)	s	40% (+9)
	2016-2017	9% (+2)	s	36% (+4)
	2017-2018	15% (+3)	s	50% (+12)
Mathematics	2015-2016	21% (+13)	s	42% (+17)
	2016-2017	14% (+7)	s	35% (+11)
	2017-2018	18% (+8)	s	48% (+19)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups in grades 3-8 at Riverton CS, CSD 29, and at the state who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or state averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

Outcomes for cohorts of fewer than six students are suppressed and indicated with an s

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, Riverton is *In Good Standing*.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

Riverton appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school's capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to-asset ratio, are measures of the charter school's capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.¹²

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed Riverton's audited financial statements from Fiscal Year 2016 through Fiscal Year 2018 to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

Riverton has strong enrollment and backfills students from K to Grade 5 from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is coming close to but not yet meeting its targets for SWDs or ELLs/MLLs (see Table 3). The school has had consistent percentages of these groups over the charter term (however, did not file the appropriate documentation to NYSED for Free/Reduced Price lunch program in 2016-2017). The school is making good faith efforts to recruit, serve, and retain at-risk students¹³ and has submitted a letter of intent to implement a lottery preference for ELL/MLL students in the next lottery.

¹² These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

¹³ Education Law §2854(2)(a) requires that schools demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of students with disabilities, FRPL eligible students and English language learners when compared to the enrollment figures for such students in the school district in which the charter is located. SUNY and the Regents were charged with setting specific enrollment and retention targets for each charter school, and have done so. Education Law §2852(9-a)(b)(i). All charter schools that were initially chartered after August 2010 or renewed after January 1, 2011, are expected to meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets set by the Regents and SUNY. When submitting an application for renewal of the charter, schools are required to provide information detailing the means by which they will meet the enrollment and retention targets (Education Law §2851(4)(e)), and this information is considered by the Regents in the review of the school's performance over the charter term. A school's plan to change its enrollment practices, whether by weighting the lottery or preferencing, may also be considered when determining whether the school will meet the targets in the upcoming charter term. A school's repeated failure to meet or exceed its enrollment and retention targets, when combined with a failure to show that extensive efforts to meet the targets have been made, may be cause for termination or revocation of the charter pursuant to section Education Law §2855(1)(e).

Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL/MLL, and SWD populations include:

- Advertisements and notifications placed in publications such as Haiti Observateur, El Correo de Queens, and The Weekly Bangladesh, specifically mentioned provision of services for ELL/MLLs.;
- Fliers were distributed in Bengali, Haitian Creole, Urdu, Spanish, Arabic;
- At enrollment meetings, provide information on the program for ELL/MLLs and provide strategies to help their students in school;
- Translating school materials and advertising as needed; and
- Doubled the staff time dedicated to community outreach and engagement.
-

Table 3: Student Demographics – Riverton Charter School Compared to District of Location

Student Population	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Riverton CS	CSD 29	Variance	Riverton CS	CSD 29	Variance
Students with Disabilities	14%	18%	-4	15%	19%	-4
English Language Learners	1%	12%	-11	2%	13%	-11
Economically Disadvantaged	35%	73%	-38	82%	77%	+5

Student Retention

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 93% of students were retained in Riverton compared with 85% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

Riverton operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for SWDs, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on January 23, 2019. Sixty-two people attended, and twenty spoke. Twenty were in favor of the renewal and none were opposed.

Summit Academy Charter School

In accordance with Education Law §§2851(4) and 2852(2), the Chancellor of the New York City Department of Education recommends a full-term renewal for a period of five years for Summit Academy Charter School due to the nature of the restructure/renewal in order to give the new school team sufficient time to support student growth and achievement. The charter term would begin on July 1, 2019 and expire on June 30, 2024.

Charter School Summary

Name of Charter School	Summit Academy Charter School
Board Chair	Michael Bernard
District of location	NYC CSD 15
Opening Date	Fall 2009
Charter Terms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial Charter: December 16, 2008 – December 15, 2013 • First Renewal: December 16, 2013 – June 30, 2017 • Second Renewal: July 1, 2017 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	Grade 6 – Grade 12/ 350 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	Grade 6 – Grade 12/ 350 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	None
Facilities	27 Huntington Street, Brooklyn (Public Space)
Mission Statement	<i>Summit Academy Charter School bridges the gap between aspirations and realities by preparing 6th through 12th grade scholars to gain acceptance to, excel in and graduate from college.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College focus • Data driven instruction • More time on task/ engaged time • Strong school/home partnership • Character development program • Emphasis on community leadership • Strategies to close the achievement gap
Requested Revisions	Restructured renewal with new educational partner (The Center for Educational Innovation), revised leadership structure, new board of trustees.

Summit Academy Charter School (SACS) offers a well-rounded education that pairs an academically rigorous curriculum, enrichment opportunities like violin, STEM, and African Drumming, and support that goes above and beyond to help all scholars reach their full potential.

Current Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2017 to 2018	Year 2 2018 to 2019
Grade Configuration	Grade 6 – Grade 12	Grade 6 – Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	350	350

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	Grade 6 – Grade 12	Grade 6 – Grade 12	Grade 6 – Grade 12	Grade 6 – Grade 12	Grade 6 – Grade 12
Total Approved Enrollment	350	350	350	350	350

Background

The Board of Regents granted an initial charter to (SACS) in December 2008. The school opened for instruction in September 2009 initially serving 100 students in Grade 6. SACS’s charter was subsequently renewed by the Board of Regents in 2013 and 2017.

SACS is located in the Red Hook neighborhood of Brooklyn in NYC Community School District 15 (CSD 15) and serves students in grades 6-12. SACS has a history of low academic performance, receiving short-term renewals in 2013-14 (3 years) and 2016-17 (2 years).

Summary of Evidence for Renewal

Restructuring Agreement

The SACS Board of Trustees and NYCDOE have agreed that restructuring the school for the next proposed charter term is the best path forward to support the students. Restructuring SACS will address ongoing academic concerns by requiring implementation of a new educational program and replacement of existing board members and leadership. It will also ensure that families in Red Hook, and particularly those enrolled in SACS, continue to have access to a community-based school, which is much needed as this community has few educational options. In February 2019, the NYCDOE solicited applicants to lead the restructuring process; the NYCDOE and SACS selected The Center for Educational Innovation (CEI) to serve as the Educational Partner Organization (EPO). As the EPO, CEI will be responsible for developing and implementing a restructuring plan designed to ensure that during the next proposed charter term, academic outcomes at the school improve and meet or exceed all accountability standards required of NYCDOE Chancellor-authorized charter schools. The SACS Board of Trustees was deeply involved in the selection of CEI and agreed that their application was reflective of the needs and feedback of the community.

As a condition of renewal, SACS is expected to submit a yearly restructure report to detail their progress towards meeting or exceeding the following standards from the NYCDOE Accountability Handbook:

- Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?
 - New York State (NYS) English Language Arts (ELA) exam proficiency rates meet or exceed comparable community school district (CSD), Citywide and DOE-defined comparison group
 - NYS Math exam proficiency rates meet or exceed comparable CSD, Citywide and DOE-defined comparison group
 - NYS Science exam proficiency rates meet or exceed comparable CSD, Citywide and DOE-defined comparison group
 - NYS Regents exam pass rates meet or exceed Citywide rates. (Standard will be assessed individually for each NYS Regents exam taken by at least five students at the school in a given school year)
 - NYS ELA and Math exam proficiency rates for English Language Learners (ELLs), Students with Disabilities (SWD) meet or exceed CSD and Citywide rates
 - College & Career Preparatory Course Index (CCPCI) meets or exceeds Citywide average
 - College Readiness Index meets or exceeds (CRI) Citywide average
- Essential Question 2: Is the school effective and well-run?
 - Student attendance rate exceeds CSD and Citywide averages
 - Board held the required number of meetings per the charter law
 - Board meetings consistently meet quorum
 - School meets NYSED enrollment and retention targets for English Language Learners/Multilingual Learners (ELLs/MLLs), Students with Disabilities (SWDs), and students eligible for free and reduced price lunch at the conclusion of charter term
- Essential Question 3: Is the school financially viable?
 - Cash position – school has at least 60 days of cash on hand to cover operating expenses

NYCDOE and SACS determined that CEI has the capacity and expertise directly relevant to the needs of SACS. CEI has close to three decades of experience supporting schools across New York City and beyond. The organization has a record of helping schools move from “Priority School” to “In Good Standing.” CEI presented a thoughtful and realistic plan that included deep community engagement. Their approach will involve conducting a comprehensive needs assessment of the academic, cultural, fiscal and operational systems at the school, creating ambitious goals to address the needs, creating action plans to achieve these goals, providing intensive supports to implement the action plans, and monitoring progress and making adjustment over time.

As part of the restructuring, and subject to Board of Regents approval, CEI will conduct a Principal recruitment process. The new Principal will assume the responsibilities of the current Principal and Executive Director, removing the top layer of management. New Board members will be added to the board starting in May 2019, and current members (apart from one to two existing board members to ensure organizational continuity) will resign effective June 30, 2019. New board members will be selected with an eye towards a connection to the Red Hook community, as well as key needs of the school community, including expertise in education, operations, law, human resources, youth development, health services and community-based organization. All current SACS staff will be afforded the opportunity to reapply for roles at the school. CEI will conduct an in-depth assessment of the academic program, school culture, enrollment, instructional data use & processes, and operations. Subsequently, CEI will conduct strategic planning for curriculum development, school culture development, professional development, assessments, and operations. In close partnership with the school staff, students, family members and community members, CEI and the newly restructured Board of Trustees will create a shared mission, vision, and values for the restructure and change process.

Based on the comprehensive needs-assessment of the school, CEI may bring Project BOOST (Building Options and Opportunities for Students) to SACS to provide students with academic enrichment, cultural enrichment, basic skills development, academic guidance, and community service opportunities. CEI will also explore, based on the needs-assessment, bringing a mastery-based approach to the SACS curriculum, as well as implementing the New York State Board of Regents benchmarks for Social and Emotional Learning through a personalized learning framework.

NYC DOE Chancellor Recommendation

Although the past performance of SACS would normally warrant a short-term renewal or a non-renewal recommendation, as the school is going through a restructuring renewal, rather than operating under the status quo, the renewal process and recommendation for SACS is separate and distinct from a traditional renewal. As such, and in order to ensure that the restructured school has sufficient time to engage in the significant organizational change and growth needed to demonstrate academic success, the NYCDOE recommends a full-term, five-year renewal, for the restructured SACS. As research shows, a full turnaround may take three to five years, with standardized test scores as “lagging indicators¹⁴”. A short-term, three-year renewal would be insufficient and would limit the NYCDOE’s ability to analyze Year 3 (2021-22) data effectively, giving the restructured school only two years to demonstrate gains.

Throughout the proposed new charter term, the NYCDOE would engage in extensive monitoring and oversight of the newly restructured SACS to ensure progress towards meeting or exceeding the standards enumerated above. The NYCDOE will conduct eight oversight visits during Year 1 of the restructure, four per year in Year 2, and two per year in Year 3.

Within 6 months of implementation of the restructure, the school will submit a full evaluation plan that creates goals for leading and lagging indicators for each year of the charter term, with Year 4 showing the school meeting the standards above. In addition to the routine Annual Comprehensive Review process conducted by the NYCDOE, the school will submit a yearly restructure report that details progress towards meeting goals in the evaluation plan. As per best practices in turnaround evaluation,¹⁵ Year 1 and 2 reports will focus on leading indicators, outline the status of implementation efforts and detail what course corrections are being made. Years 3 and beyond will outline progress on lagging indicators, focusing on gains in student’s achievement and report on the sustainability of implementation efforts. As with all charter schools, renewal is contingent on review of all standards in the accountability handbook and charter agreement.

Key Performance Area: Educational Success

Summit Academy Charter School offers curricula and coursework aligned to the New York State Learning Standards in ELA, math, Social Studies and Science. In addition, the school offers Theatre, Dance, Spanish and Physical Education. The school offers Saturday Academy.

The school offers Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) sections on all grades as well as Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) push in and pull out services. ELL/MLLs are provided with instructional modifications and support systems.

Student Performance – Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

¹⁴ http://www.massinsight.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Evaluating_School_Turnaround.pdf

¹⁵ http://www.massinsight.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Evaluating_School_Turnaround.pdf

See Tables 1 and 2 below regarding 3-8 math and ELA exam aggregate and subgroup student performance compared to the district and State average.

SACS has underperformed the host CSD and the State over the course of the charter term in ELA and math proficiency.

Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: School, District & State Level Aggregates

All Students	ELA					Math				
	Summit CS	CSD 15	Variance to CSD 15	NYS	Variance to NYS	Summit CS	CSD 15	Variance to CSD 15	NYS	Variance to NYS
2016-2017	28%	53%	-25	40%	-12	28%	45%	-17	34%	-6
2017-2018	29%	58%	-29	46%	-17	29%	50%	-21	40%	-11

Note: Data in Table 1 represents tested students in grades 6-8 at Summit CS, CSD 15, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or State averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

The school's performance with SWDs and Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students has consistently been below that of the host CSD in both ELA and math. The performance of ELL/ MLL students has been inconsistent.

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for Special Populations

Subject	School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)	English Language Learners (Variance to the district of location)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)
ELA	2016-2017	6% (-11)	0% (-2)	27% (-8)
	2017-2018	14% (-8)	9% (+6)	28% (-14)
Mathematics	2016-2017	6% (-7)	14% (+7)	28% (-1)
	2017-2018	9% (-9)	0% (-10)	28% (-7)

Note: Data in Table 2 represents tested students in respective subgroups in grades 6-8 at Summit CS, CSD 15, and at the State who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment. This table was created using grade level data to generate the comparative values, the percent difference between the school's performance and the district or State averages. All values were calculated to the nearest whole number; therefore, the percent differences may show a rounded value.

SACS offers courses that lead to Regents exams in Common Core Algebra and Algebra II, Geometry, Chemistry, Physics, US History, ELA, Earth Science, Living Environment, and Global History I and II. AP courses are available in Biology, Literature and Composition.

Student Performance – High School

SACS School has inconsistent Regents outcomes, with some subjects below the statewide average, and others slightly above.

Table 3a: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for All Students: School & State Level Aggregates

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2012 Cohort			2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State
ELA	92%	85%	+7	91%	85%	+6	88%	84%	+4
Global History	87%	78%	+9	72%	78%	-6	68%	77%	-9
Math	83%	86%	-3	91%	85%	+6	86%	83%	+3
Science	83%	84%	-1	93%	84%	+9	84%	83%	+1
US History	90%	81%	+9	81%	81%	0	75%	80%	-5

Regents outcomes for SWDs has been strong in years when data is available. The same is true for ED students, with the exception of Global History. Graduation rates overall have been slightly above or below the statewide rate. Graduation rates for SWDs has been inconsistent; graduation rates for ED students has been above that of the State.

Table 3b: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for Sub-Groups: School & State Level Aggregates

Subject	Cohort and School Year	Students with Disabilities (Variance to the State)	ELL/MLLs (Variance to the State)	Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the State)
ELA	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	71% (+20)	N/A	91% (+12)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	91% (+11)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	89% (+37)	N/A	88% (+10)
Global History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	71% (+31)	N/A	86% (+16)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	68% (-2)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	67% (+27)	N/A	64% (-5)
Math	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	57% (+6)	N/A	83% (+2)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	91% (+11)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	67% (+20)	N/A	83% (+6)
Science	2012 Cohort	71% (+21)	N/A	83% (+5)

	(2015-2016)			
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	94% (+16)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	67% (+17)	N/A	81% (+5)
US History	2012 Cohort (2015-2016)	71% (+24)	N/A	89% (+15)
	2013 Cohort (2016-2017)	s	N/A	79% (+5)
	2014 Cohort (2017-2018)	44% (-2)	N/A	74% (+2)

Outcomes for cohorts of fewer than six students are suppressed and indicated with an s.

Table 4a: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for All Students

4-Yr Cohort: All Students	2012 Cohort			2013 Cohort			2014 Cohort		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	81%	82%	-1	84%	82%	+2	80%	83%	-3
Local Diplomas	0%	5%	-5	0%	5%	-5	4%	6%	-2
Regents Diplomas	54%	46%	+8	74%	44%	+30	71%	43%	+28
Advanced Regents Diplomas	27%	31%	-4	9%	33%	-24	5%	33%	-28

Table 4b: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for Students with Disabilities

4-Yr Cohort: Sub-Groups	2012 Cohort Students with Disabilities			2013 Cohort Students with Disabilities			2014 Cohort Students with Disabilities		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	43%	55%	-12	s	57%	-	78%	59%	+19
Local Diplomas	0%	23%	-23	s	24%	-	22%	25%	-3
Regents Diplomas	14%	30%	-16	s	29%	-	56%	30%	+26
Advanced Regents Diplomas	29%	3%	+26	s	4%	-	0%	3%	-3

Outcomes for cohorts of fewer than six students are suppressed and indicated with an s.

Table 4c: High School Graduation Rate/Diplomas Awarded for Economically Disadvantaged

4-Yr Cohort: Sub-Groups	2012 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged			2013 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged			2014 Cohort Economically Disadvantaged		
	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
Graduation Rate	80%	75%	+5	85%	76%	+9	79%	76%	+3
Local Diplomas	0%	6%	-6	0%	7%	-7	5%	8%	-3
Regents Diplomas	49%	51%	-2	76%	50%	+26	67%	49%	+18
Advanced Regents Diplomas	31%	18%	+13	9%	19%	-10	7%	19%	-12

According to the 2017-2018 school year ESEA accountability designations, SACS is a “Focus Charter”.

Key Performance Area: Organizational Viability

Financial Condition

SACS appears to be in good or sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school’s independently audited financial statements. The NYCDOE reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school’s capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to asset ratio, are measures of the charter school’s capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.¹⁶

Financial Management

The NYCDOE reviewed SACS’ audited financial statements from Fiscal Year 2017 and Fiscal Year 2018 to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Key Performance Area: Faithfulness to the Charter and Law

Enrollment, Recruitment and Retention

SACS has strong enrollment and backfills students on all grades from its waitlist. Through efforts towards increasing the percentage of at-risk students enrolled, the school is approaching the targets for SWDs and ELLs/MLLs) and exceeding the target for ED students (see Table 5). The school has had consistent percentages of these groups over the charter term. The school is making good faith efforts to recruit, serve, and retain at-risk students¹⁷.

¹⁶ These rigorous indicators of fiscal soundness are aligned with those recommended by the National Association of Charter School Authorizers.

¹⁷ Education Law §2854(2)(a) requires that schools demonstrate good faith efforts to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of students with disabilities, FRPL eligible students and English language learners when compared to the enrollment figures for such students in the school district in which the charter is located. SUNY and the Regents were charged with setting specific enrollment and retention targets for each charter school, and have done so. Education Law §2852(9-a)(b)(i). All charter schools that were initially chartered after August 2010 or renewed after January 1, 2011, are expected to meet or exceed the enrollment and retention targets set by the Regents and SUNY. When submitting an application for renewal of the charter, schools are required to provide information detailing the means by which they will meet the enrollment and retention targets (Education

Efforts to recruit and retain students in the ED, ELL/MLL, and SWD populations include:

- Disseminate application materials to local organizations and community centers that serve families with limited means;
- Produce applications and promotional materials in Spanish and send recruiters door to door in housing developments that serve the target populations; and
- Place advertisements in local newspapers and newsletters, as well as areas that are well-traveled with high rates of non-native English speakers.

Table 5: Student Demographics – Summit Academy Charter School Compared to District of Location

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Summit CS	CSD 15	Variance	Summit CS	CSD 15	Variance
Student Population						
Students with Disabilities	19%	23%	-4	22%	25%	-3
English Language Learners	6%	13%	-7	10%	15%	-5
Economically Disadvantaged	82%	65%	+17	83%	67%	+16

Student Retention

According to NYCDOE data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 84% of students were retained in SACS compared with 89% in the district of location.

Legal Compliance

Summit Academy Charter School operates in accordance with applicable law, regulations, rules and other policies, including the terms of its charter, its by-laws and other school-specific policies. It is also in compliance with federally mandated disciplinary procedures for SWDs, and the Dignity for All Students Act. The board holds meetings in accordance with the Open Meetings Law.

Summary of Public Comment

The required public hearing was held by the New York City Department of Education on October 16, 2018. Thirty-seven people attended, and seventeen spoke. Seventeen were in favor of the renewal and none were opposed. A revision hearing was held on April 9, 2019. Fifty-one people attended, and fifteen spoke, including two members of leadership, nine parents, and three community members. None were in favor of the revision and fifteen were opposed.

Law §2851(4)(e)), and this information is considered by the Regents in the review of the school’s performance over the charter term. A school’s plan to change its enrollment practices, whether by weighting the lottery or preferencing, may also be considered when determining whether the school will meet the targets in the upcoming charter term. A school’s repeated failure to meet or exceed its enrollment and retention targets, when combined with a failure to show that extensive efforts to meet the targets have been made, may be cause for termination or revocation of the charter pursuant to section Education Law §2855(1)(e).