Department of Education

Dennis M. Walcott, Chancellor

HEBREW LANGUAGE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT

2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
DECEMBER 2013

Table of Contents

Summary of Renewal Recommendation 2

- I. Charter School Overview 2
- II. Overview of School-Specific Data 2
- III. Rationale for Recommendation 4

School Overview and History 7

Renewal Process Overview 8

Findings 10

- Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success 10
- Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization 14
- Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? 18
- Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term? 19

Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview 20

Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework 21

Appendix A: School Performance Data 30

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data 32

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Name of Charter School	Hebrew Language Academy Charter School
Current Board Chair(s)	Sara Berman
School Leader	Laura Silver
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 22
Physical Address	1340 East 29th Street, Brooklyn, 11210
Facility	Private
School Opened For Instruction	2009
Current Charter Term Expiry Date	1/12/2014
Maximum Grade Levels/Enrollment at Expiry Date	K-5 / 450
Proposed Charter Term	1.5 years
Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Authorized Enrollment at New Expiry Date	K-5/ 450

II. Overview of School-Specific Data:

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	-	C	F
Student Progress	-	-	F	F
Student Performance	-	-	C	C
School Environment	-	-	F	B
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	-	1.6	0.6

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	59.2%	29.0%
CSD 22	-	-	55.5%	32.9%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	3.7	-3.9
NYC	-	-	49.0%	27.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	10.2	1.3
New York State	-	-	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-	-	4.0	-2.2

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	66.2%	35.9%
CSD 22	-	-	61.3%	39.3%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	4.9	-3.4
NYC	-	-	57.0%	34.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	9.2	1.7
New York State	-	-	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-	-	0.5	7.0

All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Academic Goal Analysis (based on School's submission)					
	1st Year 2009-2010	2nd Year 2010-2011	3rd year 2011-2012	4th Year 2012-2013	Cumulative 4-Year Total
Total Achievable Academic Goals	4	6	25	27	**62**
# Met	2	1	13	10	**26**
# Partially Met	1	0	1	3	**5**
# Not Met	1	5	11	14	**31**
% Met	**50%**	**17%**	**52%**	**37%**	**42%**
% Partially Met	**25%**	**0%**	**4%**	**11%**	**8%**
% Not Met	**25%**	**83%**	**44%**	**52%**	**50%**

III. Rationale for Recommendation

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School (HLA) has partially demonstrated academic success. While HLA received an overall F grade this year on the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Progress Report, the school has, in both years of operation, performed in the top 50% of all elementary schools citywide, based on ELA and Math proficiency.

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include, "(a) Improve student learning and achievement;" and "(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure."

The Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's mission is to be a nurturing yet rigorous elementary dual language school committed to academic excellence as well as to fostering a high degree of Hebrew language proficiency. HLA strives for students to achieve a sophisticated knowledge of English Language Arts, mathematics, the sciences, and social studies. HLA will enhance the curriculum through art, music, technology, and physical education, all of which will incorporate Hebrew language instruction, using a partial immersion proficiency model. HLA seeks to develop a strong sense of social and civic responsibility through the integration of community service and service learning into their classroom studies. The school seeks to graduate students with a solid foundation for further academic learning and continuous personal development as ethical citizens in an increasingly global community.

The school entered its fifth year of operation with the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. Therefore, the New York City Department of Education has two NYC DOE Progress Reports and has two years of NYS assessment data to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at HLA. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and are based on the school's performance in each of these categories: student progress, student performance, school environment, with additional points for closing the achievement gap contributing to the overall grade. Scores are based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to all schools citywide.

Over the time that NYS assessment data has been captured for HLA, it has performed better than schools citywide, been on par with district schools, but not demonstrated progress at the same rate as peer schools. In 2011-2012, the first year the school was eligible for a NYC DOE Progress Report, the school received an overall grade of C. On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, HLA received an overall grade of F. Despite the overall F grade, HLA's proficiency has ranked the school in the top 50% of elementary schools citywide. In both years of testing, HLA outperformed the city in both ELA and math. This year, HLA ranked in the top 40% of elementary schools citywide based on the school's ELA and math proficiency. Last year, HLA ranked in the top 35% in ELA and the top 43% in math of all elementary schools citywide. Furthermore, the school's average math proficiency rating in 2012-2013 was 2.79, which puts it in the top third of the city[1]. HLA has also outperformed both Community School District (CSD) 22 and the city in ELA and math in 2011-2012. District 22 is one of New York City's higher performing districts, performing in the top third of the city.

Despite performing above the citywide average in both years of operation, HLA students experienced relatively little performance growth. For this reason, the school received an F grade on Progress. The Student Progress subsection of the Progress Report is mostly based on Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles. The school's Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles in 2012-2013

[1] The average proficiency rate is a measure that represents the mean proficiency rating for all students attributed to the school.

placed the school in the bottom 1% of elementary schools for English and the bottom 3% of elementary schools for math. citywide.[2]

Over the course of the charter term, the school has met or partially met thirty-two of sixty-two (52%) of its academic charter goals[3]. In addition, the school has consistently met its charter goal of remaining in good standing with state and federal accountability.

HLA has a developed responsive education program and supportive learning environment. The school provides a partial language immersion model, which employs a co-teaching instructional approach with two teachers providing instruction in both Hebrew and English. HLA utilizes a Response to Intervention (RTI) and Child Study Team (CST) approach to provide learning supports for at-risk students and students with disabilities. The school consistently collects, analyses, and utilizes data to inform student outcomes. The school is supported by a community based organization that provides many ways for teachers to receive professional development.

During its current charter term, the school received annual site visits from the NYC DOE in the spring of 2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013. The reviewers cited the school's range of assessments to monitor student progress. The school has been improving upon the types of assessments they collect year over year and their methods of using the data. Reviewers also cited the school's consistent approach to providing professional development through regular observations, curriculum studies, and conference attendance. HLA was also recognized for establishing a student-centered environment that promotes student progress and provides multiple opportunities for struggling students to receive academic assistance.[4]

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Hebrew Language Academy is a fiscally sound and viable organization.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. The Board currently has ten members, which is more than the minimum number of five members delineated in the school's bylaws. The Board has demonstrated effective oversight of the school as evidenced by regular school leadership updates on academic progress to the Board, well established lines of accountability, and established committees.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture. The school has had mixed results on its Learning Environment Surveys for parent and teacher satisfaction of the school. The school has met its authorized enrollment each year of its charter.

---

[2] This measure calculates the median (middle) adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. A student's growth percentile is a number between 0 and 100, which represents the percentage of students with the same score on last year's test who scored the same or lower than the student on this year's test. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the Progress Report uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect average differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The Progress Report evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

[3] It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

[4] Hebrew Language Academy Charter School Annual Site Visit Reports, 2011, 2012.

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations and is financially sustainable based on current practices. There was no material weakness noted in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 independent annual financial audits.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, Hebrew Language Academy and the Board of Trustees has been compliant with all applicable laws and regulations.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

After the 2013-2014 school year, HLA proposes to expand to serve grades 6-8. HLA proposes to take a pause in its planned expansion in order to focus more intensively on the successful implementation of additional capacity-building initiatives. The delay in expansion would allow the school to strengthen instruction as well as targeted interventions to address areas of student need and to demonstrate improvement in student progress.

For the aforementioned reasons, the NYC DOE recommends a short term renewal.

During the next charter term, the NYC DOE will continue to monitor HLA's academic performance in regards to student progress. If the school is interested in applying for a grade expansion during the next charter term, the school should submit that request to the NYC DOE for future consideration.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is an elementary school serving approximately 473[5] students in kindergarten through fifth grade during the 2013-2014 school year. HLA opened in the 2009-2010 school year with kindergarten and first grade, and is under the terms of its first charter; HLA's current charter term expires January 12, 2014.[6] The school was originally authorized to serve students in grades kindergarten through five at scale, which it reached during its current charter term. The school is located in a private facility in District 22, in Brooklyn.

HLA's mission is be a nurturing yet rigorous K-5 dual language school committed to academic excellence as well as to fostering a high degree of Hebrew language proficiency. HLA strives for its students to achieve a sophisticated knowledge of English Language Arts, mathematics, the sciences, and social studies. HLA aims to offer a rich and innovative curriculum, enhanced by art, music, technology, and physical education, all of which will incorporate Hebrew language instruction, using a partial immersion proficiency model. HLA strives for students to develop a strong sense of social and civic responsibility through the integration of community service and service learning into their classroom studies. HLA's goal is for students to graduate with a solid foundation for further academic learning and continuous personal development as ethical citizens in an increasingly global community.

The school typically enrolls new students in all grades K-5. There were 463 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.[7]

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students[8]:

Special Populations

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL)	23.4%	67.4%	62.0%	63.2%
Students with Disabilities (SwD)	20.3%	13.8%	18.5%	17.5%
English Language Learners (ELL)	5.7%	5.8%	5.4%	7.9%

Hebrew Language Academy's Board of Trustees is led by Sara Berman and has been since the school's inception. The school is led by Laura Silver who became the head of school in 2011, it was previously led by Maureen Campbell.

[5] ATS data 10/10/13
[6] NYC DOE internal data
[7] Self-reported by school leadership 7/2013
[8] Special population figures are pulled from ATS as of June 1st each year. These figures are compared against the total population which is pulled from ATS as of October 31st each year.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

Renewal Process

In the final year of its charter, a Chancellor-authorized charter school seeking renewal must demonstrate its success during the current charter term and establish goals and objectives for the next charter term. Ultimately, the renewal process offers an opportunity for the school community to reflect on its experiences during its first term, to make a compelling, evidence-based case that it has earned the privilege of an additional charter term, and, if renewed, to carry out an ambitious plan for the future.

As the school is approaching the end of its charter term, the NYC DOE performs a comprehensive review of the school's performance over the course of the charter. This renewal process is conducted through analyzing student performance data and collecting and evaluating school-submitted documents during the charter term. Evidence of a school's success is organized around the four essential questions that comprise the NYC DOE's Accountability Framework:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?
3. Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
4. What are the school's plans for its next charter term?

A school will answer these overarching questions by demonstrating that its students have made significant academic progress and that the school has met the goals and objectives pledged in its initial charter. In addition, the school will describe challenges it has faced during its charter term, the strategies that were used to address those challenges, and the lessons learned.

Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding a school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during its charter term, including but not limited to oversight visits, annual reports, and formal correspondence between the school and its authorizer, the NYC DOE, all of which are conducted in order to identify areas of weakness and to help the school to address them. Additionally, the NYC DOE incorporates into this report its findings from the renewal application process, which includes a written application, a report on student achievement data and a school visit by staff from the Charter Schools Accountability and Support (CSAS) team and other staff from the NYC DOE.

Upon review of all the relevant materials, a recommendation is made to the Chancellor. The Chancellor's determination, and the findings on which that decision is based, is then submitted to the New York State Board of Regents.

Is the school an academic success?

To assess whether a school is an academic success, the NYC DOE considers performance measures, including, but not limited to the following:

- Overall NYC DOE Progress Report score,
- New York State ELA and Math results and/or New York State Regents exams,
- ELA and Math proficiency compared to the district for elementary and middle schools, and graduation rates compared to the city for high schools,
- New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) or other approved alternate assessments, and
- Performance data pertaining to college and career readiness.

Academic success is rated as **Demonstrated, Partially Demonstrated, or Not Yet Demonstrated.**

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally sound, viable organization, CSAS focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and

Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the NACSA (National Association of Charter School Authorizers) Financial Framework[9].

The NYC DOE considers a variety of supporting materials and data, including but not limited to the following:

- Board of Trustee bylaws,
- Board of Trustee meeting minutes,
- Annual Reports submitted by schools to New York State Education Department (NYSED),
- NYC DOE School Surveys,
- Data collection sheets provided by schools,
- Student, staff, and Board turnover rates,
- Audits of authorized enrollment numbers, and
- Annual financial audits.

A school's Governance Structure & Organizational Design and Climate & Community Engagement are rated as **Developed, Partially Developed,** or **Not Yet Developed.** A school's Financial Health is rated to indicate whether there are concerns about the near-term financial obligations and the financial sustainability of the school.

Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Staff Representatives

The following NYC DOE staff representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on April 30th and 31st, 2013:

- Sonya Hooks, Senior Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Andrea McLean, Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Keisha Womack, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Martine Santos, Senior ELL Curriculum Specialist, NYC DOE Office of English Language Learners

[9] http://www.qualitycharters.org/assets/files/images/stories/pdfs/publications/Performance_Framework_Fall_2012_Draft.pdf, page 38-59

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal Hebrew Language Academy has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

Academic Attainment and Improvement

At the time of this report, the school has received two NYC DOE Progress Reports and two years of NYS assessment data. (For detailed information on the progress reports and grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A.)

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	-	C	F
Student Progress	-	-	F	F
Student Performance	-	-	C	C
School Environment	-	-	F	B
College and Career Readiness**			-	-
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	-	1.6	0.6

** The College and Career Readiness grade was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	59.2%	29.0%
CSD 22	-	-	55.5%	32.9%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	3.7	-3.9
NYC	-	-	49.0%	27.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	10.2	1.3
New York State	-	-	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-	-	4.0	-2.2

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	66.2%	35.9%
CSD 22	-	-	61.3%	39.3%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	4.9	-3.4
NYC	-	-	57.0%	34.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	9.2	1.7
New York State	-	-	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-	-	0.5	7.0

All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Mission and Academic Goals

Over the charter term, the school achieved: 2 of 3 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter, 1 of 4 in the second year, 16 of 28 in the third year, 10 of 26 in the fourth year.[10]

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

	Met in 2009-10?	Met in 2010-11?	Met in 2011-12?	Met in 2012-13?
75% or more of students at grade level or above for grades K, 1, and 2 ECLAS	Partial	Partial	Partial	Partial
75% of students must score a 3 or above for ELA	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
75% of students must score a 3 or above for Math	N/A	N/A	No	N/A
Each year, the School's Aggregate Performance Index on the NYS exams will meet its Adequate Yearly Progress set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability System.	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
75% of students must score a 3 or above on the NYS Science Exam	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
75% of students must score a 3 or above on the NYS Social Studies Exam	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade level cohorts of students will reduce by one half, the gap between their average Normal Curve Equivalent (N.C.E.) in the previous Spring administration of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (I.T.B.S.) ELA and an N.C.E. of 50 in the current Spring	N/A	N/A	Partial	Yes
Grade level cohorts of students will reduce by one half, the gap between their average Normal Curve Equivalent (N.C.E.) in the previous Spring administration of the I.T.B.S. Math and an N.C.E. of 50 in the current Spring	N/A	N/A	No	No
Grade level cohorts of students will reduce by one half, the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS ELA exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade level cohorts of students will reduce by one half, the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS Math exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Math Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Percent of students performing at or above level 3 on the NYS ELA examination will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of CSD 22.	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
Percent of students performing at or above level 3 on the NYS Math examination will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of CSD 22.	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
From years 2-4, the school will receive a "B" or higher on the Student Progress section of the NYCDOE Progress Report	N/A	N/A	No	No
Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Report Card	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes

[10] Annual reports submitted to the New York State Education Department (NYSED).

75% of students at or above Novice-Mid Level in Speaking - Grade K	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Low Level in Listening - Grade K	No	No	No	No
75% of students will be able to recognize all Hebrew letters in their print form and write their name - Grade K	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes
75% of students at or above Novice-High Level in Speaking - Grade 1	Yes	No	No	No
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Mid Level in Listening - Grade 1	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes
75% of students at or above Novice-Mid Level in Reading - Grade 1	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes
75% of students at or above Novice-Mid in Writing - Grade 1	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Low Level in Speaking - Grade 2	N/A	No	No	Yes
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Mid Level in Listening - Grade 2	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes
75% of students at or above Novice-Mid Level in Reading - Grade 2	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Low Level in Writing. 75% of students will be able to write all Hebrew letters in script - Grade 2	N/A	N/A	Yes	No
75% of students at or above Novice-High Level in Speaking - Grade 3	N/A	N/A	No	No
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Mid Level in Listening - Grade 3	N/A	N/A	Yes	Yes
75% of students at or above Novice-Mid Level in Reading - Grade 3	N/A	N/A	No	No
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Low Level in Writing. 75% of students will be able to write all Hebrew letters in script - Grade 3	N/A	N/A	No	No
75% of students at or above Novice-High Level in Speaking - Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Mid Level in Listening - Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	No
75% of students at or above Novice-Mid Level in Reading - Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes
75% of students at or above Intermediate-Low Level in Writing. 75% of students will be able to write all Hebrew letters in script - Grade 4	N/A	N/A	N/A	No

Responsive Education Program

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited the school on September 16 and 17, 2013. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
  - HLA adhered to the Citywide Instructional Expectations, which guides the school's implementation of the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). This helped facilitate a more deliberate approach for teachers to promote the instructional shifts in ELA and Math strategies.
  - The school reported implementing several improvements to its educational program, including:
    - Selecting new curriculum and aligning curriculum to Common Core Learning Standards.

- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
    - HLA utilizes a Response to Intervention (RTI) and Child Study Team (CST) approach to provide learning supports for at-risk students and students with disabilities.
    - HLA uses the workshop model of small group and independent practice to reduce the student to teacher ratio and to enable more individualized attention focused on students' diverse needs (both for accelerated and at risk learners).
    - Students performing under benchmarks on assessments for ELA, math, and/or Hebrew proficiency are identified for Academic Intervention Services, in which additional layers of support are delivered through a variety of strategies, including differentiated instruction.
    - Students who are struggling in ELA, math and/or Hebrew are also supported through an optional summer school program that operates 3 hours a day for four weeks.
    - The school also streamlined its daily schedule to more effectively distribute staff resources within and between classrooms, allowing two teachers for each core subject as well as Hebrew to push-in or pull-out for more small group guided instruction.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
    - On the days of the visit, staff from the NYC DOE observed twenty-six classrooms, grades K-5, with the Head of School, Director of General Studies Curriculum and Instruction, Director of Hebrew Language Curriculum and Instruction, and the Board of Trustees Education Committee Chair.
    - The average class size was 27, with two teachers in each classroom.
    - Forms of questioning during the observations included some basic fact recall, as well as questions which challenged students to demonstrate understanding or to analyze and apply understanding.
    - In most rooms, NYC DOE staff observed that checks for understanding included questioning, polling, class work, teacher observation, and frequent use of student turn and talk.
    - In all rooms, NYC DOE staff observed differentiation of materials, tasks, and products, through small group instruction or independent practice. These were consistent with the school model.
    - In all observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
    - In all observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were quickly redirected.
    - Based on debriefs with the school's Head of School, Directors of Hebrew and General Studies Instruction and Curriculum and Board of Trustees Education Committee Chair after classroom visits, all classroom instruction was aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with eleven teachers and two learning specialists. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received school-based professional development both in the summer and weekly during the school year, with the administration providing resources. They also reported being encouraged by administration to get further professional development outside of the school.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through both formal (i.e. Common Core standards-based tests, Developmental Reading Assessment [DRA]) and informal assessments (i.e. observational notes, exit slips assessments. for groupings and lesson planning).

Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design.

On September 18, 2013, as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE interviewed the school's Board of Trustees. Based on document review and interview, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has ten active members, and has maintained membership within the minimum of five members and maximum of thirteen members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- School Leadership updates the Board on academic progress and operations at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organization chart and school leadership's monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.
- The Board has active and functioning committees, as required by its bylaws, including a Finance Committee, Education Committee, Church/State Separation Compliance Committee and Nominating Committee, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The board's chair is Sara Berman and has been since the school's inception.
- The Head of School is Laura Silver who has been at the school since 2011, the school's founding principal was Maureen Campbell.

School Climate & Community Engagement

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture.

- Over the charter term, the school has met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% except for one year, 2011-2012 when its average student attendance was 93%. Current average daily attendance for students is slightly below its goal, 94.7%.[11]

Average Daily Attendance	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
	95%	95%	93%	95%

- Twenty-seven percent of instructional staff did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the 2012-2013[12] school year.
- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey results were:

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School NYC School Survey Results

	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Academic Expectations	-	Below Average	Well Below Average	Average
Communication	-	Average	Well Below Average	Average
Engagement	-	Below Average	Well Below Average	Above Average

[11] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 7/2013
[12] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 7/2013

Safety & Respect	-	Average	Well Below Average	Above Average

- The school's charter goals include, "parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect." The school has met the goal in each year of the charter[13].
- The school's charter goals include, "staff will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect." The school has not met this goal[14].
- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey response rates were:

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

	Parents	Citywide	**Teachers**	Citywide	**Students[15]**	Citywide
2009-10	**-**		**-**		**-**	
2010-11	**66%**	52%	**86%**	82%	**-**	
2011-12	**81%**	53%	**78%**	82%	**-**	
2012-13	**86%**	54%	**100%**	83%	**-**	

As part of the renewal process, representatives of the NYC DOE have collected evidence relevant to the school's climate and community engagement over the school's charter term. Based on discussion, document collection and review, and observation, the following was noted:

- An internal survey performed by the school during the 2012-2013 school year indicated that 95% of parents were either satisfied or very satisfied with their child's education.
- The school engages families through school-wide and classroom events such as annual science fairs, parent breakfasts, and publishing parties as well as regular parent teacher conferences. Parent participation rates at parent-teacher conferences have risen from 66% in 2009-10 to 81% in 2012-2013.
- The School has a Parent Organization (PO) that meets monthly. The Education Committee of the PO meets regularly with the HOS to address any concerns, discuss upcoming events, test preparation, and instructional strategies. This committee informs the rest of the PO and communicates parent feedback. The PO also maintains a Facebook page, provides newsletters to the school community, and distributes daily e-blasts for scheduled events. The PO as well as its Education Committee is encouraged to attend charter school advocacy days and assists with recruitment efforts for the School.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 80 participants attended the hearing; forty-nine spoke in support of the school' renewal and none spoke in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by Hebrew Language Academy for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.

Students in grades 1, 4 and 5 were interviewed on the September 17th school visit. Based on student interviews, the following was noted:

[13] HLA Charter School Statistics: http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/22/K746/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm
[14] HLA Charter School Statistics: http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/22/K746/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm
[15] Student Response Rates on the NYC School Survey have not been applicable for this school over the course of the current charter term.

- Students interviewed reported that teachers have academic expectations and were helpful if the work was challenging.
- Students interviewed were asked to speak and write in Hebrew, all were able to do so effortlessly.

Financial Health

Overall, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations.

- Based on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school has sufficient unrestricted cash to cover its operating expenses for more than a month without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-2014 budget to the actual enrollment, as of October 31, 2013, revealed that the school had met its enrollment target supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

Overall, the school is financially sustainable based on its current practices**.**

- Based on the financial audits from FY10 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus over the four audited fiscal years.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY10 to FY13, the school generated overall positive cash flow and the school had positive cash flow in each measurable year.

There was no material weakness noted in the last four independent annual financial audits from years 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013.

Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?

Over the charter term, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School has been compliant with applicable laws and regulations.

The Board is in compliance with:

- Membership size: The Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range of five to fifteen outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws.
- Submission of all required documents: All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms and do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.[16]
- Timely submission of documents: The Board has provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the NYC DOE.
- The required number of board meetings: The school has held at least the minimal number of meetings, which is six, as stated by the Board's bylaws.
- Availability of board documents: The Board has made all board minutes and agendas available to the public prior to Board meetings by posting on the school's website.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of all required documents: The school has submitted the required private facility safety plan. The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Fingerprint clearance: Over the charter term, all staff has had the required fingerprint clearance.
- Certification of staff: The school is in compliance with the section of the NY State Charter Schools Act requiring that charter schools to have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower.
- Insurance requirements: The school has all appropriate insurance documents.

[16] Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term?

As reported by school leadership and the school's Board, the following was noted:

- After the 2013-2014 school year, HLA proposes to expand to serve grades 6-8. The pause in expansion will allow the school to focus more intensively on the successful implementation of additional capacity-building initiatives. The delay in expansion will allow the school to strengthen instruction as well as targeted interventions to address areas of student need and demonstrated improvement in student progress.
- In response to the 2010 amendments to NYS Charter Schools Act requiring schools to attract and retain percentages of students who are designated as Free and Reduced Lunch learners, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners, the school is making demonstrated efforts to attract and retain these students.
    - HLA has been successful in maintaining comparable percentages of SWD and FRPL in accordance with the School's charter.
    - HLA has experienced challenges in attracting an ELL population comparable to CSD 22. To improve results, the expended extra effort to recruit students through cultural, community, and education-based organizations. The school also promotes itself through radio and printed media advertisements, including those established to attract and inform families of non-English-speaking origins.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Statutory Basis for Renewal

The Charter Schools Act of 1998 ("the Act") authorizes the creation of charter schools to provide opportunities for teachers, parents, and community members to establish and maintain schools that operate independently of existing schools and school districts in order to accomplish the following objectives:

- Improve student learning and achievement;
- Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system;
- Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.[17]

When granted, a charter is valid for up to five years. For a school chartered under the Act to operate beyond the initial charter term, the school must seek and obtain renewal of its charter.[18]

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted. [19] As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act's renewal standards:

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;
- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction.

Where the NYC DOE approves a renewal application, it is required under the Act to submit the application and a proposed charter to the Board of Regents for its review and approval.[20]

[17] See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.
[18] See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.
[19] See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).
[20] § 2852(5)

Part 6: Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework

The New York State Charter Schools Act ("the Act") states the following regarding the renewal of a school's charter:

> **§2851.4**: Charters may be renewed, upon application, for a term of up to five years in accordance with the provisions of this article for the issuance of such charters pursuant to section twenty-eight hundred fifty-two of this article; provided, however, that a renewal application shall [also] include:
> (a) A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in the charter.
> (b) A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private. Such statement shall be in a form prescribed by the Board of Regents.
> (c) Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school required by subdivision two of section twenty-eight hundred fifty-seven of this article, including the charter school report cards and the certified financial statements.
> (d) Indications of parent and student satisfaction. Such renewal application shall be submitted to the charter entity no later than six months prior to the expiration of the charter; provided, however, that the charter entity may waive such deadline for good cause shown.
> (e) The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents or the board of trustees of the state university of New York, as applicable, of students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal. When developing such targets, the board of regents and the board of trustees of the state university of New York shall ensure (1) that such enrollment targets are comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the charter school is located; and (2) that such retention targets are comparable to the rate of retention of such categories of students attending the public schools within the school district, or in a city school district in a city having a population of one million or more inhabitants, the community school district, in which the proposed charter school would be located.

The NYC DOE may recommend four potential outcomes for charter schools applying for renewal: full-term renewal, renewal with conditions, short-term renewal, or non-renewal.

Full-Term Renewal
In cases where a school has demonstrated exceptional results with its students, a five-year renewal will be granted. A school must show that its program has yielded strong student performance and progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

Renewal with Conditions
In cases where a school has demonstrated mixed academic results or concerns about organizational viability, renewal is contingent upon changes to the prospective application or new charter, new performance measures, or both. These may include changes to curriculum, leadership, or board governance structure that are intended to yield improved academic outcomes during the next chartering period.

Short-Term Renewal
In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has fewer than two years of state-assessment results, a renewal of three-years or fewer may be considered. In limited circumstances, a

school not in its initial charter or in its initial charter with more than three years of state assessment data, may be considered for a short-term renewal.

Non-Renewal
Schools that have not demonstrated significant progress or high levels of student achievement and/or are in violation of their charter will not be renewed.

The CSAS Accountability Framework

To help NYC DOE authorized charter schools better understand what we mean by success for charter schools, the NYC DOE's Charter Schools Accountability & Support (CSAS) has developed an Accountability Framework build around four essential questions for charter school renewal:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?
3. Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
4. What are the school's plans for its next charter term?

1. Is the School an Academic Success?
1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement
Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below: • Meet absolute performance goals • Meet student progress goals • Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students • Are surpassing performance of DOE identified peer-schools • Are surpassing performance district and city proficiency or better averages • Are meeting other rigorous academic and non-academic goals as stated in school's charter
Evidence for success might include, but not be limited to, the following depending on school configurations: • Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations) • Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations) • Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations) • Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results • When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results • HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates (absolute and progress, overall, for at-risk student populations) • Grades 8-12 College Readiness Credit Accumulation • Percentage of Students Applying to and Being Admitted to College • Percentage of Students Taking AP Courses and/or Percentage of Students Passing AP Courses • Results on state accountability measures • Charter School Academic and Non-Academic Goals • NYC Progress Reports
1b. Mission and Academic Goals
Schools with successful missions and goals have many of the characteristics below: • Have an animating mission statement that staff, students and community embrace • Set ambitious academic and non-academic goals that entire school community knows and embraces • Have processes for regular monitoring and reporting on progress toward school goals • Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data

Evidence for successful missions and goals might include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Mission statement, charter, external documents (parent and family handbooks, school website, etc.)
- Annual reports, school improvement plans, leadership board reports
- Board agendas and minutes
- Parent, student, and teacher satisfaction surveys
- Participation at parent-teacher conferences, school advocacy events, participation in academic goal related programs

1c. Responsive Education Program

Schools with successful education programs have many of the characteristics below:

- Are self-reflective and examine practice based on outcomes against goals
- Have well-thought out curricular programs that are aligned with NYS learning outcomes as described by state standards and the new Common Core Curriculum.
- Use instructional models and resources consistent with school mission and that are flexible in addressing the needs of all learners
- Have defined strategies that they can measure and monitor for closing the achievement gap
- Offer defined opportunities for remediation and acceleration
- Implement a coherent and effective interim assessment system (e.g., use of formative, interim, and summative assessment data) for monitoring progress, predicting performance, and adjusting instruction
- Have an effective process for supporting improved classroom instruction, including frequent observation and feedback
- Have effective strategies and quality instructional programs for addressing students with special needs and ELLs
- Use a defined process for evaluating curricular tasks, programs and resources for effectiveness and fit with school mission and goals

Evidence for successful education programs, in addition to positive results, may include, but not be limited to, many of the following:

- Instructional planning documents (alignments, scope and sequences, curriculum maps, unit and lesson plans, etc)
- Student/teacher schedules
- Classroom observations
- Student Intervention / Response to Intervention program description and resources
- Interim assessment results
- Student and teacher portfolios
- Data findings; adjusted lesson plans
- Self-assessment documentation
- Professional development plans and resources

1d. Learning Environment

Schools with successful learning environments have many of the characteristics below:

- Have a strong culture that connects high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to give their best effort academically and socially
- Use a comprehensive approach to student management, including positive behavioral expectations and a clear discipline policy to build and sustain a safe, orderly, and supportive classroom environment
- Provide for safe, respectful, efficient transitions, hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.
- Have classrooms were academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Provide opportunities for students to actively engage in their own learning and in the life of the school

- Have a formal or informal character education, social development, or citizenship program that provides opportunities to develop as individuals and citizens

Evidence for successful learning environments may include, but not be limited to, many of the following:

- School mission and articulated values
- Student management plan (code of conduct, school values, discipline policy, positive incentive system, etc.)
- Student attendance and retention rates
- Student discipline data
- DOE School Survey student results
- DOE School Survey parent and teacher safety and respect results
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, student interviews
- Classroom observations
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)

2. Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization?

2a. Governance Structure and Organizational Design

Schools with successful governance and organizational design structures have many of the characteristics below:

- Operate with a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter
- Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly but not limited to open-meeting laws and conflict of interest regulations
- Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time and despite circumstance
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals; it also has clear lines of accountability for leadership roles, accountability to Board, and, if applicable, relationship with a charter management organization
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Implemented a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's organization and leadership structure
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provide regular feedback on instruction to teachers

Evidence for school governance and organizational design may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- School charter
- Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, meeting agenda and minutes
- Annual conflict of interest forms
- Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook, operations manual
- School calendar, professional development plan

2b. School Climate and Community Engagement
Schools with a sustaining school climate and engaged parent and community support have many of the characteristics below: • A healthy professional school climate that is collaborative, student centered, and open to parents and community support • An effective process for recruiting, hiring, supporting, and evaluating leadership and staff • A flexible, data-driven approach to professional development for all staff • An effective way of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including the DOE School Survey • Effective home-school communication practices to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children • Strong community-based partnerships and advocacy for the school
Evidence for school climate and community engagement may include, but not be limited to, the following: • DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results • Student retention and wait list data • Staff retention data • Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews • Student and staff attendance rates • Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences • Parent association meeting calendar and minutes • Community partnerships and sponsored programs
2c. Financial and Operational Health
Schools that are responsible stewards of public funds and effective, sustaining organizations have many of the characteristics below: • Consistently meet its student enrollment and retention targets • Annual budgets that meets all short- and long-term financial responsibilities with available revenues • School leadership and Board that oversee financial and operational responsibilities in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to decision-making • Boards and school leadership that maintain effective internal controls of finances to ensure integrity of financial management and a proactive approach to mitigating risk • Consistently clean financial audits • If applicable, strong, accountable partnerships with management organizations and other partners and significant vendors to support delivery of chartered school design and academic program • A safe, clean and appropriately resourced educational facility with all appropriate services specified in charter and mandated by appropriate law and regulations
Evidence for a financially sound, viable organization may include, but not be limited to, the following: • School budget, P&Ls, and monthly/quarterly cash-flow reports • Appropriate insurance documents • Required facility documents (lease, certificate of occupancy, fire and safety inspections, etc.) • Financial audits • Financial leader(s) resume and accountability documents • Operational policies and procedures • Operational org chart • Secure storage areas for student and staff records • Policies/protocols for maintaining secure records • School safety plan

3. Is the School in Compliance with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?
3a. Approved Charter and Agreement
Schools in substantial compliance with their charter and agreement have: • Implemented the key features of their charter as described in the original charter and as modified in approved revisions to their charter, including but not limited to mission, academic program, school organization, grade configuration, enrollment, goals, etc. • Ensure that update-to-date charter is publicly available to staff, parents, and school community • Implemented comprehensive academic, behavioral, oversight, management, and operational policies and procedures that are substantially aligned with the charter and the school's stated mission and vision
Evidence for a school's compliance with the terms of its charter and charter agreement may include, but not be limited to, the following: • Authorized charter and signed agreement • Charter revision request approval and documentation • School mission • School policies and procedures • Site visits • Board meetings, agendas and minutes • Leadership/board interviews
3b. Applicable Federal and State Law
Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have: • Met all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting • Comparable enrollment of FRL, ELL and Special Education students to those of their district of location *or* are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages • Implemented school policies related to student discipline and promotion and retention that are fully compliant with laws and regulations related to students with disabilities and due process regulations • Conducted independently verified fair and open lottery and manage with integrity enrollment process and annual waiting lists • Employed instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and certification requirements
Evidence for compliance with applicable federal and state law may include, but not be limited to, the following: • School reporting documents • School's Annual Report • Student recruitment plan and resources • Student management policies and promotion and retention policies • Student discipline records • Lottery policy, resources, and records; enrollment procedures and records • Staff roster, fingerprint clearance for all staff, certification status of all instructional staff
3c. Applicable Regulations

Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have:

- Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns with applicable regulations
- Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and have completed all other financial reporting as required
- Boards that meet requirements for size, meeting frequency, public notice, applicable open-meeting and conflict of interest regulations, as well as complying with NYC DOE CSAS's requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members.
- Informed NYCDOE CSAS, and where required, received CSAS approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization
- Effectively engaged parent associations

Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School or building safety plan; appropriate inspection documents
- Annual audits, escrow accounts, other financial reporting documents
- Board roster, calendar, agenda and minutes, conflict of interest documents, notification of changes/approval of new member request documents
- Charter revision requests, revised or new contracts
- Parent association calendar of meetings, identified officers, parent association agenda and minutes, parent satisfaction survey results
- Interviews

4. What Are the School's Plans for its Next Charter Term?

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

In anticipation of a new charter term schools may be considering various growth options: replication, expansion to new grades or increased enrollment or altering their model in some significant way. Successful schools generally have processes for:

- Conducting needs/opportunity assessments
- Forming Board and leadership committees or subcommittees to investigate options, develop action plans, ensure capacity and resources are aligned, etc.
- Engaging school community in articulating charter revisions (or a new charter in cases of replication) to address the proposed growth plans
- Ensuring that the final proposal is ambitious but realistic in its plans
- Creating a well-reasoned and documented prospective for the school's new charter term and, if applicable, a new charter proposal (for replication)

Evidence for likely success in planning for school growth in a new charter term may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and Board interviews

4b. Organizational Sustainability

Successful schools consistently perform despite change. While there is no single path for ensuring sustainability, successful schools often have the following features:

- School anticipates organizational opportunities/needs and plans for resource development (human resource policies for growing your own talent, for example, or fundraising or budget management to take care of anticipated capital needs and to mitigate risks for the unexpected, or board development to bring new talent or specific needs-based expertise to the school)

Evidence for organizational sustainability may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organization chart
- Staff rosters
- Staff handbook
- Leadership and staff interviews
- Budget

4c. School or Model Improvements

Successful schools are thoughtful about the continued appropriateness of school design features and elements of their models. They:

- Review performance carefully and even if they don't make major changes through expansion or replication, they are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success.
- Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission.

Evidence for successful improvements to a school's program or model may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and board interviews
- MOUs or contracts with partners

Appendix A: School Performance Data

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD and NYC averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	59.2%	29.0%
CSD 22	-	-	55.5%	32.9%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	3.7	-3.9
NYC	-	-	49.0%	27.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	10.2	1.3

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	66.2%	35.9%
CSD 22	-	-	61.3%	39.3%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	4.9	-3.4
NYC	-	-	57.0%	34.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	9.2	1.7

All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

% of Third Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	59.2%	43.8%
CSD 22	53.6%	54.7%	55.5%	32.1%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	3.7	11.7
NYC	46.5%	48.1%	49.0%	28.1%
Difference from NYC	-	-	10.2	15.7

% of Third Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	66.2%	42.5%
CSD 22	60.5%	62.3%	61.3%	36.6%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	4.9	5.9
NYC	54.3%	54.8%	57.0%	33.1%
Difference from NYC	-	-	9.2	9.4

All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	-	13.9%
CSD 22	52.6%	57.9%	60.6%	33.7%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	-	-19.8
NYC	45.6%	51.0%	52.4%	27.2%

Difference from NYC	-	-	-	-13.3

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-	-	-	29.2%
CSD 22	66.9%	68.7%	72.7%	42.0%
Difference from CSD 22	-	-	-	-12.8
NYC	58.4%	62.3%	65.7%	35.2%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	-6.0

All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Progress Reports

2012 – 2013 Academic Year
2011 – 2012 Academic Year

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-2013
Annual Site Visit Report 2011-2012
Annual Site Visit Report 2010-2011
Annual Site Visit Report 2009-2010