



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2014-2015

**ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT**

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

Charter Authorization Profile

Academic Leadership Charter School	
Authorized Grades	Grades K-8
Authorized Enrollment	500
School Opened For Instruction	2009-2010
Charter Term Expiration Date	June 30, 2018
Last Renewal Term Type	Full Term (5 years)

School Information for the 2014-2015 School Year

Academic Leadership Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Michael Ansbro
School Leader(s)	Leena Varghese
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 7
Borough(s) of Location	Bronx
Physical Address(es)	677 East 141 Street, Bronx, NY 10454 (Grades K-4)
	500 Courtland Avenue, Bronx, NY 10451 (Grades 5-6)
Facility Owner(s)	DOE & Private
School Type	Elementary/Middle School
Grades Served 2014-2015	Grades K-6
Enrollment in 2014-2015*	375
Charter Universal Pre-Kindergarten Program	Yes (53 Pre-Kindergarten students in 2014-2015)

* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2014 (excludes Pre-Kindergarten enrollment).

Enrollment Policies (School Year 2014-2015)*	
Primary Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	Kindergarten
Additional Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	Grades 1-2 and Grade 6
Does School Enroll New Students Mid-Year	Yes
Number of Applicants for Admission	1,639
Number of Students Accepted via the Charter Lottery	116
Lottery Preferences (School Year 2014-2015)**	
Attends a Failing School	Yes
Does Not Speak English at Home	No
Receives SNAP or TANF Benefits	No
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	Yes
Has IEP and/or Receives Special Education Services	No
Homeless or Living in Shelter or Temporary Residence	No
Lives in New York City Housing Authority Housing	No
Unaccompanied Youth	No

* Enrollment policy information is based on self-reported data from the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey.
 ** Preferences were recorded from the NYC Charter School Center's Online Application. For schools that do not participate in the Common Application, their preferences were self-reported from the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. If a field is marked "N/A", the school did not provide the information.

Management or Support Organization (If Applicable)	
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A

For the self-reported mission of this charter school, please see their NYC Charter School Directory listing at <http://schools.nyc.gov/community/charters/information/directory.htm>.

School Reported Current Key Design Elements	
Key Design Element	Description
Rigorous Standards Based Curriculum	The school offers four periods of literacy, two periods of mathematics, one period of science, one period of social studies and one specialized class (Art, P.E. Music) daily. All subjects have curricula designed in-house, which are created around Common Core Learning Standards.
Standards Based, Authentic Lesson Planning	Teachers and Associate Teachers plan lessons for all subject areas, aligned to Common Core Learning Standards and based off of the school's curriculum.
More Time on Task	The school offers an extended school day, 7:45 a.m.-4:00 p.m. with an after school tutoring program on Tuesdays and Thursdays from 4:00-5:30 p.m. for students in grades two through six.
Powerful Use of On-Going Assessments	The school has six-week assessments allowing the school to monitor student progress and design instruction to meet the needs of all students.
Use of Authentic Texts	For all subject areas, English Language Arts (ELA), social studies, science, and mathematics, teachers select and use authentic literature. A variety of fiction and nonfiction trade books, along with magazine articles are used during every lesson.
Differentiated Instruction	The school's two teacher model ensures students are receiving differentiated instruction based on students' needs. Teachers and Associate Teachers plan their own lessons, which are tailored towards the groups they work with which vary from period to period.
Character Education	The school's character education program reinforces exemplar citizenship from its students. Star students are selected each month who best portray these traits from each class. Classroom teachers and cluster teachers teach character education within the classroom setting using a bibliotherapy approach.

Grade-Level Enrollment (School Year 2014-2015)		
Grade Level	Number of Students	Section Count
Kindergarten	55	2
Grade 1	57	2
Grade 2	62	2
Grade 3	52	2
Grade 4	31	2
Grade 5	59	4
Grade 6	59	2
Grade 7	-	-
Grade 8	-	-
Total Enrollment	375	16

* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2014.

Part 2: Annual Review Process Overview

Rating Framework

The New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) performs a comprehensive review of each NYC DOE Chancellor-authorized charter school to investigate three primary questions: is the school an academic success; is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization; and is the school in compliance with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations? To ascertain matters of sustainability and strategic planning, OSDCP also inquires about the school's plans for its next charter term.

This review is conducted by analyzing student performance data and collecting and evaluating school-submitted documents during school year 2014-2015. The report outlines evidence found during this review.

As per the school's monitoring plan, the NYC DOE may also conduct a visit to a school. Visits may focus on academic outcomes, governance, organizational structure, operational compliance, fiscal sustainability or any combination of these as necessary.

Essential Questions

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 (as appropriate for grades served):

- New York State ELA and math assessment absolute results; New York State Regents exams passage rates;
- Comparative proficiency for elementary and middle schools, including growth rates for ELA and math proficiency;
- Comparative graduation rates and Regents completion rates for high schools;
- Closing the achievement gap performance relative to CSD or New York City public schools;
- New York State Alternate Assessment (NYSAA) or other approved alternate assessments; and
- Performance data pertaining to college and career readiness.

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization, OSDCP 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 National Association of Charter School Authorizers' Core Performance Framework.¹

OSDCP 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.

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 relevant laws and regulations as identified in the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework.

¹ Please refer to the following website for more information:
http://nacsa.mycrowdwisdom.com/diweb/catalog/item/id/126547/q/%20q=performance*20framework&c=82

Part 3: Summary of Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?

Overview of School-Specific Data Since 2012-2013

ES/MS students scoring at or above Level 3 on NYS assessments, compared to CSD, NYC and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Academic Leadership Charter School	23.2%	38.3%
CSD 7	9.6%	10.3%
Difference from CSD 7 *	13.6	28.0
NYC	27.7%	29.8%
Difference from NYC *	-4.5	8.5
New York State **	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-7.9	7.7
% Proficient in Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Academic Leadership Charter School	48.9%	52.9%
CSD 7	12.0%	16.2%
Difference from CSD 7 *	36.9	36.7
NYC	34.2%	39.1%
Difference from NYC *	14.7	13.8
New York State **	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	17.8	16.7

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

** New York State proficiency rates were taken from data.nysed.gov.

Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Academic Leadership Charter School - All Students	65.0%	70.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	58.1%	71.5%
City Percent of Range- All Students	52.7%	69.6%
Academic Leadership Charter School – School's Lowest Third	54.0%	72.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	2.5%	45.2%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	43.9%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Academic Leadership Charter School - All Students	60.0%	58.5%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	50.3%	45.3%
City Percent of Range- All Students	43.5%	42.9%
Academic Leadership Charter School – School's Lowest Third	69.0%	64.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	38.4%	32.3%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	36.7%	30.6%

A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A peer/city percent of range of 50% represents the position of the average and can be interpreted as a school outperforming 50% of their peer group/city.

Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	50.0%	38.5%
English Language Learner Students	25.0%	56.3%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	25.0%	50.0%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	50.0%	23.1%
English Language Learner Students	37.5%	31.3%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	44.4%	16.7%

* Defined as students with a placement in Self-Contained, ICT, or SETSS.

Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals in 2013-2014²

Academic Goals	
Charter Goals	2013-2014
1. Each year, 80% of third through fifth grade students enrolled in at least their third year will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA Exam.	Not Met
2. Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the NYS ELA Exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Met
3. Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA Exam in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of Community School District 7.	Met
4. Each year, 60% of the students who have attended the school for at least three years will perform at or above 50% on the Terra Nova in ELA.	Met
5. Each year, grade-level cohorts of the same 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 80% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA Exam. If cohort proficiency exceeded 80% on the previous year's exam, students will demonstrate growth (above 80%) in the current year.	Not Met
6. Each year, in kindergarten, first, second, and third grade, 60% of students will perform on or above level on the Spring Developmental Reading Assessment.	Partially Met
7. Each year, 80% of third through fifth grade students enrolled in at least their third year will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math Exam.	Not Met
8. Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index (PI) on the NYS Math Exam will meet the Annual Measurable Objective (AMO) set forth in the state's NCLB accountability system.	Met
9. Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math Exam in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of Community School District 7.	Met
10. Each year, 60% of the students who have attended the school for at least three years will perform at or above 50% on the Terra Nova in Math.	Met
11. Each year, grade-level cohorts of the same 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 80% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Math Exam. If cohort proficiency exceeded 80% on the previous year's exam, students will demonstrate growth (above 80%) in the current year.	Not Met
12. Each year, 80% of fourth grade students enrolled in at least their third year will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science Exam.	Met
13. Each year, the percent of students who are enrolled in at least their third year and performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science Exam will be greater than that of fourth grade students in Community School District 7.	Met
14. Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing."	Met
15. Each year, the school will have a daily student attendance rate of at least 90%.	Met

² Goals were self-reported by the school in the school's 2013-2014 Annual Report documentation submitted to NYSED. It should be noted that beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, due to a change in state regulation, the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two. Further, due to the elimination of the accountability instrument, the DOE will not evaluate goals related to NYC DOE Progress Report grades beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.

Self-Reported Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment³

Curriculum Changes and/or Adjustments

- The school teaches a curriculum aligned to the New York Common Core Learning Standards. Curriculum choices include SRA McGraw-Hill Imagine It!, 6+1 traits of writing, TERC Investigations in Number, Data, and Space supplemented by McGraw Hill My Math and Singapore Math for Mathematics, Scott Foresman Science supplemented by the Full Options Science System (FOSS) for Science, and McGraw Hill National Geographic for Social Studies. All curricula include specialized remediation programs for students who fall behind, as well as the ability to tailor learning and pacing in order to meet the needs of students at different levels.

Interim Assessments

- In addition to aligning assessments in the four major subject areas of ELA, mathematics, science, and social studies, the school added Mock Standardized Assessments in the areas of mathematics and ELA. The school's goal is to get 70% or more of students to proficiency or above. During the 2014-2015 school year, the school saw an improvement in scores from the first Six Week Assessment to the sixth Six Week Assessment. These exams are administrator-designed and modeled after the New York State Education Department (NYSED) exams and provide a way for the school to assess whether or not students are mastering critical ELA and mathematics skills. Assessment data provides teachers with a better understanding of how students are applying the skills, strategies, and knowledge they learn in the classroom to material presented in different ways.
- Six Week Assessments are used to chart growth and the students are placed in new groups when needed. After students who are in need of remediation or acceleration are identified, the school's teachers, teacher associates, and support staff work together to work out what teaching methods work best for each student. Having up to three adults in a classroom at a time provides the opportunity for teachers to teach different levels of students in the same setting. Additionally, the after-school program is designed to address the needs of at-risk students. The program provides more time for instruction and teachers are able to further individualize their teaching strategies.

Approach to Data-Driven Instruction

- The school believes in data-driven instruction to ensure that every student reaches high levels of academic achievement. All classroom teachers and support staff members (Special Education and Title I) plan lessons based on the needs of specific groups of students. Teachers look at assessment data and informal classroom observations and student work samples to identify student needs. Each teacher and associate then plans lessons and groups students based on needs, as well as in mixed needs/mixed ability groups to help them master the necessary skills.

Philosophy on Special Education and English Language Learner Service Provision

- The school's multifaceted Literacy remediation program includes Title I, Special Education, and English Language Learner (ELL) teachers "pushing in" to the classroom to work collaboratively with the classroom and associate teachers to provide cohesive instructional programs to meet the needs of each of the targeted students by working with small groups in the classroom and following the Literacy curriculum. This allows the school to give students tailored attention according to their needs. The school's ELL immersion program to serve limited English proficient students uses a similar structure. The Title I teacher "pushes in" to each classroom daily during Literacy and Mathematics to provide instruction to those students performing at levels 1 and 2 based on the NYSESLAT test.⁴ ELL students are not classified as Special Education students because of their language skills; each is a different population with distinct needs.

Professional Development Opportunities

- The school's professional development program starts during pre-service in August and continues with weekly 1.5 hour after school meetings throughout the year, as well as twice-weekly grade level meetings during common preparation time. The objective of the yearlong professional development

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on May 1, 2015

⁴ New York State English as a Second Language Assessment Test

program is to develop a comprehensive curriculum aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards. The program provides training on differentiating instruction to the individual student's learning style and pace of learning, as well as training devoted to interdisciplinary instructional methods.

- Under the direction of the Principal and Executive Director, teacher teams collaborate to develop curriculum maps and units of study. The school also makes use of publisher-developed materials in each subject area to develop the comprehensive curriculum map for each of the four major subject areas and units of study. Teachers and leadership look at assessment data to refine extensive professional development programs and teaching practices within the classroom.

Teacher Evaluation

- Staff evaluations are conducted by a member of the leadership team (Executive Director, Principal and/or Assistant Principal). These evaluations are maintained in the personnel file for each employee and/or in binders. The format of the evaluation is determined by the Principal and the Executive Director.
- Teachers receive informal and formal observations, as well as an end of the year evaluation. While both the formal and informal observations serve as an evaluation of individual teachers, they also provide a snapshot of the degree to which the school's teaching strategies are being implemented throughout the building. The purpose of the evaluations are to give and receive safe, non-threatening, qualitative, evidence-based feedback to stimulate in-school dialogue, reinforce attention to a focus on teaching and learning priorities within a standards-based environment and deepen an understanding of teaching and learning through ongoing formative feedback related to school improvement that supports the school's instructional focus.
- Classroom visits last about 15 minutes and observers remain as unobtrusive as possible. The specifics of what is to be observed or asked, as well as responses to these questions, are recorded on the observation form as the visits are made. Observers refrain from providing feedback to teachers they are observing.
- Coaching support is offered to teachers on a daily basis. School leaders visit classrooms and co-teach with teachers and work with students side by side. Follow-up meetings take place to discuss particular lessons and areas of strength and growth. This is also the time where classroom teachers can ask questions and lines of communication are open.

Differentiated Instruction

- Each class at the school has two teachers, one lead classroom teacher and an associate teacher or co-teacher. This two-teacher model allows the school to keep students in each classroom in small groups throughout the day, reducing class size and differentiating instruction geared towards the specific needs of students. Both lead and associate teachers plan their own lessons; these lessons are unique and based on the needs of the specific students they are working with during various periods. This allows each class to run like two small classes. The teaching model uses small groups to provide differentiation of instruction. The two, and sometimes three, instructors per classroom rotate between low, middle, and high performing students so the lead teacher, teacher associate, and Special Education/ELL/Title I teachers are all aware of each child's needs and can work as a team to enrich each child's learning experience.
- The school also has structures in place for accelerated learners. Accelerated learners work in small groups based on their ability level and receive additional and more challenging work from their teachers. Lesson plans are examined and refined through teacher-to-teacher conferences and meetings between teachers and leadership staff by analyzing data and ensuring that lesson plans are aimed at each ability level during the eight periods of the day.

Learning Environment

- The school has established a school culture where every stakeholder is encouraged to contribute and is engaged as a learner including the school's leadership, teachers, teacher associates, students, and parents. The school strives to establish a calm, safe, and supportive learning environment. Every student, including those served under IDEA guidelines, classified as an English Language Learner, or "at-risk," must meet the same high expectations set forth at the school.

- While the school focuses on students' strengths and individual learning styles, teachers also strive to help students develop the confidence to excel. The school's staffing model provides stability and structure as well as allowing for differentiation of instruction and small group teaching.
- The school's approach to discipline centers around recognizing students for positive behavior in order to prevent negative behavior. The school strives to provide a safe environment where effective teaching and good citizenship are the standard. To achieve this, the school has established clear, high expectations, a system of discipline, and a uniform policy.
- Parents receive calls, notes, and awards to praise their children for doing well. Parent participation is actively sought as part of the ongoing process of improving each child's performance and behavior at school. Teachers, administrative staff, and leadership are encouraged to hand out tokens for good behavior in the classrooms, hallways, and shared spaces. Classes with the most tokens are rewarded with ice cream parties. Systems of discipline within the classrooms acknowledge both positive and negative behavior, such as being on green, yellow, or red on the class traffic light discipline system.
- One of the school's fundamental goals is to help students develop character and ethics, therefore the school also teaches character education, starting with kindergarten students. The school's Character Education program focuses on monthly themes such as friendship, trustworthiness, perseverance, and citizenship. Students are rewarded for exhibiting behavior that reflects these traits. Teachers reinforce each trait and the importance of good character through various trade books, peer discussions, and by encouraging and praising students for exhibiting these traits. The school also encourages students to assist one another in a peer mentor discussion when conflicts arise.

Essential Question 2: Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

School Leadership Team (School Year 2014-2015)		
Title	Name	Number of Years With the School
1. Executive Director	Norma Hurwitz	6
2. Principal	Leena Varghese	6
3. Assistant Principal	Jaime Kennedy	6

Board of Trustees (School Year 2014-2015)		
Board Member Name	Position – <i>Committee(s)</i>	Was all Documentation Submitted to OSDCP? Was Board Member Approved by OSDCP?
1. Michael Ansbro	President – Finance, Real Estate	Yes
2. James Sander	Vice President – Finance, Real Estate, Education	Yes
3. Desiree Lafontaine	Secretary – Education	Yes
4. Robert Blau	Treasurer – Finance	Yes
5. Robert Podhurst	Board member	Yes
6. Cheryl Kramer	Board member	Yes
7. Maggie Allen	Board member – Real Estate	Yes
8. Norma Figueroa-Hurwitz	Board member	Yes
9. Ted Hurwitz	Board member – Real Estate, Education	Yes
10. Ben Corpus*	Board member	Yes

* Ben Corpus resigned from the Board of Trustees of Academic Leadership Charter School on December 15, 2014.

Board of Trustees Committees (School Year 2014-2015)		
Committee Name	Is This an Active Committee?	Evidence of Committee Activity (Roster, Committee Meeting Minutes, etc.)
1. Finance	Yes	Yes
2. Real Estate	Yes	Yes
3. Education	Yes	Yes

School Climate & Community Engagement

Academic Leadership Charter School	
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2013-2014)*	26.3%
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2014-2015)**	14.8%
Number of Instructional Staff Members Not Returning from the Previous Academic Year*	4
Does the School have a Parent Organization?	Yes
• If Yes, how many times did it meet?	3
• If Yes, how many parents attended these meetings?	10
Average Daily Attendance Rate (School Year 2013-2014)***	92.8%

* Reflects 2013-2014 instructional staff who did not return to the school, either by choice or request, at the start of the 2014-2015 school year or who left the school during the 2013-2014 school year.

** Reflects 2014-2015 instructional staff left the school between July 1, 2014 and April 1, 2015.

*** Attendance was taken from ATS.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree				
Survey Question		Academic Leadership Charter School		Citywide Average
		2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	-	-	-
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	-	-	-
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	-	-	-
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	99%	95%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	97%	96%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	100%	98%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	76%	89%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	76%	100%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	80%	94%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.	60%	78%	81%

* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.

** This question was phrased as "My teachers inspire me to learn" in the 2012-2013 School Survey.

NYC School Survey Response Rates			
		2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	Academic Leadership Charter School	-	-
	NYC	-	-
Parents	Academic Leadership Charter School	94%	91%
	NYC	54%	53%
Teachers	Academic Leadership Charter School	100%	100%
	NYC	83%	81%

* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.

Financial Health

Short-Term Financial Health				
	Indicator	Benchmark	School's Measure	Status
Cash Position	Number of days of operating expenses the school can cover without an infusion of cash	60 days (2 months)	948 days	Strong
Liabilities	School's position to meet liabilities expected over the next 12 months	Current assets sufficient to cover current liabilities (ratio should be greater than or equal to 1.00)	19.00	Strong
Projected Revenues	Actual enrollment for 2014-2015 is compared to projected enrollment for 2014-2015 to allow for accounts receivable of budgeted per pupil revenues	Actual enrollment within 15% of authorized enrollment (ratio should be greater than or equal to 0.85)	0.93	Strong
Debt Management	School debts as provided in audited financial statements, as well as payments on those debts	School is meeting all current debt obligations	Not in Default	Strong

Long-Term Financial Sustainability				
	Indicator	Benchmark	School's Measure	Status
Total Margin	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the previous fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	0.37	Strong
	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the past three fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	1.18	Strong
Ratios	Debt to Asset Ratio	Ratio should be less than 1.00	0.05	Strong
	Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Ratio should be greater than 1.00	132.12	Strong
Cash Flow	Most recent fiscal year's cash flow	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$2,080,830	Strong
	Trend of cash flow over the past three fiscal years	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$4,021,273	Strong

An independent audit performed for fiscal year 2014 (FY14) showed no material findings.

Essential Question 3: Is the school in compliance with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations?

Board Compliance

Board of Trustee Compliance*	
Total Number of Board Members as of April 1, 2015	9
Number of Board Members Required per the Bylaws	7
Number of Board Members Who Either Did Not Return Following the 2013-2014 School Year or Who Left During the 2014-2015 School Year:	1
Number of Board Members Who Joined the Board Prior to or During the 2014-2015 School Year	0
Board Meeting Minutes From Most Recent Meeting Posted on the School's Website?	Yes
Number of Board Meetings in the 2014-2015 School Year with a Quorum of Board Members Present / Number Meetings Required per Bylaws**	7 / 9

* All data presented above is as of April 1, 2015.

** Section 2851(2)(c) of the NYS Charter School Act states that charter schools shall have a "procedure for conducting and publicizing monthly board of trustee meetings at each charter school..."

School Compliance

Based on a document review and based on information provided elsewhere in this report, the school is in compliance with:

Compliance Area	Compliance
Teacher Certification ⁵	No
Employee Fingerprinting	Yes
Safety Plan/Emergency Drill	No
Immunization Record ⁵	Yes
Insurance	Yes
Lottery	No
Annual Report Submitted to SED (2013-2014)	Yes
Financial Audit Posted (2013-2014)	Yes

⁵The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30% of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools.

Teachers (School Year 2014-2015)						
Number of Teachers:	Number of NYS Uncertified Teachers:	Percent NYS Uncertified Teachers:	Number of Highly Qualified Teachers:	Percent Highly Qualified Teachers:	Number of Teachers without Fingerprint Clearance:	Percent of Teachers Not Fingerprinted:
27	10	37.0%	27	100.0%	0	0.0%

Student Discipline

Based on a document review, the school's discipline policy contains written rules and procedures for:

Compliance Area	Evidence Submitted?	Language of Compliance Evident in the Documents Submitted?
Disciplining students	Yes	Yes
Removing students (i.e., suspending)	Yes	Yes
Procedures for expelling students	Yes	Yes
Notice and opportunities to be heard for Short Term Removals (10 days or fewer)	Yes	No
Notice and opportunities to be heard for Long Term Removals (more than 10 days)	Yes	Yes
Appropriate procedures for providing alternative education to students when students are removed (i.e., suspended)	Yes	Yes
Specifically addresses student discipline policy for students with disabilities	Yes	Yes
Does the school distribute the student discipline policy to all students and/or their families?	Yes	Yes
Number and percentage of students suspended in 2014-2015	In School Suspensions: 2 (1%) Out of School Suspensions: 3 (1%)	

Enrollment and Retention Targets⁶

New York State (NYS) charter schools are required to demonstrate the means by which they will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities (SWDs), English Language Learners (ELLs), and students who are eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL). As per the NYS Charter Schools Act, enrollment and retention targets have been finalized by the Board of Regents (BoR) and the board of trustees of the State University of New York (SUNY). These targets are meant to be comparable to the enrollment figures of such categories of the Community School District (CSD) in which the charter school is located.

⁶ State enrollment and retention targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). The NYC DOE used the calculator posted on the SED website as of April 1, 2015. Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific target. The CSD for a multi-district school is the primary CSD as determined by each school. The enrollment is determined by the total number of students enrolled as of October 1 for each school year. Any school with an unusual grade configuration (i.e. K, 6-9) should use an available grade configuration provided by SED that is most aligned as determined by the DOE, otherwise a school's actual grade span is used. For more information regarding SED's methodology behind the calculation of charter school enrollment and retention targets, please refer to the memo at <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2012Meetings/July2012/712brca11.pdf>.

Charter schools are also required to demonstrate “good faith efforts” to attract and retain a comparable or greater enrollment of SWDs, ELLs, and students eligible for FRPL.

As a consideration of renewal, charter schools are required to “to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets” for SWDs, ELLs, and students who are eligible for FRPL. The amendments further indicate “Repeated failure to comply with the requirement” as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.

- In school year 2014-2015, Academic Leadership Charter School served:
 - a higher percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to its SED-derived enrollment target for students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch;
 - a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to its SED-derived enrollment target for English Language Learner students; and
 - a lower percentage of students with disabilities than its SED-derived enrollment target for students with disabilities.
- From October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014, Academic Leadership Charter School retained:
 - a lower percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to its SED-derived retention target for students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch;
 - a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to its SED-derived retention target for English Language Learner students; and
 - a lower percentage of students with disabilities than its SED-derived retention target for students with disabilities.

Enrollment of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	Academic Leadership Charter School	97.7%	97.4%
	Effective Target	96.1%	96.1%
	Difference from Effective Target	+1.6	+1.3
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Academic Leadership Charter School	15.7%	11.2%
	Effective Target	18.1%	18.5%
	Difference from Effective Target	-2.4	-7.3
English Language Learners (ELL)	Academic Leadership Charter School	20.5%	17.3%
	Effective Target	21.4%	22.0%
	Difference from Effective Target	-0.9	-4.7

Retention of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	Academic Leadership Charter School	72.0%	N/A
	Effective Target	80.2%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	-8.2	-
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Academic Leadership Charter School	49.1%	N/A
	Effective Target	73.0%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	-23.9	-
English Language Learners (ELL)	Academic Leadership Charter School	65.3%	N/A
	Effective Target	77.5%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	-12.2	-

Enrollment Information Used to Generate Targets		
	2013-2014	2014-2015
Grades Served	K-5	K-6
Enrollment	351	375
CSD(s)	7	7

Essential Question 4: What are the school's plans for the next charter term?

As reported by the school's leadership, the following is noted:

- There are no plans at the current time for expansion and/or replication.