Department of Education
Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

HEBREW LANGUAGE ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR
MARCH 2015

Table of Contents

PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION **2**

I. CHARTER SCHOOL OVERVIEW: 2

Background Information *2*

Overview of School-Specific Data *3*

II. RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE 5

PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY **11**

PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW **13**

PART 4: FINDINGS **15**

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success? *15*

Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization? *21*

Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? *26*

Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term? *29*

PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS **30**

PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK **33**

APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA **45**

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA **49**

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Background Information

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Sara Berman
School Leader(s)	Laura J. Silver
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	Hebrew Charter School Center Charter School Business Management
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 22
Physical Address(es)	1340 East 29th Street, Brooklyn
Facility Owner(s)	Private
School Opened For Instruction	2009-2010
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	6/30/2015
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-8
Current Authorized Enrollment	486
Proposed New Charter Term	4 years [July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2019]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-8
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	783
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	Grades K-8: 3 sections per grade

Overview of School-Specific Data

School Evaluation of Academic Goals as stated in Annual Report to NYSED and Renewal Application to NYC DOE

Academic Goal Analysis		
	2013-2014	**Cumulative Charter Term Total**
Total Achievable Goals	21	21
# Met	4	4
# Partially Met	6	6
# Not Met	4	4
# Not Applicable *	7	7
% Met	19%	19%
% Partially Met	29%	29%
% Not Met	19%	19%
% Not Applicable *	33%	33%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	29%	29%

* Some goals may not be applicable in all years. For example, goals related to the NYC Progress Report are not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year as Progress Reports were not issued that year.

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts	
	2013-2014
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	31.2%
CSD 22	35.6%
Difference from CSD 22 *	-4.4
NYC	29.8%
Difference from NYC *	1.4
New York State **	30.6%
Difference from New York State	0.6

% Proficient in Mathematics	
	2013-2014
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	52.7%
CSD 22	44.6%
Difference from CSD 22 *	8.1
NYC	39.1%
Difference from NYC *	13.6
New York State **	36.2%
Difference from New York State	16.5

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served. CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.
** 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	
	2013-2014
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School - All Students	**54.5%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	22.0%
City Percent of Range- All Students	21.4%
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School - School's Lowest Third	**63.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	25.8%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	17.5%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics	
	2013-2014
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School - All Students	**65.5%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	54.1%
City Percent of Range- All Students	58.5%
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School - School's Lowest Third	**66.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	44.5%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	35.7%

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	
	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	40.0%
English Language Learner Students	10.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	36.4%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics	
	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	33.3%
English Language Learner Students	10.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	36.8%

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

II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 4 year short term renewal with an academic performance condition, and permission to serve students in grades kindergarten through eight.

The academic performance condition is as follows:

1. **The school must demonstrate academic growth, as measured by the school's median adjusted growth percentile in English Language Arts, for each year of the charter term. The median adjusted growth percentile for the school's students will be at or above 50 percent of city percent of range for English Language Arts in each year of the charter term.**

Upon review and approval of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's renewal application, the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) is lifting the condition placed on the school in 2014 to allow for the continued phase-in of authorized grades kindergarten through eight.

As part of the renewal application, Hebrew Language Charter School submitted one material revision consistent with the school's request to be allowed to continue to phase-in to serve authorized grades kindergarten through eight. The NYC DOE determination is as follows: regarding the material revision to increase the authorized maximum enrollment to 783 students across grades kindergarten through eight during the next charter term, the NYC DOE approves this material revision.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School has partially demonstrated academic success.

New York Charter Schools Act

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include:

§ 2850 (2)
(a) Improve student learning and achievement;
(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
(c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
(d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
(e) Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system; and
(f) Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance-based accountability systems by holding the schools established under this article accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

Data available for Hebrew Language Academy Charter School indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting some of these objectives.

Mission and Vision
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's mission is to be a nurturing yet rigorous K-8 dual language school committed to academic excellence as well as to fostering a high degree of Hebrew language proficiency. Hebrew Language Academy Charter School (Hebrew Language) strives for its students to achieve a sophisticated knowledge of English Language Arts, mathematics, the sciences, and social studies. Hebrew Language 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. Hebrew Language strives for students to develop a strong sense of social and civic responsibility through the integration of community service and service learning into its classroom studies. Hebrew Language'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.

School Specific Academic Performance
The school entered its sixth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The school was last renewed in January 2014; as a result, the NYC DOE has one year of New York State (NYS) assessment data and one year of other academic data, such as data obtained through internal assessments and attendance information, to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at Hebrew Language Academy Charter School over the retrospective charter term.

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's aggregate math proficiency rate on the NYS assessments exceeded those of both Community School District (CSD) 22 and New York City (NYC) for the one-year charter term under review. However, while the school's aggregate English Language Arts (ELA) proficiency rate on NYS assessments exceeded the citywide proficiency rate, it fell below that of CSD 22.

For NYS assessments administered beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, NYS tests were aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). As such, proficiency rates for school years prior to the 2012-2013 are not directly comparable. However, as this school's current charter term covers only the latter half of the 2013-2014 school year and the current 2014-2015 school year, all proficiency results provided in this renewal report are aligned to the CCLS.

In 2013-2014, 52.7% of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's students were proficient on the NYS assessments in math. For 2013-2014, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's math proficiency was greater than 73% of elementary schools citywide. However, when compared to elementary schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools) Hebrew Language Academy Charter School outperformed only 40% of its peer schools. The school outperformed 65% of CSD 22 elementary schools. In 2013-2014, 31.2% of Hebrew

Language Academy Charter School's students demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA. With this level of proficiency, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School outperformed 62% of elementary schools citywide. Hebrew Language Academy Charter School outperformed only 13% of its peer schools and 48% of other elementary schools in CSD 22 in ELA proficiency.

Over the one year that data is available for the retrospective charter term, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School has met only 29% of its applicable academic charter goals.[1,2] Hebrew Language Academy Charter School met four of 14 applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year. Because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's academic performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, 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.

In 2013-2014, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile on the NYS assessments was 54.5% with a City Percent of Range of 21.4%, placing the school in the 12th percentile of all elementary schools citywide.[3] Similarly, the school's peer and CSD percentiles were 13% and 9%, respectively. This means that nearly all other elementary schools in Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's peer group and CSD 22 had ELA median adjusted growth percentiles greater than Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

In 2013-2014, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile on the NYS assessments was 65.5% with a City Percent of Range of 58.5%, placing the school in the 63rd percentile of all elementary schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer and CSD percentiles were 60% and 65%, respectively. The school's math median adjusted growth percentile was above the average of both its peer group and CSD 22 in 2013-2014.

Hebrew Language has a partially developed responsive education program and supportive learning environment. The school provides a partial language immersion model, which employs a co-teaching instructional approach with three teachers providing instruction in Hebrew and two teachers providing instruction in English and Math. Hebrew Language 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, analyzes, and utilizes data to inform student outcomes. The school is supported by a community based organization that provides multiple ways for teachers to receive professional development.

Closing the Achievement Gap

---

[1] This calculation does not include goals which have not been evaluated (not applicable) either as a result of the goal no longer being measurable (e.g. NYC DOE Progress Report grades for the 2013-2014 school year forward) or the goal not yet measurable for the school at the time of the annual reporting (e.g. high school graduation rate for an academic year in which the school was not serving grade twelve students).

[2] It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

[3] A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A percentile rank provides the percentage of schools that score the same or lower than the school under consideration. A City Percent of Range of 21.4% indicates that the school's median adjusted growth percentile was more than one standard deviation below the average (that only 21.4% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School), while a citywide percentile of 12% indicates that Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 12% of all elementary schools citywide.

NYC DOE-authorized charter schools are also assessed based on their ability to close the achievement gap for specific student populations. In school years prior to the 2013-2014 school year, schools received additional credit on the NYC DOE Progress Report for progress and performance of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, charter schools will be assessed on the actual performance as well as the academic growth of students in these populations compared with public school students in the CSD and throughout New York City.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 36.8% of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places Hebrew Language Academy Charter School in only the 29th percentile of all elementary schools citywide. Similarly, only 36.4% of the school's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this level places Hebrew Language Academy Charter School in only the 9th percentile of all elementary schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 33.3% of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's students with disabilities experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places Hebrew Language Academy Charter School in the bottom 24% of all elementary schools citywide. Similarly, only 40.0% of students with disabilities experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this level places Hebrew Language Academy Charter School in the 21st percentile of all elementary schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, only 10.0% of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's English Language Learner (ELL) students experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other ELL students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places Hebrew Language Academy Charter School in only the 3rd percentile of all elementary schools citywide. Similarly, only 10.0% of ELL students experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other ELL students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this level places Hebrew Language Academy Charter School in only the 2nd percentile of all elementary schools citywide.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is a partially operationally sound and fiscally viable organization. This assessment was made based on a review of the following indicators of operational and fiscal viability:

- Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's FY14 independent financial audit;
- Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's FY15 budget and five-year projected budget;
- Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's 2014-2015 student, family and staff handbook;
- On-site review of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's financial and operational records;
- Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's self-reported staffing data;
- Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's Board of Trustee meeting minutes;
- Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's Board of Trustee bylaws; and

- Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees financial disclosure forms.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. The level of membership is consistent with the minimum of seven and the maximum of 15 members established in the Board's bylaws. There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational chart and by regular updates at the Board meetings, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.

The Board's bylaws require the following committees: an Executive Committee, a Finance Committee, a Nominating, Education, and Accountability Committee, and a Personnel Committee. The 2014-2015 Board roster and the school's website reference these committees; however, Board minutes do not reference all of the committees. The Board's bylaws indicate the Board will hold 12 meetings per year consistent with the NYS Charter Schools Act; however, the Board of Trustees did not hold 12 meetings per year during the retrospective term as evidenced by meeting minutes reviewed. Quorum was achieved at all Board meetings over the course of the current charter term.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture. The school is currently led by Head of School, Laura Silver, who has been at the school since 2011 and the Board Chair, Sara Berman has been with the school since its inception. Over the course of the one-year retrospective charter term, the school has not had any changes in school leadership. However, the school has had significant turnover in instructional staff in the most recent one-year charter term. For the most recent period, instructional staff turnover was 35% of instructional staff not returning, either by choice or request, at the start of the 2014-2015[4] school year.

Average daily attendance for students during the retrospective charter term was 94.2%[5]; the school did not meet its attendance goal of 95% in the retrospective one-year charter term. During the 2013-2014 school year, the school had generally positive results on the NYC School Survey.

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has at least 60 days of unrestricted cash on hand to meet obligations totaling $1,127,249.

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

There was no material weakness noted in the FY14 independent financial audit.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School has been compliant with most applicable laws and regulations, but not others.

Over the current charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, a minimum of seven and maximum of 15 members. However, only eight of the 10 current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents that have been submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.[6] The Board submitted the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) during the current charter term.

[4] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form in February 2015
[5] Reflects attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system
[6] Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

NYS Charter law requires the school to post annual audits to its website. Currently, there are financial audits available on the school's website for all years of operation.

All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.

The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is in compliance with state requirements for teacher certification. The 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.

The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.

The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.

The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.

One or more of the school leaders were trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.

Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently submit complete invoicing and reconciliation documents by the associated deadlines.

The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy for the 2014-2015 academic year; this policy was determined to be compliant with federal law regarding due process and a discipline policy for students with disabilities.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School would like to continue with its model as presented in its original charter application, which is to serve students across grades kindergarten through eight. The school would like to continue its phase-in to serve students in grades six through eight starting in the 2015-2016 academic school year.

As part of its renewal application, Hebrew Language Charter School submitted one material revision to increase the authorized maximum enrollment to 783 students across grades kindergarten through eight, consistent with the school's request to be allowed to continue to phase-in to serve authorized grades kindergarten through eight.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is an elementary school serving 472 students[7] in kindergarten through fifth grade during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2009-2010 school year with kindergarten and first grades and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's authorized full grade span as per the original charter application as approved by the NYC DOE is for grades kindergarten through eight. However, the school is authorized to serve grades kindergarten through five only in the current 2014-2015 school year.[8] Hebrew Language Academy Charter School was renewed for a short term renewal of one and one-half years in January 2014. The school's current charter term expires on June 30, 2015. The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in a privately operated facility in Community School District 22 in Brooklyn.

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is a dual-language elementary school located in Midwood, Brooklyn. The school sets out to provide a nurturing yet rigorous dual-language program that fosters academic excellence and a high degree of Hebrew language proficiency. In addition to receiving instruction in English and Hebrew, the school's curriculum is enhanced by art, music, technology, and physical education, all of which incorporate Hebrew language instruction. Students at Hebrew Language develop social and civic responsibility through the integration of community services and service learning into their classroom studies, and will have a solid foundation for further academic learning and continuous personal development as ethical citizens in an increasing global community.

To reach its goals, the school partners with Hebrew Charter School Center and Charter School Business Management. The Hebrew Charter School Center provides the school with academic support, professional development, curriculum development, curriculum assessment and student assessment data gathering, and access to the Culture and History of Israel and its Immigrant Communities curriculum. Working with and through the management organization, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School manages student information via the DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system and the school's invoices through the NYC DOE vendor portal. Charter School Business Management provides, via contract with the school, back office support and financial support services. The annual budget is created by the Board of Trustees of the school. Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees is solely responsible for complying with all requirements of grants for the School, the School's governing charter, and all applicable laws.

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees is led by chair and school founder Sara Berman, who has been with the school since its inception. The school is led by Head of School Laura Silver who has been at the school since 2011.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades kindergarten through two, though kindergarten is considered the primary entry grade. The school has indicated that it does backfill empty seats from the waitlist during the school year for grades kindergarten through five. There were 561 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery.[9]

Over the charter term, the school enrolled and served students as follows with average class size and section count noted for the most recently completed school year, 2013-2014.

[7] ATS data as of October 31, 2014
[8] NYC DOE internal data
[9] Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

Enrollment

Grade-Level Annual Enrollment *	2013-2014
Kindergarten	81
Grade 1	84
Grade 2	84
Grade 3	82
Grade 4	73
Grade 5	75
Total Enrollment	479

* Enrollment figures reflect ATS data as of October 31, 2013.

Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	3	27
Grade 1	3	28
Grade 2	3	28
Grade 3	3	27
Grade 4	3	24
Grade 5	3	25
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	109	

* Lottery information is based on self-reported data from the 2013-2014 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. Section counts are based on self-reported information collected as part of the school's Renewal Application. Average Class Sizes were determined by dividing ATS enrollment as of October 31, 2013 by the appropriate grade-level section count.

Please see additional demographic data in Section 4 of this report for information regarding the enrollment of special populations at Hebrew Language Academy Charter School. This information includes enrollment data for the percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners and students with disabilities as compared to the CSD and citywide averages, as well as targets recently finalized by the New York State Education Department.[10]

[10] Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, Board of Regents authorized charter schools, including those authorized by NYC DOE, will be held accountable to enrollment targets established by NYSED for students with disabilities, English Language Learner students, and students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch. Please note that the recently finalized targets are currently based on enrollment in the 2010-2011 school year and may be updated in the future.

Part 3: Renewal Report Overview

Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding the charter school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during the current 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 evaluate and monitor the charter school's academic, fiscal, and operational performance. 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 the Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) and other staff from the NYC DOE.

Upon review of all the relevant materials, a recommendation is made to the NYC DOE 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 (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.

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

Is the school a fiscally and operationally 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 Authorizer's Core Performance Framework.[11]

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;
- 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.

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

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.

Staff Representatives

The following experts participated in the review of this school, including the renewal visit to the school conducted during February 4 and February 5, 2015:

- Sonya Hooks, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Meera Jain, Director of Evaluation and Policy, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kim Wong, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Karen Drezner, Independent Consultant
- Caitlin Robisch, Director of Analytics, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Paul Yen, Data Analyst, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Alexandra Anormaliza, Executive Director, School Design and Partnerships, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnership
- Julia Bove, Community School Superintendent, District 22, NYC DOE

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

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

High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has one year of academic performance data and one year of New York State assessment data at the time of this report for the retrospective charter term. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments as well as school performance data for the 2012-2013 school year, please see Appendix A. The 2012-2013 school performance data is provided for reference only; it was not used to inform the school's renewal recommendation.

NOTE: The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 ELA and math proficiency percentages should not be compared directly with prior-year results. Unlike prior years, proficiency on the NYS assessments for ELA and math in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 were based on the Common Core Learning Standards – a more demanding set of knowledge and skills necessary for 21st century college and career readiness.

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts	
	2013-2014
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	31.2%
CSD 22	35.6%
Difference from CSD 22 *	-4.4
NYC	29.8%
Difference from NYC *	1.4
New York State **	30.6%
Difference from New York State	0.6

% Proficient in Mathematics	
	2013-2014
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	52.7%
CSD 22	44.6%
Difference from CSD 22 *	8.1
NYC	39.1%
Difference from NYC *	13.6
New York State **	36.2%
Difference from New York State	16.5

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served. CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.

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

Mission and Academic Goals

According to the Renewal Application submitted to the NYC DOE by Hebrew Language Academy Charter School, as well as the 2013-2014 annual report submitted to the New York State Education Department, over the one year retrospective charter term, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- Four of 14 applicable charter goals in the 2013-2014 school year.[12]

Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals *

	Academic Goals	2013-2014
1.	The school will show progress towards achieving 75% proficiency of third through eighth grade students, who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years, performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA exam.	**Partially Met**
2.	The school will show progress towards achieving 75% proficiency of third through eighth grade students, who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years, performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State math exam.	**Met**
3.	The school will show progress towards achieving 75% proficiency of third through eighth grade students, who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years, performing at or above Level 3 on the New York State science exam.	**Met**
4.	Each year, each grade level cohort of students will reduce by one-quarter 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 demonstrate growth (above 75%) in the current year.	**Not Met**
5.	Each year, each grade level cohort of students will reduce by one-quarter 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 demonstrate growth (above 75%) in the current year.	**Partially Met**
6.	The school's Aggregate Performance Index on the NYS ELA exam will meet its Adequate Yearly Progress set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability System.	N/A
7.	The school's Aggregate Performance Index on the NYS math exam will meet its Adequate Yearly Progress set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability System.	N/A
8.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS math exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of CSD 22. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYC DOE.	**Met**

[12] 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% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that refer to comparative academic performance of the school (e.g. to the Community School District) were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

	Academic Goals	2013-2014
9.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of CSD 22. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYC DOE.	**Not Met**
10.	The school will earn a score of B or better in the “Performance” section of the NYC DOE Progress Report.	N/A
11.	The school will earn a score of B or better in the "Progress" section of the NYC DOE Progress Report.	N/A
12.	Each year, the school will be deemed “In Good Standing” on the NYS Report Card.	N/A
13.	Each year, 75% or more of students will perform at or above grade level on the ECLAS-2 assessments.	**Partially Met**
14.	Each year, 75% of kindergarten students who were enrolled at the school on BEDS day will perform at or above grade level on the spring administration of the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System.	**Met**
15.	Each year, 75% of first through eighth grade students who were enrolled at the school on BEDS day for two consecutive years will perform at or above grade level on the spring administration of the Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System.	**Partially Met**
16.	Each year, 75% of all tested students (Grades 1-5) who were enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive BEDS dates, will perform at or above grade level (NCE=50) on the Spring administration of the ITBS Reading test.	**Not Met**
17.	Each year, 75% of all tested students (Grades 1-5) who were enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive BEDS dates, will perform at or above grade level (NCE=50) on the Spring administration of the ITBS Math test.	**Partially Met**
18.	Each year, grade-level cohorts of students in grade three and above will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at grade level on the previous Spring administration of the ITBS Reading test and 75% at or above grade level (NCE=50) in the current Spring test administration. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above grade level (NCE=50) in the previous year, the cohort will remain above 75% at or above grade level (NCE=50) in the current year.	N/A
19.	Each year, grade-level cohorts of students in grade three and above will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at grade level on the previous Spring administration of the ITBS Math test and 75% at or above grade level (NCE=50) in the current Spring test administration. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above grade level (NCE=50) in the previous year, the cohort will remain above 75% at or above grade level (NCE=50) in the current year.	N/A
20.	Each year, 75% of students will perform at the required proficiency level based on BEDS days of Hebrew instruction received.	**Partially Met**
21.	Each year, the school will have an average daily attendance rate of at least 95%.	**Not Met**

* Goals were self-reported by the school in the school's Renewal Application submitted to NYC DOE and 2013-2014 Annual Report documentation submitted to NYSED.

Responsive Education Program

The school administers the Early Childhood Literacy Assessment (ECLAS-2), Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessment (F&P) and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). For these assessments the following data was self-reported by the school and the results indicate that the school has had mixed performance across grade levels and assessment instruments:[13]

- With the exception of Spelling Strands in grades one and two, Hebrew Language met its absolute performance goal of 75% or more of kindergarten through second grade students at or above grade level on the ECLAS-2 assessments.
- While over 75% of students in grades kindergarten through two exceeded the relevant F&P grade-level benchmarks, less than 75% of students in grades three through five scored at or above grade level on the F&P assessments.
- With the exception of kindergarten student performance on both the ITBS Reading and Math test, and third grade student performance on the ITBS math test, Hebrew Language students fell short of the grade-level benchmarks on the ITBS assessments.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on February 4 and February 5, 2015. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**
    - School leadership reported that Hebrew Language has incorporated several improvements to its educational program to coincide with the CCLS. Specifically the school is:
        - Continuing to review, align, and revise the instructional curriculum for alignment to the CCLS to close any curricular gaps.
        - The staff has received ongoing, intensive training on the CCLS, which reflected the instructional shifts with increased capacity for horizontal alignment and vertical articulation.
        - Teachers utilize the Danielson Framework-aligned lesson plan template that requires teachers to indicate the relevance, higher order thinking skills/questions, Webb's depth of knowledge, learning modalities, differentiation, extension, and remediation, as well as provide a post-lesson reflection on rigor, engagement, and collaboration.
        - The ongoing monitoring of instruction by instructional coaches ensures that teachers' scope and sequence are aligned with the CCLS.
    - The key instructional shifts that Hebrew Language has been addressing in ELA are:
        - Regular practice with complex texts and their academic language;
        - Reading, writing, and speaking grounded in evidence from texts, both literary and informational; and
        - Building knowledge through content-rich non-fiction.
    - The key instructional shifts that Hebrew Language has been addressing in mathematics include:
        - Greater focus on fewer topics;
        - Coherence via linking topics and thinking across the grades; and
        - Rigor via a pursuit of conceptual understanding, procedural skills and fluency, and application with equal intensity.
            - To achieve these elements Hebrew Language has organized its ELA instructional model around the EngageNY curriculum modules and the Teachers College Reading and Writing Units of Study.
            - In math, Hebrew Language's curriculum, supported by EnVisionMATH Common Core and EngageNY, is marked by an in-depth focus on fewer topics. It integrates the CCLS, rigorous classroom reasoning, and

[13] Self-reported information from school-submitted Renewal Application submitted 12/5/2014

extended classroom time devoted to practice and reflection through problem sets and high expectations for mastery.

- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**
    - Hebrew Language utilizes a Response to Intervention (RtI) and Child Study Team (CST) approach to provide learning supports for at-risk students and students with disabilities.
    - Hebrew Language 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 full day summer school program t for four weeks.
    - The school streamlined its daily schedule to more effectively distribute staff resources within and between classrooms, allowing two teachers for each core subject as well as three Hebrew teachers in Hebrew to push-in or pull-out for more small-group guided instruction.
    - The school provides additional educational supports for struggling students including retained students and students performing below grade level. These supports include:
        - Learning Review Programs, which take place during the February and April vacation weeks and are full-day intervention programs providing more intensive support; and
        - Full Day Summer School for four weeks in July to targeted students in NYS testing grades.

- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**
    - During the renewal visit, 26 classrooms, grades kindergarten through five, were observed with the school's Head of School, Director of Hebrew Language Instruction, Director of Curriculum and Instruction, and Board of Trustees Education Committee Chair
    - In all observed classes, teachers were following one of the school's models of co-teaching including Integrated Collaborative Teaching (ICT), team teaching, parallel teaching, one teach and one assist, and alternative teaching.
    - Class sizes observed ranged from 22 to 29 students, with two teachers in all classrooms.
    - 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 classrooms, the NYC DOE renewal visit team observed that checks for understanding included questioning, polling, class work, teacher observation, and frequent use of student turn and talk.
    - In all classrooms, the NYC DOE renewal visit team 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 observed was aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with nine 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 additional professional development resources. They also reported being encouraged by the administration to participate in further professional development outside of the school.
- Some of the interviewed teachers mentioned the use of the Teacher Evaluation Rubric by Danielson for formal teacher evaluations conducted by the school's Directors of Instruction and Curriculum (General Education and Hebrew), while most of the interviewed teachers discussed the use of informal observations for receiving feedback from the Director who oversees them.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through both formal and informal assessments.

NYC DOE representatives conducted interviews with students across all grades kindergarten through five. The following was noted:

- Most students interviewed reported that felt the work was challenging and they felt safe in their school.
- All students interviewed reported feeling safe and supported, as well as feeling like there was always someone to talk to.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 97% of parents agree or strongly agree "that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child" and 97% of parents who responded to the survey agree or strongly agree "that the school has high expectations for [their] child."[14]

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey 80% of teachers agree or strongly agree that "order and discipline are maintained at the school" and 8% agree or strongly agree with the statement that "at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school."[15]

[14] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 67% of parent respondents strongly agree that Hebrew Language Academy Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 30% agree with the statement. Similarly, 62% of parent respondents strongly agree that Hebrew Language Academy Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 35% agree with the statement.

[15] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 38% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at Hebrew Language Academy Charter School; another 42% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 60% strongly disagree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 31% of teacher respondents disagree with the statement; 4% agree with the statement; and 4% strongly agree with the statement.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

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

On February 5, 2015, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE met with a representation of the school's Board of Trustees independent of the school leadership team. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has 10 active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of seven members and maximum of 15 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary and Treasurer, specified positions in the bylaws, are currently filled with no vacancies.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in 13 months of meeting minutes reviewed.
- According to available meeting minutes, the Board is updated regularly on academics via the Head of School's report. The Board is also updated on school finances by the Board Treasurer.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational 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's bylaws require the following committees: an Executive Committee, a Finance Committee, a Nominating, Education, and Accountability Committee, and a Personnel Committee. The 2014-2015 Board roster and the school's website reference these committees; however, Board minutes do not reference all of the committees to indicate that they are active.
- The school's founder, Sara Berman, is still a member of the school's Board and currently serves as Board Chair. The school leader is Laura Silver, who has been at the school since 2011.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- The school did not meet its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% in the 2013-2014 school year. Average daily attendance for students was 94.2% as presented in the table below.[16]

Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance	
	2013-2014
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School*	**94.2%**
NYC**	93.2%
Difference from NYC	1.0

* Attendance figures reflect average attendance as reflected in ATS.
** NYC attendance figures reflect average attendance across all general education district schools as reflected in ATS.

[16] The table reflects attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school year 2013-2014. Please note that the school self-reported a different attendance rate than that recorded in ATS for the 2013-2014 school year. The school self-reported an attendance rate of 95.1% for 2013-2014.

- Staff turnover has been consistent during the length of operation of the school. For the one-year period of the charter term, which is the most recent period, staff turnover was 35% of instructional staff not returning, by choice or request at the start of the 2014-2015[17] school year.
- Student mobility is presented below for the charter term without comparison to other schools, the CSD, or NYC as final student retention goals were not yet finalized by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term at the time of the writing of this report. Based on the NYC DOE's evaluation and not in comparison to any other school, the CSD, or NYC averages, the school has had significant challenges with retaining students.

Mobility

Student Mobility out of Hebrew Language Academy Charter School *	
	2013-2014
Number of Students who Left the School	119
Percent of Students who Left the School	26.3%

* Figures are based on student enrollment as of October 31 for each respective school year with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012. Students in terminal grades are not included.

- The NYC DOE has made changes to the NYC School Survey during the entirety of the retrospective charter term. Questions asked have been altered, added, or deleted from year to year. Also, beginning with the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, survey categories will not be measured in total points out of 10 possible points. To allow for consistency during the evaluated charter term, selected questions, consistent with the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework were identified as relevant for charter schools. These are presented below for the duration of the retrospective charter term. In the most recent year of survey results, 2013-2014, the percentage of teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for two of four selected questions, equal to the citywide average for one question, and below the citywide average for the fourth question. The percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for two of the three selected questions and equal to the citywide average for the third question.
- NYC School Survey Response Rates should be comparable over time, however, as the measurement of these has remained consistent. Response rates for each parents, teachers and students (if participating) are presented below for the one-year retrospective charter term. The response rate for Hebrew Language Academy Charter School parents was above the citywide average and the response rate for Hebrew Language Academy Charter School teachers was also above the citywide average.

[17] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form in February 2015

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree			
Survey Question		Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	Citywide Average
		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.	95%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	97%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	96%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	80%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	89%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	95%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	66%	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 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 School Surveys.
*** This question was not introduced until the 2011-2012 School Survey.

NYC School Survey Results

	Response Rates	
		2013-2014
Students*	Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	-
	NYC	-
Parents	Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	93%
	NYC	53%
Teachers	Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	90%
	NYC	81%

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

As part of the renewal process, representatives for 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:

- The school has a Parent Organization (PO) that meets on a monthly basis and the PO's Executive Board meets monthly with Head of School Laura Silver. The PO plans events, such as Teacher Appreciation Day, Pajama Movie Nights and other celebrations, distributes newsletters and calendars with important information, and provides general support and resources to the school.
- Over the course of the charter, the school has increased its support of parents by adding a Parent/Community Liaison, who is responsible for establishing working relationships with parents to promote the school, support the annual student recruitment process, and meet with the Parent Organization to increase parental involvement.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing on February 5, 2015 at Hebrew Language Academy Charter School located at 1340 East 29th Street, Brooklyn, NY 11210 in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 140 participants attended the hearing, with 55 speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents/guardians from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made during February 2015 and 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.

Financial Health

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations.

- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's current ratio of 1.98 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit the school had sufficient cash to cover its operating expenses, with 60 days of unrestricted cash on hand totaling $1,127,249 for at least two months of operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of October 31, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

Financial Sustainability

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

- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school generated an aggregate surplus and operated at a surplus in FY14.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.51 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school generated positive cash flow in FY14.

There was no material weakness noted in the FY14 independent financial audit.

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

As of the review in February 2015, the Board of Trustees for Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is in compliance with:

- **Membership size.** Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, a minimum of seven and maximum of 15 members. The Board currently has 10 members.
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has consistently made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting on the school's website.
- **Timely submission of documents.** The Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for the current charter term. The school has posted to its website its annual audit for the charter term, as required in charter law.
- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** The board has consistently submitted board resignation notices or new board member credentials within the required five days of change to OSDCP for review and, if necessary, approval.

As of the review in February 2015, the Board of Trustees for Hebrew Language Academy Charter School is out of compliance with:

- **Submission of all required documents.** All but two current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.[18]
- **Required number of monthly meetings.** The school's bylaws indicate that the Board is to hold 12 meetings a year. In 2013-2014, the Board held eight meetings, which is less than the required number of monthly meetings, as evidenced by the posted meeting minutes. Required meetings are those which met quorum. The current Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months, per year. The Board has updated its bylaws to comply with this law.

As of the review in February 2015, the charter school is in compliance with:

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2014-2015 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 9, 2014 adhering to the charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1.
- **Teacher certification.** The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification. The 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.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Immunization.** The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.
- **Insurance.** The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- **Fire Emergency.** One or more of the school leaders were trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.
- **Timely Submission of Invoicing and Reconciliation Documents.** Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently submit complete invoicing and reconciliation documents by the associated deadlines.
- **Student Discipline Plan.** The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was

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

determined to be compliant with federal law regarding due process and the discipline policy for students with disabilities.

Enrollment and Retention Targets

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
    - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.
    - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
    - As of the writing of this report, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act were still in a proposed status; these targets have since been finalized. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, as well as the recently finalized current enrollment targets developed by NYSED. It should be noted that these targets were developed using a different methodology than that used to develop the school-specific enrollment rates for each special population as presented below.[19]
- In school year 2013-2014, Hebrew Language Academy Charter School
    - served a lower percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to both the CSD 22 and citywide percentages;
    - served a lower percentage of students with disabilities compared to both the CSD 22 and citywide percentages; and
    - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to both the CSD 22 and citywide percentages.

[19] Please see the following website for more information: http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/enrollment-retention-targets.html

Enrollment of Special Populations[20]

Special Population		2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Current)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)[21]	**Hebrew Language Academy Charter School**	**62.8%**	**83.9%**
	CSD 22	79.1%	
	NYC	82.5%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	**Hebrew Language Academy Charter School**	**15.0%**	**14.0%**
	CSD 22	17.2%	
	NYC	19.7%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	**Hebrew Language Academy Charter School**	**8.1%**	**16.5%**
	CSD 22	12.7%	
	NYC	16.0%	

Additional Enrollment Information	
	2013-2014
Grades Served	K-5
CSD(s)	22

[20] Comparisons of a charter school's special populations to the CSD and City are made relative only to the grades served by the school. For example, if a charter school serves grades kindergarten through five, comparisons of that school's special populations will only be made relative to grades kindergarten through five in the CSD and citywide. CSD comparisons are particular to the grades served in each CSD each year. Enrollment rates reflect demographic characteristics as of June 1 and enrollment as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.
State enrollment targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific enrollment 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 31, 2013. 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.

[21] The school used a private vendor for school lunch services for the 2013-2014. As a result, the percentage of students receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch was self-reported by the school as part of its Renewal Application dated December 2014. Please note that the NYC DOE's ATS records indicate that at least 64.7% of students at Hebrew Language Academy Charter School were eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch for school year 2013-2014.

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

Hebrew Language Academy Charter School would like to continue with its model as presented in its original charter application, which is to serve students across grades kindergarten through eight. The school would like to continue its phase-in to serve students in grades six through eight starting in the 2015-2016 academic school year.

As part of its renewal application, Hebrew Language Charter School submitted one material revision to increase the authorized maximum enrollment to 783 students across grades kindergarten through eight, consistent with the school's request to be allowed to continue to phase-in to serve authorized grades kindergarten through eight.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Renewal Process

In the final year of its charter, a NYC DOE 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 prior 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.

The NYC DOE does not automatically grant charter renewal, and no charter operator is entitled to renewal. Rather, a school must prove that it has earned renewal and is worthy of continuing the privilege of educating New York City public school students. To make such determinations, the NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships renewal team performs a comprehensive review of the school's academic, operational and fiscal performance over the course of the charter which includes an analysis of the school's renewal application. This application is built around the four essential questions of the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework and includes a retrospective analysis of the school's prior track record as well as a prospective plan for the school. In reviewing this information, a school must be able to demonstrate that it can satisfy the four essential questions of the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework:

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

The school presents evidence to support its application for renewal by providing a compelling response to these overarching questions that demonstrates its students have made significant academic progress, is serving students equitably, has sustainable operations to be successful in the next charter term, and that the school has met the goals and objectives pledged in its current 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.

While the academic performance of students is the foremost determining factor of a school's success, a school's ability to demonstrate an effective educational program, a financially and operationally viable organization, and a strong learning community with support from stakeholders are also important factors that inform a renewal decision. For more information on how OSDCP makes renewal recommendations to the Chancellor, please see the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework overview in Part 6 of this report.

Statutory Basis for Renewal

The New York State Charter Schools Act ("the Act") authorizes the creation of a system 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:

§2850:

(a) Improve student learning and achievement;
(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
(c) Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
(d) Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
(e) Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system; and

(f) Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools established under this article accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.

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.[22]

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.
> (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.
>
> 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.

The determination of whether to approve a renewal application rests in the sole discretion of a charter school's authorizer.

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.[23] As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education ("NYC DOE") 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;

[22] See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.
[23] See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

- 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; and
- The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents 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.[24]

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.[25]

[24] § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.
[25] See § 2852(5).

Part 6: NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

The Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) team may recommend to the Chancellor three potential outcomes for charter schools applying for renewal: full-term renewal (with or without conditions), short-term renewal (with or without conditions), or non-renewal.

After the OSDCP renewal site visit, the OSDCP team incorporates its findings from the visit into this renewal report. The evidence and findings align to the four essential questions of the NYC DOE accountability framework and may include classroom observations, leadership interviews, assessment results, School Survey results, public hearings and other community feedback, as well as a variety of other data. Schools will be given the opportunity to correct factual errors in this report. If the OSDCP renewal team determines that renewal is not warranted, the school will be informed in writing of the reasons for the non-renewal. If OSDCP approves the renewal application and the Chancellor recommends renewal for the school, prior to the school's charter expiration date, OSDCP will send the renewal report and recommendation along with the school's renewal application and other supporting evidence to the Board of Regents for its approval.

Full-Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions

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 clearly and consistently demonstrated high academic attainment and/or consistent and significant student academic progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has demonstrated operational viability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

Short Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions

In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has two years or fewer of state-assessment results, or where any school has demonstrated mixed academic results or has uncertain organizational or financial viability, a short-term renewal with conditions may be considered.

Non-Renewal

Renewal is not automatic. 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.

Grade Expansions or Enrollment Changes

A school may seek material charter revisions as part of the renewal process. In the case of a grade expansion or change in authorized enrollment, these material charter revisions are considered separately from the charter renewal. Charter renewal, with or without conditions, is not a guarantee of approval for a proposed material charter revision.

The NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

To help Chancellor-authorized charter schools better understand what we mean by success for charter schools, the OSDCP team has developed an Accountability Framework built around four essential questions for charter school renewal:

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

Although academic performance is primary, the NYC DOE takes into account a wide variety of factors (as indicated by the framework strands and available evidence detail) when evaluating a school. These factors include academic, fiscal, operational and environmental indicators of a charter school's performance. Additionally, some of the indicators we evaluate relate to expected performance as defined in the New York State Charter Schools Act including evidence of improved student learning and achievement, special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure, use of different and innovative teaching methods, parent and student satisfaction, and enrollment and retention of special student populations. Further detail about the application of the framework to school reflection and evaluation is provided beginning on page 17 of the NYC DOE Chancellor-Authorized Schools Accountability Handbook for 2014-2015.

What follows is a framework that outlines strands, indicators, and potential evidence for each of the four essential questions. The framework identifies what OSDCP looks at in determining whether a school is successful enough to earn a new charter term, with or without conditions, and the duration of the charter term recommended by NYC DOE. As schools use the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework, they should remember that charter schools exist to deliver improved student achievement for the students they serve, particularly at-risk students, so the schools are high-quality choices for families. This reminder should help a school apply this framework to its own performance analysis, underscoring the state and city's commitment to superior academic performance as the most important factor in a school's performance, while also recognizing the importance of closing the achievement gap and offering high-quality learning opportunities for all students.

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 established in school charter • Meet student progress goals established in school charter • Meet other rigorous academic goals as stated on school charter • Demonstrate increasing student achievement/growth • Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students • Are surpassing academic performance measures of DOE identified peer-schools • Are surpassing academic performance measures compared with district/city proficiency averages

Evidence for success might include, but not be limited to, the following depending on school configurations:

- Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates
- Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results
- 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
- When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results
- Results on state accountability measures
- Charter School Academic Goals
- School-reported internal assessments
- NYC DOE Progress Reports or School Quality Reports[26]

1b. Instructionally Sound and 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 and Common Core Learning Standards
- Use instructional models and resources that are consistent with school mission and 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
- Utilizes 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 and supporting curricular tasks, programs and resources for effectiveness and fit with school mission and goals

[26] Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE replaced the DOE Progress Report with the DOE School Quality Report. The 2012-2013 school year is the last year NYC public schools will have a Progress Report score. The Progress Report and School Quality Report contain similar indicators of performance.

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

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

1c. Learning Environment

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

- Provide a safe, respectful, and stable academic environment conducive to student leaning (one with efficient transitions and safe hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.)
- Have a strong academic culture that creates high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to consistently give their best effort academically and to actively engage in their own learning and the life of the school
- 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
- Have classrooms where academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Have formal or informal structures or programs in place that provide students opportunities to develop as individuals and citizens (for example: a character education, citizenship, or community involvement or service program)

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

- Classroom observations
- NYC DOE School Survey results (students, parents and teachers)
- 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 (referral, suspension, expulsion)
- Parent complaint/concern information
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Interviews with school leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, students
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)
- School calendar and class schedules

2. Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?
2a. Mission and Goals
Schools with a successful mission and goals have many of the characteristics below: • Have an animated mission statement and clearly articulated goals (both academic and non-academic) that staff, students and community embrace • Demonstrate an active self-evaluation process that involves regular monitoring, an examination of practices based on outcomes against goals, and reporting on progress towards school goals • Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data
Evidence for a successful mission and goals might include, but not be limited to, the following: • Mission Statement • School charter and external documents (student/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 • Stakeholder interviews (board, parents, staff, students, etc.)

2b. Leadership and Governance Structure
Schools with successful leadership and governance structures have many of the characteristics below: • Have a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations, with clear lines of accountability for the Board, school leadership and all staff • Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate officers, committees, and a purposeful 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 Law and conflict of interest laws, and is fully compliant with its Board approved by-laws (number of meetings, quorum, posting of calendar, agenda and minutes) • Have a defined process for Board reflection on effectiveness, assessing developing needs, and plan for professional growth • 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 • Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals and, if and when necessary, makes timely adjustments to that structure with proper notice to and approval by its authorizer • Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel • Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provides regular feedback on instruction to teachers, including both formal and informal observations
Evidence for school governance and organizational design may include, but are not limited to, the following: • School charter • Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, calendar of meetings, meeting agenda and minutes • Annual conflict of interest forms • Board resources for evaluating school leadership and staff, including rubric/performance metrics • Board resources for self-reflection and professional growth • Board development plan • Board interviews • Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook and core operational policies • School calendar • Professional development plans • Stakeholder interviews (board, school leadership and staff)

2c. 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 • Employ an effective means of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including, but not limited to, the NYC DOE School Survey • Have effective home-school communication practices and engagement strategies to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children • Strong community-based partnerships that support and advocate for the school • Engage families actively in the life of the school, including advocacy, community engagement, and feedback on school policies and initiatives • Have a clear procedure for parents and staff to express concerns to school leadership and the Board, as appropriate, including a clearly articulated escalation path to authorizer • Share instructional and operational practices with the larger NYC school community and actively seek opportunities for partnering and collaboration • Encourage professional conversations about effective performance and quality instruction among staff, through, for example, such means as regular and periodic teaming (grade level teams, data days, etc.) and peer observations • Have systems in place to evaluate professional development effectiveness and provide ongoing support for school-wide and individual initiatives
Evidence for school climate and community engagement may include, but not be limited to, the following: • NYC 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 • Participation in NYC DOE initiatives and efforts to collaborate/partner with other NYC schools • Parent and community feedback via public hearings, renewal calls to parents, etc. • Community outreach documents (newsletters, announcements, invitations, etc.) • School Professional Development Plan and staff feedback on professional development events • Resources for evaluations and observations, scheduled opportunities for professional collaboration, staff feedback on professional development events • Student/Family and Staff Handbooks

2d. Operational Health

Schools that are effective, sustainable organizations have many of the characteristics below:

- A safe, clean and appropriately resourced educational facility with all appropriate services specified in charter and mandated by appropriate law and regulations
- Demonstrate efficient and orderly daily operations
- Have appropriate insurance coverage and insurance and facility documents
- An effective process for recruiting, hiring, compensating, monitoring, supporting, and evaluating school leadership and staff
- A flexible, data-driven approach to professional development for all staff
- Consistently meet student enrollment and retention targets as established by SED (applicable to schools renewed after 2010)
- Communications with NYC DOE are timely, comprehensive, and appropriate
- If applicable, school relationship with a charter management organization identified in charter and supported by a management agreement that spells out services, responsibilities, accountability reporting, performance expectations, and fees

Evidence of an operationally viable organization may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Required facility documents (lease, certificate of occupancy, fire and safety inspections, etc.)
- Appropriate insurance documents
- Operational policies and procedures
- Operational organizational chart
- Secure storage areas for student and staff records
- Policies/protocols for maintaining secure records
- School safety plan
- Immunization completion rate information
- Appropriate AED/CPR certifications

2e. Financial Sustainability

Schools that are responsible stewards of public funds and are effective, sustainable organizations have many of the characteristics below:

- Maintain annual budgets that meet all short- and long-term financial responsibilities with available revenues
- Provide rigorous oversight of financial and operational responsibilities, at school leadership and Board levels, in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to short- and long-term decision-making
- Consistently clean financial audits and compliant escrow accounts
- If applicable, strong, accountable partnerships with management organizations and other partners and significant vendors to support delivery of charter school's design and academic program
- School leadership and Board maintain effective internal controls of finances to ensure integrity of financial management and a proactive approach to mitigating risk
- School leadership and Board oversee financial and operational responsibilities in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to decision-making
- Demonstrate financial planning for future school years, including per-pupil and space-related cost projections

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
- Financial audits, escrow accounts and other fiscal reporting documents
- Financial leader(s) resume and accountability documents
- Financial and operational organizational chart
- Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) for significant partnerships and vendor relationships

3. Is the School in Compliance with its Charter and All Applicable Laws and Regulations?

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with the school's charter and charter agreement have the characteristics below:

- Implement the key features of their charter as described in the original charter and, if appropriate, 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 up-to-date charter is available on request to staff, parents, and school community
- Implement 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
- Annual Comprehensive Review reports
- Board meetings, agendas and minutes
- Leadership/Board and staff interviews
- Public hearings (renewal or material revision hearings)

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have the characteristics below:

- Meet all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, ELL and Special Education students to those of their community school district of location[27] *or* are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages for enrollment and retention
- Implement 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
- Conduct an independently verified fair and open lottery and manage enrollment process and annual waiting lists with integrity
- Employ instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and meet all certification requirements

[27] School-specific targets for enrollment and retention were developed by the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

Evidence for compliance with applicable federal and state law may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School reporting documents
- School's NYSED Annual Report
- Student recruitment plan and resources
- Student management policies and promotion and retention policies
- Student/Family Handbook
- Student discipline policy and records
- Parent complaint/grievance records
- Lottery policy, resources, and records; enrollment procedures and records
- Demographic data (school, district, and other as appropriate)
- Staff roster, fingerprint clearance for all staff, certification status of all instructional staff

3c. Applicable Regulations

Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have the characteristics below:

- Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns
- Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and complete 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 comply with NYC DOE OSDCP's requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members
- Inform NYC DOE OSDCP, and where required, receive OSDCP 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
- Stakeholder 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, a school may consider various growth options: replication, expansion to new grades or increased enrollment, or alteration of its 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 determine community needs and to communicate regarding the school's 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:

- Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Renewal application revised charter submission, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Charter revision or merger applications
- 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 (for example, human resource policies for growing your own talent, 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)
- School develops contingency plans especially for facilities or financial scenarios

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

- Charter renewal application
- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organizational 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 without major changes through expansion or replication, 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: • Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term • Renewal application revised charter including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term • Leadership and Board interviews • Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) with partners or important vendors

Appendix A: School Performance Data

The school performance data provided in the tables below for the 2012-2013 school year is for reference only; it was not used to inform the school's renewal recommendation. Only the performance data during the school's retrospective charter period, i.e. the 2013-2014 school year, was evaluated.

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**
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	29.0%	31.2%
CSD 22	32.9%	35.6%
Difference from CSD 22 *	-3.9	-4.4
NYC	27.7%	29.8%
Difference from NYC *	1.3	1.4
New York State **	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-2.1	0.6

% Proficient in Mathematics		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School	35.9%	52.7%
CSD 22	39.3%	44.6%
Difference from CSD 22 *	-3.4	8.1
NYC	34.2%	39.1%
Difference from NYC *	1.7	13.6
New York State **	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	4.8	16.5

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served. CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.

** 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**
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School – All Students	**39.0%**	**54.5%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	0.0%	22.0%
City Percent of Range - All Students	0.0%	21.4%
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School – School's Lowest Third	**55.0%**	**63.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	25.8%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	17.5%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School – All Students	**42.0%**	**65.5%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	0.0%	54.1%
City Percent of Range - All Students	1.4%	58.5%
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School – School's Lowest Third	**47.0%**	**66.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	44.5%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	35.7%

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 *	20.0%	40.0%
English Language Learner Students	33.3%	10.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	42.9%	36.4%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities *	40.0%	33.3%
English Language Learner Students	50.0%	10.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	20.0%	36.8%

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

Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School		
Grade 3	43.8%	40.2%
Grade 4	13.9%	31.9%
Grade 5	-	19.4%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 22 *		
Grade 3	11.7	5.5
Grade 4	-19.8	-5.5
Grade 5	-	-15.2
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC		
Grade 3	15.7	10.3
Grade 4	-13.3	0.8
Grade 5	-	-9.0

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics		
	2012-2013	**2013-2014**
Hebrew Language Academy Charter School		
Grade 3	42.5%	63.9%
Grade 4	29.2%	48.6%
Grade 5	-	43.3%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 22 *		
Grade 3	5.9	21.5
Grade 4	-12.8	3.4
Grade 5	-	-2.9
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC		
Grade 3	9.3	25.2
Grade 4	-6.1	8.6
Grade 5	-	4.5

* CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

Renewal Report 2013-2014