Department of Education
Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

DR. RICHARD IZQUIERDO HEALTH AND SCIENCE CHARTER SCHOOL RENEWAL REPORT

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR
JANUARY 2014

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 *6*

PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY 13

PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW 15

PART 4: FINDINGS 17

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success? *17*
Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization? *24*
Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? *30*
Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term? *33*

PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS 34

PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK 37

APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA 49

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA 51

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Background Information

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Duarna Oller
School Leader(s)	Richard Burke
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	Community Based Organization: Urban Health Plan, Inc.
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 12
Physical Address(es)	800 Home Street, Bronx
Facility Owner(s)	DOE
School Opened For Instruction	2010-2011
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	12/14/2014
Current Authorized Grade Span	6-12
Current Authorized Enrollment	500
Proposed New Charter Term	1.5 years [December 15, 2014 - June 30, 2016]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	6-12
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	721
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	3-4 (three sections per grade in grades 4-6; four sections per grade in grades K-3 and 7-8)

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					
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	Cumulative Charter Term Total
Total Achievable Goals	16	16	16	16	64
# Met	2	0	1	1	4
# Partially Met	1	1	0	0	2
# Not Met	3	9	4	11	27
# Not Applicable *	10	6	11	4	31
% Met	13%	0%	6%	6%	6%
% Partially Met	6%	6%	0%	0%	3%
% Not Met	19%	56%	25%	69%	42%
% Not Applicable *	63%	38%	69%	25%	48%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	33%	0%	20%	8%	12%

* 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				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	20.4%	22.5%	7.8%	9.6%
CSD 12	27.0%	27.9%	8.9%	10.0%
Difference from CSD 12 *	-6.6	-5.4	-1.1	-0.4
NYC	43.6%	44.3%	24.8%	27.0%
Difference from NYC *	-23.2	-21.8	-17.0	-17.4
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-32.4	-32.6	-23.3	-21.0

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	57.0%	30.0%	5.7%	13.7%
CSD 12	40.8%	42.8%	10.5%	12.8%
Difference from CSD 12 *	16.2	-12.8	-4.8	0.9
NYC	56.0%	58.3%	26.5%	28.9%
Difference from NYC *	1.0	-28.3	-20.8	-15.2
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-6.3	-34.8	-25.4	-22.5

* 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				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School - All Students	**41.0%**	**53.0%**	**63.0%**	**50.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	0.0%	24.1%	58.9%	0.0%
City Percent of Range- All Students	0.0%	20.6%	44.6%	2.1%
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School - School's Lowest Third	**62.0%**	**59.0%**	**72.0%**	**66.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	2.7%	19.7%	12.9%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	2.8%	21.4%	11.8%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School - All Students	**55.5%**	**25.0%**	**56.5%**	**57.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	26.2%	0.0%	43.4%	32.8%
City Percent of Range- All Students	32.9%	0.0%	36.2%	39.0%
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School - School's Lowest Third	**70.0%**	**33.0%**	**64.0%**	**70.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	53.8%	0.0%	29.6%	39.8%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	53.7%	0.0%	17.1%	40.5%

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				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities *	20.0%	28.1%	59.4%	60.7%
English Language Learner Students	18.8%	18.8%	15.8%	26.5%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	22.5%	24.2%	38.8%	32.6%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities *	31.3%	9.1%	48.4%	53.6%
English Language Learner Students	38.9%	5.9%	26.3%	25.4%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	40.0%	6.5%	39.1%	46.4%

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

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School enrolled its first class of ninth grade students beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. As a result, data on high school graduation rates is not available. In addition, Regents Pass Rates and Credit Accumulation data are only available for the 2013-2014 school year.

Weighted Regents Pass Rates

2014				
	Math	**Science**	**Global History**	**U.S History**
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	1.17	1.06	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	67.8%	59.6%	-	-
City Percent of Range	62.9%	47.4%	-	-

The Weighted Regents Pass Rate measures students' progress since the corresponding eighth grade test, with more weight given to students with lower proficiency based on eighth grade test results.

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.

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	-	-	-	92.4%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	84.4%
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	83.0%

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.

II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 1.5 year short term renewal with an academic performance condition.

The academic performance condition is as follows:

If by the start of school year 2015-2016, the school's high school academic performance in 2014-2015 does not meet or exceed the following, the NYC DOE reserves the right to provide the school's students and parents with information and counseling regarding the citywide high school choice process:

- **NYS Regents exam pass rates (weighted and standard) at or above the citywide average for the Regents exams in English, math (two or more of the following: Geometry, Integrated Algebra, or Algebra II/Trig) and science (two or more of the following: Living Environment, Chemistry, Physics, or Earth Science); and**
- **PSAT administration (i.e. participation rate) is at minimum 75% of tenth grade students and 85% of eleventh grade students based on the total number of tenth and eleventh grade students, respectively, enrolled at the school on the last school day prior to the test administration day.**

Global Condition
By the time of evaluation for renewal, the School must have met or exceeded 70 percent of the applicable DOE mandated goals as set forth herein in Exhibit D in order to be eligible for renewal. Failure to meet at least 70 percent of the mandated goals may result in NYC DOE recommendation to the Regents for non-renewal at the conclusion of the charter term.

As part of the renewal application, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School submitted three material revisions. The NYC DOE determination is as follows: regarding the material revisions to continue phase-in of maximum authorized enrollment from 500 to 762 students, to continue phase-in of high school with expansion of grades served to six through 12, and to expand the school's leadership team, the NYC DOE approves these material revisions.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science 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 Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting some of these objectives.

Mission and Vision
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's mission is to provide students in the South Bronx with a nurturing and challenging educational environment to achieve their fullest potential and address the health and economic disparities in the school's community. The mission states that upon graduation, students will be prepared for numerous pathways to post-secondary success, including: the highest levels of college achievement, gainful employment as New York State certified health care professionals, and a commitment to serve others as they pursue rewarding lives and respected careers for themselves. The school executes against this mission by emphasizing health and science concepts throughout all instructional areas and through its partnership with institutional partner Urban Health Plan, which provides professional staff to co-teach the school's health education curriculum and also helps operate its on-site health clinic.

School-Specific Academic Performance
The school entered its fifth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data and four years of other academic indicator(s) to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School.

Beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, NYS assessments 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.

In 2012-2013, 5.7% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's students were proficient in math. Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's math proficiency was higher than 27% of middle schools citywide. However, when compared to middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools), Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School outperformed only 3% of similar schools. In 2012-2013, 7.8% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's students demonstrated proficiency in state tests in English Language Arts (ELA). With this level of proficiency, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School outperformed 35% of middle schools citywide but only outperformed 8% of its peer schools.

In the following year (2013-2014), the school's proficiency rates rose in both ELA and math. However, only 13.7% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's students demonstrated math proficiency. Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's math proficiency was higher than 42% of middle schools citywide; however, when compared to peer schools, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School outperformed only 18% of

similar schools. In 2013-2014, only 9.6% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's students demonstrated proficiency on state assessments in ELA. With this level of proficiency, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School outperformed 31% of middle schools citywide but only outperformed 5% of its peer schools.

In 2013-2014, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 50.0% with a City Percent of Range of 2.1%, placing the school in the 3rd percentile of middle schools citywide.[1] Similarly, the school's peer and Community School District (CSD) percentiles were both 0%. This means that all other middle schools in Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's peer group and CSD had an ELA median adjusted growth percentile greater than Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's median adjusted growth percentile.

In 2013-2014, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile was 57.0% with a City Percent of Range of 39.0%, placing it in the 30th percentile of middle schools citywide. The school's peer group and CSD percentiles were 33% and 20%, respectively. The school's math median adjusted growth percentile was below the average of both its peer group and CSD 12.

As the school has only had one complete year serving high school students, the NYC DOE has minimal academic data associated with high school performance to evaluate. The following represents one year of credit accumulation and weighted regents pass rate results for Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School. In the most recent school year, 2013-2014, as self-reported by the school, 92.4% of first-year students at Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School earned 10+ credits, placing the school in the 81st percentile of its peer group schools and the 80th percentile of all high schools citywide.

Weighted Regents pass rates are available for only one year in math and science; therefore, a performance trend cannot be identified. In 2013-2014, the school generally compared favorably against its peer group schools when analyzing weighted Regents pass rates: the school's peer group percentile was 73% for both the math and science weighted Regents pass rate. The school earned citywide percentile ranks of 61% and 49% for its weighted Regents pass rates in math and science, respectively. The school's weighted Regents pass rate was above the citywide average in math, but below the citywide average in science. Regents pass rates on exams administered in 2013-2014 were 83.1% on the Integrated Algebra exam and 93.8% on the Living Environment exam. These exams were taken by only students in the ninth grade in 2013-2014.

Over the four years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School met 12% of its applicable academic charter goals.[2,3] Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School met one of 12 applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year. Because of the move to Common Core standards in

---

[1] 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 2.1% indicates that the school's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was more than one standard deviation below the average (that only 2.1% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School), while a citywide percentile of 3% indicates that Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 3% of all middle schools citywide.

[2] 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 2013-2014 school year and beyond) 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).

[3] It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% 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 in its analysis of progress towards goals.

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, 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. The school has demonstrated an inconsistent trend of achievement of its stated charter goals during the retrospective charter term, with a drop in its success rate over the last two years of the charter term under review.

The school has consistently provided a supportive learning environment for students but has shown mixed evidence of a developed responsive education program. Reports from the past three NYC DOE visits to the school indicate that in the first three years of the charter, the school provided a safe environment that was conducive to learning. These reports consistently describe safe, orderly and positive classrooms that are resource-rich and incorporate the use of technology.[4] However, high staff and leadership turnover has contributed to inconsistent use of data as well as inconsistent instructional quality.[5] The school's current leadership team has been responsive to this during the past two school years, first reporting a return to instructional basics such as lesson plan writing and time management,[6] and most recently, providing increased professional development, as well as stabilizing the school's interim assessment measures and protocols.[7]

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School received a C grade in all sections except Performance, for which it received a D grade. This ranked Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School in the 11th percentile of all middle schools citywide. On the prior year's NYC DOE Progress Report (2011-2012), the school earned an overall grade of F, placing it at the 1st percentile compared with all middle schools citywide. While the school demonstrated improvement in its year-over-year performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report, its overall performance, as represented by percentile rank, remained low. (Schools receive an ungraded progress report in their first year serving students.)

NYC DOE Progress Reports graded each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and were based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores were based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of 40 schools with similar student populations and to all schools citywide. The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report was the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constituted 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section was primarily based on median adjusted growth percentiles,[8] which measure students' growth on state tests relative to other students with the same prior-year score. Although the NYC DOE Progress Report was discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, individual academic performance metrics from the former NYC DOE Progress Report are included in this renewal report for all years for which data was available in the current charter term.

Closing the Achievement Gap

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 (ELLs), and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, charter

[4] Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School Annual Site Visit Reports, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012
[5] Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School Annual Site Visit Report, 2011-2012
[6] Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School Annual Site Visit Report, 2012-2013
[7] Self-reported in school's renewal application materials submitted March 31, 2014
[8] A student's growth percentile compares his or her growth to the growth of all students in the City who started at the same level of proficiency the year before. To evaluate a school on its students' growth percentile, the NYC DOE uses an adjusted growth percentile. Growth percentile adjustments are based on students' demographic characteristics and reflect average differences in growth compared to students with the same starting proficiency level. The NYC DOE evaluates a school based on its median adjusted growth percentile, the adjusted growth percentile of the middle student when all students adjusted growth percentiles are listed from lowest to highest.

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, 46.4% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science 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 Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School in the 44th percentile of middle schools citywide. However, 32.6% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School 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 Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School in only the 4th percentile of all middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 53.6% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science 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 citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School in the 72nd percentile of middle schools citywide. Similarly, 60.7% of students with disabilities at Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School 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 places Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School in the 78th percentile of all middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 25.4% of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's English Language Learner students 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 Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School in just the 12th percentile of middle schools citywide. Similarly, 26.5% of English Language Learner students 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 places Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School in only the 10th percentile of all middle schools citywide.

As the school did not have a high school graduating class in the retrospective charter term, closing the achievement gap data is not available for the high school grades. The NYC DOE does not have closing the achievement gap data associated with four-year weighted diploma rates or the College and Career Preparatory Course Index (CCPCI) to evaluate at the time of this charter renewal.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School is a partially operationally sound and fiscally viable organization. This assessment was made based on a review of the following indicators of the school's operational and fiscal viability:

- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's FY11 mid-year, FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's 2014-2015 student/family handbook;
- On-site review of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's financial and operational records;
- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's FY15 budget and five-year projected budget;
- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's Board of Trustees financial disclosure forms;

- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's Board of Trustees minutes;
- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's Board of Trustees by-laws; and
- Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's self-reported staffing data.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has partially developed its governance structure and organizational design. The Board's membership and leadership have been consistent since the school's founding, with the founding Board chair stepping down and being replaced by the current Board chair, Duarna Oller, during the 2011-2012 school year. Approximately 55% of the founding Board's members, including the founding Board chair, remain on the Board. The Board's officer positions have been consistently filled and its committees have been consistently active. However, year-over-year school leadership team instability and the resulting organizational structure changes have been continuing areas of concern.

The Board has held 12 meetings per year since July 2012 as per the Board's bylaws and the Charter Schools Act. The Board does post its meeting minutes and agenda publicly via the school's website. The Board receives standing academic and operational reports from the school's leadership team during meetings.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has not yet developed a stable school culture. The school has had four leaders during its charter term: John Xavier, Principal in school year 2010-2011; Frank Steele, Principal in school year 2011-2012; Anthony Lopez, Chief Executive Officer in school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014; and Richard Burke, Head of School in school year 2014-2015.

In general, instructional staff turnover has been a concern, ranging between 10% and 65% over the course of the charter term. In year one, year two, and year three of the charter term (2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013), 30%, 65%, and 53% of instructional staff did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year. However, for the most recent period, staff turnover was only 10%, which represents five instructional staff members.[9] The school also experienced high levels of student attrition in school year 2012-2013 and has not met its student attendance charter goal in the last three years of this charter term under review.

Based on NYC School Survey results, only 89% of teachers at Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School agree or strongly agree that school leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching, and this rate has fallen since the first year of operation and over the last year. This level of agreement is three percentage points below the citywide average of 92%.[10] Responses on key questions from parents and teachers had mixed results when compared with citywide averages, though response rates for students, parents and teachers have been above citywide averages in both of the last two years.

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has approximately 53 days unrestricted cash on hand totaling $922,832 to meet near term obligations.

Overall, there are concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices.

[9] Data on instructional staff turnover was self-reported by the school in its Renewal Application to the NYC DOE dated November 2014.

[10] The percentage of teachers at Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School who agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching" fell from 100% in the 2010-2011 school year to 80% in the 2011-2012 school year, and from 94% in the 2012-2013 school year to 89% in the most recent school year, 2013-2014. The citywide average of 92% reflects 2013-2014 NYC School Survey results.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits from FY12 through FY14.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School has been compliant with most applicable laws and regulations but was out of compliance with several programmatic components of its original charter and was briefly under-enrolled in school year 2012-2013.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

The school has submitted a request to make the following material revisions to its charter as part of its next charter term:

- Continue phase-in of maximum authorized enrollment from 500 to 721 students;
- Continue phase-in of high school with expansion of grades served from six through ten to six through twelve (though the authorized grade span remains six through twelve); and
- Expand the leadership team to include the following positions overseen by the Head of School: a High School Director of Teaching & Learning, a Middle School Director of Teaching & Learning, a Director of Special Education and ELL Services, and a Director of Assessment.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School is a middle/high school serving 517 students[11] in grades six through ten during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2010-2011 school year with grade six and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's authorized full grade span as per the original charter application is for grades six through twelve. However, the school is authorized to serve grades six through ten only in the fifth year of its current charter term, i.e. the current school year, 2014-2015.[12] The school's current charter term expires on December 14, 2014.[13] The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in a New York City Department of Education[14] (DOE)-operated facility in Community School District 12 in the Bronx, and is co-located with Bronx Latin and Bronx Career and College Preparatory High School.[15]

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School is designed to provide students in the South Bronx with a nurturing and challenging educational environment to achieve their fullest potential and address the health and economic disparities in the school's community. Upon graduation, students will be prepared for numerous pathways to post-secondary success, including: the highest levels of college achievement, gainful employment as New York State certified health care professionals, and a commitment to serve others as they pursue rewarding lives and respected careers for themselves.

To reach its goals, the school partners with non-profit institutional partner The Urban Health Plan, Inc. (UHP). UHP provides resource supports for the school's health and science curriculum, including: the establishment and operation of its on-site health clinic; guidance on its implementation of Career and Technical Education (CTE) programming (specifically focused on students achieving EMT licensing credentials); and provision of medical professional staffers as guest lecturers for CTE and other health-related programming. Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School manages student information via the DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system and invoices through the NYC DOE vendor portal. The annual budget is created by the Board of Trustees of the school using paid assistance from Charter School Business Management (CSBM). Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science 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. UHP is not involved in the fiscal or operational management aspects of the school.

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School's Board of Trustees is led by chair Duarna Oller. The school's founder, Dr. Richard Izquierdo, is still a member of the school's Board. The school is led by Head of School Dr. Richard Burke, who has been at the school for one year, having joined the school in November 2013 as a Director of Teaching and Learning and subsequently as school leader starting in July 2014. Prior to this, the school was led by John Xavier as principal in school year 2010-2011, Frank Steele as principal in school year 2011-2012, and Anthony Lopez as the Chief Executive Officer/School Leader in school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, with Dr. John Kalaboukas serving as the Director of Curriculum and Instruction in school year 2012-2013.

The school has typically enrolled new students at all grade levels throughout its charter term. There were 267 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery.[16] The school currently backfills students from the waitlist during the school year across all grade levels six through ten; however, in the next charter term it does not intend to backfill any seats in grades ten through twelve.

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.

---

[11] ATS data as of October 31, 2014
[12] NYC DOE internal data
[13] NYC DOE internal data
[14] NYC DOE internal data
[15] NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System
[16] Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

Enrollment

Grade-Level Annual Enrollment *	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grade 6	97	113	75	190
Grade 7	-	105	90	87
Grade 8	-	-	85	75
Grade 9	-	-	-	66
Grade 10	-	-	-	-
Grade 11	-	-	-	-
Grade 12	-	-	-	-
Total Enrollment	97	218	250	418

* Enrollment figures reflect ATS data as of October 31st for each school year with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.

Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Grade 6	8	24
Grade 7	4	22
Grade 8	4	19
Grade 9	3	22
Grade 10	-	-
Grade 11	-	-
Grade 12	-	-
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	200	

* Lottery and section count information are based on self-reported data from the 2013-2014 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. 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 Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science 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 proposed by the New York State Education Department (NYSED).[17]

[17] 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 once established by NYSED for students with disabilities, English Language Learner students, and students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch.

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.[18]

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

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

A school's Governance Structure & Organizational Design and Climate & Community Engagement are rated as **Developed, Partially Developed,** or **Not Yet Developed.** A school's Financial Health is rated to

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

indicate whether there are concerns about the near-term financial obligations and the financial sustainability of the school.

Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with 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 two renewal visits to the school on May 29-30, 2014 and October 2, 2014:

- DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Gabrielle Mosquera, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Caitlin Robisch, Director of Analytics, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Mariama Sandi, Chairperson of the Committee on Special Education, NYC DOE
- Dr. Dorita Gibson, Senior Deputy Chancellor, NYC DOE
- Laura Feijoo, Senior Supervising Superintendent, NYC DOE

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has four years of academic performance data and four years of NYS assessment data at the time of this report. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments, as well as other high school academic indicators, please see Appendix A.

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				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	20.4%	22.5%	7.8%	9.6%
CSD 12	27.0%	27.9%	8.9%	10.0%
Difference from CSD 12 *	-6.6	-5.4	-1.1	-0.4
NYC	43.6%	44.3%	24.8%	27.0%
Difference from NYC *	-23.2	-21.8	-17.0	-17.4
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-32.4	-32.6	-23.3	-21.0

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	57.0%	30.0%	5.7%	13.7%
CSD 12	40.8%	42.8%	10.5%	12.8%
Difference from CSD 12 *	16.2	-12.8	-4.8	0.9
NYC	56.0%	58.3%	26.5%	28.9%
Difference from NYC *	1.0	-28.3	-20.8	-15.2
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-6.3	-34.8	-25.4	-22.5

* 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.

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Middle School Progress Report Grades	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Overall Grade	-	F	C	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	-	F	C	
Student Performance	-	D	D	
School Environment	-	C	C	

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School did not receive high school progress reports during school years 2010-2011 through 2012-2013 as the school did not enroll ninth grade students until the 2013-2014 school year.

Mission and Academic Goals

According to the school's Renewal Application submitted to the NYC DOE, as well as annual reports submitted to NYSED, over each of the four years in the charter term during which the school was open, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- 2 of 6 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 0 of 10 in the second year,
- 1 of 5 in the third year,[19] and
- 1 of 12 in the fourth year.

Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals *

Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1. 75% of students in the grade seven two year cohort must score a 3 or above on the NYS ELA Examination.	N/A	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
2. 75% of students in the grade eight two year cohort must score a 3 or above on the NYS ELA Examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	**Not Met**
3. 75% of students in the grade seven two year cohort must score a 3 or above on the NYS Math Examination.	N/A	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
4. 75% of students in the grade eight two year cohort must score a 3 or above on the NYS Math Examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	**Not Met**
5. 75% of students in the grade eight two year cohort must score a 3 or above on the NYS Science Examination.	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**

[19] 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 2012-13 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 in its analysis of progress towards goals.

	Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
6.	Grade level cohorts of students in grades seven and eight will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS ELA exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year.	N/A	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
7.	Grade level cohorts of students in grade six will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS ELA exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year. (ELA Value-added Performance will be measured for the School's sixth graders using their fifth grade NYS ELA scores obtained through ATS.)	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
8.	Grade level cohorts of students in grades seven and eight will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS Mathematics exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Mathematics Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year.	N/A	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
9.	Grade level cohorts of students in grade 6 will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS Mathematics exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Mathematics Exam. If a grade-level cohort exceeds 75% at or above Level 3 in the previous year, the cohort will show at least an increase in the current year. (Mathematics Value-added Performance will be measured for the School's sixth graders using their fifth grade NYS Mathematics scores obtained through ATS.)	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
10.	Each year the percentage of students performing at or above Level 3 on both the State ELA and Mathematics exams in each tested grade will place the School in the top quartile of all similar schools.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
11.	Each year, the school will meet the requirements to be deemed "in good standing" according to the NCLB accountability system and the New York State requirement for AYP, meeting AYP in the aggregate and in all subgroups in all tested areas.	**Met**	**Partially Met**	**Not Met**	N/A
12.	It will be expected that 75% of each ninth grade cohort graduate from high school after five years.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
13.	All students who score proficient as defined by grade level will remain so from fall to spring.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14.	All students below grade level will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent scoring at or above grade level on the fall administration of the test and 75% at or above grade level on the spring administration.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15.	Each year the School will have a daily student attendance rate including excused absences of at least 95%.	**Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**

Academic Goals		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
16.	Each year the School will have a higher rate of attendance than similar schools.	**Partially Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**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

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on May 29–30, 2014 and on October 2, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**
  - School instructional leadership reported that leadership instability during the first three years of the charter term impeded the school's focus on curriculum and assessment alignment to Common Core Learning Standards. In response, in August 2013, the school engaged an external team of curriculum and instructional consultants to work with the then-Director of Curriculum and Instruction to bring its curricular and programmatic elements into CCLS-alignment.
  - The school began using the CCLS-aligned Achievement Network system of internal interim assessments in school year 2013-2014 and continues to use these assessments to assess ELA and math progress of students in grades six through eight. Additionally, the school now uses Connected Math Program 3's (CMP3) published textbook along with its readiness assessments in grades six through eight to measure progress against math CCLS. The school began using the Engage NY ELA curriculum in grades six through eight starting in school year 2013-2014 and also began incorporating writing assessments into its grades six through eight ELA and Social Studies programs during that time.

- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**
  - The school provides its special education and general education teachers a "snapshot" of each Individualized Education Program (IEP) that gives a basic summary of the student's needs. The snapshot is a Google document that can be viewed by only the teachers who are working with the special education student.
  - To review the entire IEP in Special Education Student Information System (SESIS), the special education teachers are given access to the IEP by the Director of Special Education. Copies of the most current IEPs are also kept in a locked cabinet in the Director of Special Education's room.
  - As observed on the October 2, 2014 visit, the school reported having 79 students with disabilities. All annual reviews for students with IEPs had been completed for the 2013-2014 school year, but eight of these were not within compliance dates. There were 32 three-year reviews currently due in SESIS, and eight of these were past due the compliance date. IEP dates were generally within compliance but the program recommendations were an area of concern for at least 14 cases.[20] Although the school reported that all special education teachers are certified, written confirmation was not offered at the time of the visit.
  - At the time of the school visit, there were 14 students with disabilities with Special Class recommendations on their IEPs. At the time of the visit, the school was planning to

[20] Information regarding students with disabilities and IEPs is from renewal visit documentation review and observations conducted by the NYC DOE CSE Chair.

request IEP meetings to consider recommendation changes that would reflect programs offered by the school.

- The school described a Tier 1 through 3 approach to Response to Intervention (RTI) for students in need of academic support services as follows:
    - Tier 1: Students are tracked and teachers utilize classroom based interventions. The student intervention team meets once a week to review data on students who may be failing or struggling.
    - Tier 2: Students are provided a more structured setting with eight students for a six-week period for intensive academic support once a week.
    - Tier 3: Students are considered for more intense additional weeks of services in a smaller setting of up to four students three times a week for four to six weeks. Students are pulled-out during the intervention period or elective classes. If students still do not make progress, the school considers a referral to the Committee on Special Education (CSE).
        - The CSE is given information on the pre-referral strategies that have been tried and failed as part of the referral process.
- Parents of students with disabilities are given informed progress reports at parent-teacher conferences. The template from SESIS is used as a guide for teachers to present this information. The school also indicated that scheduled time to review IEP goals is often provided to parents at any time requested. The general education teachers along with the special education teachers review student progress towards meeting the goals in class four times per year.
- The school educates all students with disabilities in the least restrictive environment. Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) is the most restrictive setting offered at the school, and students with disabilities are always in class settings with their general education peers.
- The school provides educational supports for students from special populations including English Language Learners (ELLs) and students with disabilities. These supports include: the addition of two ELL specialists in school year 2014-2015; a Student Intervention Team (SIT) comprised of teachers and support specialists to whom cases of struggling students are brought; use of a Response to Intervention program; and use of Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) on both a push-in and pull-out basis.
- As observed on the October 2, 2014 visit, the school reported having 55 ELL students: 42 advanced, five intermediate, and eight beginners. The school provides ELL services based on the student's proficiency level. Beginner-level students are pulled out with specific computer-based instruction, such as Rosetta Stone and Duolingo, in small groups of three or four students. Vocabulary building exercises and Google images are supplied to the ELL students. Intermediate and advanced students are provided ELL services with in-class support during ELA and social studies classes. The curriculum is broken down for students at this level.[21]
- The school provides additional educational supports for struggling students including retained students and students performing below grade level. These supports include: an extended day program mandated for students scoring at NYS proficiency levels 1 or 2 in ELA or math and/or who fail two or more core subjects; daily intervention periods that utilize a combination of i-Ready software and a Kaplan curriculum taught by the school's instructional staff; ELA pull-outs using the Wilson Reading System; and a mandated four-week Summer Academy that has a 15:1 student-to-teacher ratio. The school has contracted with instructional coaches focused on social studies, science, ELA, and math, as well as implementation of the Workshop Model at the high school level. The school has also retained an outside consultant focused on differentiation.
- School leadership reported that teachers have begun receiving summer professional development focused on co-teaching methods and co-planning. High school teachers

[21] Information regarding English Language Learners and performance levels is from renewal visit documentation review and observations conducted by the NYC DOE CSE Chair

now receive daily professional development (PD) during their schedule's first period, and whole-school PD is held on Wednesday mornings.
    - The school began gathering baseline data for its current sixth grade students as early as July 2014 to better diagnose areas of strength and need within this cohort and address them at the start of the school year.
    - The school began implementing a co-teaching model across all grades and subjects by the start of school year 2014-2015. It supports this model with the summer PD mentioned above as well as by building a daily prep period into the school's schedule where teachers plan with their co-teachers.

- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**

    - During the renewal visits in May and October 2014, a total of 28 classrooms across grades six through ten were observed with the school's Head of School, and Middle and High school Directors of Teaching and Learning.
    - In most observed classes, teachers were using a combination of the following instructional methods: lecture, lead and assist, lead and monitor, and independent practice.
    - Class-sizes observed ranged from 15 to 23 students in size, with two teachers in most classrooms by October 2014.
    - Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations largely consisted of those related to basic fact recall and to challenging students to demonstrate understanding of the material being taught. Some questioning challenged students to analyze and apply the material taught using illustrations and in a few cases, to synthesize and evaluate it through the creation of artifacts.
    - In most classrooms, checks for understanding included questioning, classwork, and teacher observation; exit tickets and performance-based activities were observed in some, mostly math classrooms. These activities included groupings of students demonstrating understanding of congruent angles by constructing layouts of mock city blocks; an integrated algebra Regents review conducted in the style of a game show; and a mock trial of the mathematician/astronomer Copernicus.
    - In a few observed classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, and products, through small group instruction or independent practice, was observed. School leadership had reported that differentiation was a current area of focus for its teachers' professional development and that the school has started using a consultant specifically focused on the use of this practice.
    - 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 off task for a short duration and were attended to by a teacher fairly quickly.
    - Based on debriefs with the school's leadership team members after classroom visits, all classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 11 teachers and two learning specialists. The following was noted:

- Interviewed teacher responses varied with regard to the types of data used to inform daily classroom instruction. Some referred to data from Achievement Network or i-Ready as their primary data and tracking methods used, while others spoke about using data walls or excel spreadsheets. Others referred to more informal checks such as observation of class work, exit tickets, checks for understanding, or student responses to Do Now activities as the means by which they decide what needs to be retaught the following day.

- Some of the interviewed teachers reported getting regular feedback on lesson plans, but others did not. All teachers who had received regular feedback on lesson plans characterized it as helpful.
- All interviewed teachers spoke positively regarding the school's PD, with the high school teachers specifically enjoying its frequency (daily). PD topics cited included classroom management, the Danielson framework, lesson planning, and student activities.
- All interviewed teachers reporting feeling comfortable communicating directly with either their lead teacher or any member of the school leadership team. All interviewed teachers reported a similar level of comfort directing questions about students with disabilities to the school's Special Education teacher, ELL teacher, or Special Education Coordinator.

NYC DOE representatives conducted group interviews with 16 students in grades six through nine. The following was noted:

- Most interviewed students reported that their schoolwork was challenging in a positive way and that teachers broke down academic material well enough to make it unintimidating.
- All interviewed students stated that their teachers had high expectations for them and are willing to provide them with extra help whenever necessary.

According to the 2013-2014 School Environment Survey, most parents agree "that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child" and most parents who responded to the survey agree "that the school has high expectations for [their] child."[22]

According to the 2013-2014 School Environment Survey, 89% of teachers agree that "order and discipline are maintained at the school," though 25% agree with the statement that "at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school."[23]

[22] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 46% of parent respondents strongly agree that Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 48% agree with the statement. Similarly, 49% of parent respondents strongly agree that Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 45% agree with the statement.

[23] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 42% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School; another 47% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 8% marked that they strongly agree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; another 17% of teacher respondents marked 'agree' to 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 partially developed its governance structure and organizational design.

The school has had four leaders during its charter term: John Xavier, Principal in school year 2010-2011; Frank Steele, Principal in school year 2011-2012; Anthony Lopez, Chief Executive Officer in school years 2012-2013 and 2013-2014; and Richard Burke, Head of School in school year 2014-2015. This instability at the school leadership level, along with the resulting changes in school organizational structure, raises a concern regarding sustainability and effectiveness of leadership selection and Board oversight.

On October 7, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE interviewed 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 11 active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of seven and maximum of 15 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Chair, Vice-Chair, Treasurer and Secretary positions specified in the bylaws are currently filled.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in the school's renewal application materials. The school reports that the Board did not achieve quorum during its meetings for school years 2010-2011 through 2012-2013.[24] However, minutes reviewed from July 2012 through October 2014 indicate that the school did achieve quorum during all but one of these meetings, which was an exception due to extreme weather.
- On a standing basis at each Board meeting, as recorded in meeting minutes, the school leader updates the Board on the school's academic progress and the Director of Operations provides a similar update regarding the school's operations. The Board Treasurer provides a standing update on the school's finances.
- 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 has active and functioning committees as required by its bylaws, including an Executive committee, a Finance committee, a Board Development committee, and an Education and Accountability committee, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The school's founder, Dr. Richard Izquierdo, is still a member of the school's Board. As previously stated, the Board has experienced some degree of turnover (between one and two members) during each year of the current charter term, but its membership number has never gone below the minimum number of five required by its bylaws.

[24] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on March 31, 2014

School Climate & Community Engagement

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has not yet developed a stable school culture.

- To date, as self-reported by the school and reflected in student data in ATS, the school has not met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95%, except in its first year. However, high school attendance for the school's first year serving high school grades, 2013-2014, exceeded the citywide high school attendance average by 7.6 percentage points. Average daily attendance for students over the course of the retrospective charter term (2010-2011 through 2013-2014) is recorded according to the data in the table below. [25]

Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School *	**95.0%**	**93.2%**	**91.4%**	**92.7%**
NYC **	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	1.8	-0.7	-2.2	-0.5
High School Attendance				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School *	**-**	**-**	**-**	**94.1%**
NYC **	-	-	-	86.5%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	7.6

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

- Instructional staff turnover has been a concern over most of the charter term, ranging from 30% in school year 2010-2011 to 65% in 2011-2012 and then falling to 10% in 2013-2014. There is evidence that this has affected student performance. The school reports that instructional turnover during the first years of the charter term resulted in a lack of articulated school curricula and instructional continuity, as well as inadequate professional development for its largely novice teaching staff, all of which was evidenced by state assessment results.[26] However, a recent decline in teacher turnover was reported by school leaders during the last renewal visit on October 2, 2014; as reported, staff turnover fell to only 10% of instructional staff not returning, either by choice or request, at the start of the 2014-2015 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 established by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term. Based on the NYC DOE's evaluation and not in comparison to any other school, the CSD, or NYC averages, the school has had challenges with retaining students.

[25] The table reflects average daily attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014. Please note that the school self-reported different attendance rates in its Renewal Application than those recorded in ATS for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, though the differences are not significant. The school self-reported attendance rates of 93.0% and 92.2% for school years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, respectively.
[26] Self-reported information from school-submitted renewal application on March 31, 2014

Mobility

Student Mobility out of Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School *				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Number of Students who Left the School	13	54	72	72
Percent of Students who Left the School	13.4%	24.8%	28.8%	17.6%

* 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 students agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for all three selected questions; the percentage of teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for two of four selected questions; and the percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was below citywide averages for all three of the selected questions.
- NYC School Survey Response Rates should be comparable over time, however, as the measurement of these has remained consistent. Response rates for parents, teachers and students (if participating) are presented below for each year of the charter term. In general, for each year of the charter term, the response rates for Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School parents and students are above NYC averages (with the exception of the parent response rate in 2010-2011) and the response rates for Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School teachers, although initially below citywide averages, have been at 100% for the past two school years, exceeding NYC averages.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree						
Survey Question		Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School				Citywide Average
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.*	87%	77%	60%	71%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	44%	45%	60%	62%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	77%	72%	85%	81%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	89%	90%	78%	94%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	83%	89%	80%	90%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	86%	90%	78%	93%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	75%	30%	89%	89%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	75%	80%	89%	89%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	100%	80%	94%	89%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.**	-	60%	95%	75%	81%

* 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				
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students	Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	98%	95%	97%	97%
	NYC	83%	82%	83%	83%
Parents	Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	42%	76%	72%	79%
	NYC	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	80%	56%	100%	100%
	NYC	82%	81%	83%	81%

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 Engagement Coordinator on its staff and created a Family Engagement Center (FEC) in the fall of 2013 in order to promote parent engagement with the school. The FEC is a dedicated space within the school where parents can access computers, attend job and health fairs, and participate in workshops on topics ranging from health and wellness to financial literacy. Based on the results of an internal survey asking which topics are most important to parents, the school is identifying teachers who can deliver workshops related to core content areas, state assessments, and homework help. School leadership reports that it had held more than 30 workshops by March 2014 with approximately 30 parents per week in attendance.[27]
- The school has had a Parent Association (PA) throughout the course of the charter term, but the degree of its involvement has been mixed. The PA experienced significant turnover during the spring of 2012 following the school leadership change, resulting in the PA being without officers for several months during the entire 2011-2012 school year and part of the 2012-2013 and school years.[28] The school responded by facilitating a retreat between the Chief Executive Officer and remaining PA members to strengthen their relationship going forward. School leadership reported that by March 2013, new PA officers had been elected and were holding monthly meetings.
- The school's Board bylaws mandate a parent seat on the Board roster, and Board meetings include a standing agenda item for a report from the school's PA leaders.
- School leadership stated that in July 2014, the school for the first time included incoming students and parents in its Summer Academy in addition to returning students attending for remediation. This was implemented in response to parent feedback regarding prior iterations of Summer Academy, which was geared solely toward enrichment and which parents found to be inefficient. The revamped Summer Academy was intended to better acculturate these new students and parents to the school and its expectations. School leadership reported good attendance among its incoming students and families, estimating that 85 to 90 parents (out of 150 incoming students) attended some part of the program.[29]
- The in-school health clinic operated by Urban Health Plan, Inc. in partnership with the school is a DOE school-based Health Clinic (SBHC) which serves all schools co-located in the school building at 800 Home Street in the Bronx, including Bronx Latin and Bronx Career and College Preparatory High School.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing on October 2, 2014 at 800 Home Street, Bronx, NY for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 75 participants attended the hearing, with 41 people speaking in support of the school's renewal and three 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 October and November 2014 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 85% of parent/guardian respondents provided positive feedback regarding the school.

[27] Self-reported from the school's renewal application submitted March 31, 2014
[28] DOE Annual Comprehensive Report, 2012-2013 School Year
[29] DOE renewal visit, October 2, 2014

Financial Health

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

- Based on the fiscal year 2014 (FY14) financial audit, the school's current ratio of 3.51 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash of $922,832 representing 53 days to cover its operating expenses for one to two months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of September 30, 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.

Overall, there are concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices.

- Based on the financial audits from FY12 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus over these audited fiscal years, though in FY14 the school operated at a 4% deficit.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.05 indicated that the school had minimally more total assets than it had total liabilities**.**
- Based on the financial audits from FY12 through FY12 and follow up by the DOE, the school had overall negative cash flow from FY12 to FY13, with declining cash flow in each fiscal year.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits FY12 through FY14.

Based on follow up documentation from the school, the following was noted:

- The school spent approximately $1.34 million in consultant fees during FY14, which resulted in the school operating at a deficit and a decline in cash flow at the end of the fiscal year.
- According to the school's FY15 projected budget, the school will end the fiscal year with a surplus and will reduce consulting fees to approximately $450,000.

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

Over the retrospective charter term, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School has been compliant with almost all applicable laws and regulations.

However, the school was out of compliance with several programmatic components of its original charter application, including: cross-curricular integration of health and science concepts; offering Regents exams for eighth grade students; the creation of Individual Health Plans for all students; the creation of Student Success Plans for all students; the creation of Teacher Success Plans for all instructional staff; the establishment of Annual Review Conferences; and the provision of 200 instructional days per school year. The school acknowledged this lack of compliance in its renewal application and noted the program components that it has begun to implement in the 2014-2015 school year to address these gaps. Additionally, the school has adjusted its revised charter for the prospective charter term to include the programmatic components that are now being implemented, as well as to remove components it does not intend to implement in the future.

Additionally, the school fell more than 15% below its authorized enrollment projection in school year 2012-2013.[30] The current charter agreement specified that student enrollment must be within 15% of the authorized projected enrollment for the school. However, the school's enrollment in 2013-2014 and as of the review in November 2014 is within its authorized amount as per the current charter agreement.

As of the review in November 2014, the Board of Trustees for Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science 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.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.[31]
- **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 as well as keeping these materials available at the school.
- **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.
- **Timely submission of documents.** The Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the NYSED by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term. The school has posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law.
- **Required number of monthly meetings.** The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in the school's renewal application materials. The school reports that the Board did not achieve quorum during its meetings for school years 2010-2011 through 2012-2013.[32] However, minutes reviewed from July 2012 through October 2014 indicate that the school did achieve quorum during all but one of these meetings, which was an exception due to extreme weather.
    - The Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months per year. The Board's current bylaws already stipulate 12 meetings, inclusive of its June annual meeting, to be held each calendar year.

[30] NYC DOE Annual Comprehensive Review Report, 2012-2013 School Year
[31] Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report
[32] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on March 31, 2014

As of the review in November 2014, the charter school is in compliance with:

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- **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.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2014-2015 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 1, 2014 and lottery date of April 8, 2014, adhering to charter law's requirement of accepting applications up to at least April 1. Over the course of the charter term, the school consistently adhered to this requirement.
- **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 determined to be compliant with federal law.

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 November 1, 2014, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act are still in a *proposed* status. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, however, these averages should not be assumed to be similar to the final enrollment targets to be released by NYSED.[33]
- In all years of operation, including the most recent completed school year 2013-2014, Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School:
    - served a lower percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to the CSD 12 rate, but a higher percentage than the citywide rate, with the exception of 2012-2013, in which the school served a lower percentage than the citywide rate;
    - served a lower percentage of students with disabilities compared to both the CSD 12 and citywide percentages; and
    - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to both the CSD 12 and citywide percentages.

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

Enrollment of Special Populations[34]

Special Population		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Proposed)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	**Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School**	**88.7%**	**90.4%**	**81.6%**	**92.1%**	**93.0%**
	CSD 12	94.8%	94.9%	94.9%	94.3%	
	NYC	81.6%	83.8%	82.7%	81.2%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	**Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School**	**17.5%**	**16.1%**	**14.4%**	**12.0%**	**19.3%**
	CSD 12	22.5%	24.0%	23.9%	25.0%	
	NYC	19.7%	19.5%	19.9%	20.9%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	**Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School**	**9.3%**	**7.3%**	**7.6%**	**11.0%**	**22.0%**
	CSD 12	18.4%	17.2%	18.1%	20.0%	
	NYC	13.2%	12.1%	11.8%	12.3%	

Additional Enrollment Information				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Grades Served	6	6-7	6-8	6-9
CSD(s)	12	12	12	12

[34] 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.

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

The school has submitted a request to make the following material revisions to its charter as part of its next charter term:

- Continue phase-in of maximum authorized enrollment from 500 to 721 students;
- Continue phase-in of high school with expansion of grades served from six through ten to six through twelve (though the authorized grade span remains six through twelve); and
- Expand the leadership team to include the following positions overseen by the Head of School: a High School Director of Teaching & Learning, a Middle School Director of Teaching & Learning, a Director of Special Education and ELL Services, and a Director of Assessment.

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 (OSDCP) 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.[35]

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.[36] 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;

[35] See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.
[36] 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.[37]

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.[38]

[37] § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.
[38] 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[39]

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

[39] 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[40] *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

[40] School-specific targets for enrollment and retention are to come from 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

Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School				
Grade 6	20.4%	22.8%	4.7%	6.6%
Grade 7	-	22.2%	8.1%	9.9%
Grade 8	-	-	9.8%	16.4%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 12 *				
Grade 6	-6.6	-6.3	-3.4	-1.4
Grade 7	-	-4.4	-0.4	-0.5
Grade 8	-	-	-0.2	4.7
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 6	-23.2	-22.5	-18.6	-18.6
Grade 7	-	-21.1	-17.3	-16.9
Grade 8	-	-	-15.7	-12.4

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School				
Grade 6	57.0%	28.7%	9.4%	13.3%
Grade 7	-	31.3%	3.6%	12.3%
Grade 8	-	-	4.9%	16.2%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 12 *				
Grade 6	16.2	-13.7	-1.3	0.4
Grade 7	-	-11.9	-4.7	-0.1
Grade 8	-	-	-7.5	3.0
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 6	1.0	-30.6	-19.4	-20.5
Grade 7	-	-26.0	-21.4	-17.3
Grade 8	-	-	-20.8	-6.5

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

Regents Pass Rates

Dr. Richard Izquierdo Health and Science Charter School	
	2013-2014
Integrated Algebra	83.1%
Algebra 2 / Trigonometry	-
Comprehensive English	-
U.S. History	-
Chemistry	-
Physics	-
Living Environment	93.8%
Language Other Than English	-

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

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