Department of Education

Dennis M. Walcott, Chancellor

SUMMIT ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT

2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
NOVEMBER 2013

Table of Contents

Summary of Renewal Recommendation 2

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

School Overview and History 7

Renewal Process Overview 8

Findings 10

- Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success 10
- Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization 16
- Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? 19
- Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term? 20

Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview 21

Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework 22

Appendix A: School Performance Data 31

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data 33

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Name of Charter School	Summit Academy Charter School
Current Board Chair(s)	Gene Moore
School Leader	Natasha Campbell, Executive Director Thomas Gordon, Principal
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 15
Physical Address	27 Huntington Street, Brooklyn, NY 11231
Facility	Public
School Opened For Instruction	2009-2010 School Year
Current Charter Term Expiry Date	12/15/2013
Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at Expiry Date	6-10 / 444 (currently serving 291)
Proposed Charter Term	3 years
Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Authorized Enrollment at New Expiry Date	6-12/ 391

II. Overview of School-Specific Data:

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	C	B	B
Student Progress	-	C	C	A
Student Performance	-	C	B	B
School Environment	-	A	C	D
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	1.0	4.1	3.3

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**17.8%**	**17.6%**	**20.0%**	**14.1%**
CSD 15	45.8%	50.3%	51.1%	35.6%
Difference from CSD 15	-28.0	-32.7	-31.1	-21.5
NYC	40.1%	40.0%	42.5%	24.8%
Difference from NYC	-22.3	-22.4	-22.5	-10.7
New York State	54.2%	51.8%	52.8%	31.6%
Difference from New York State	-36.2	-32.8	-33.8	-17.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**38.6%**	**46.1%**	**60.4%**	**18.8%**
CSD 15	59.8%	64.8%	65.2%	33.4%
Difference from CSD 15	-21.2	-18.7	-4.8	-14.6
NYC	53.0%	55.8%	57.3%	26.5%
Difference from NYC	-14.4	-9.7	3.1	-7.7
New York State	54.2%	51.8%	52.8%	31.6%
Difference from New York State	-36.2	-32.8	-33.8	-17.6

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

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**-**	**2012-2013**
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	12.2%
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	0.0%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-		-
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**-**	**-**
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	-

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 or city.

Academic Goal Analysis (based on School's submission)					
	1st Year 2009-2010	2nd Year 2010-2011	3rd year 2011-2012	4th Year 2012-2013	Cumulative 4 Year Total
Total Achievable Academic Goals	**5**	**10**	**10**	**4**	**24**
# Met	0	1	0	1	**2**
# Partially Met	0	0	0	0	**0**
# Not Met	5	9	10	3	**22**
% Met	**0%**	**10%**	**0%**	**25%**	**8%**
% Partially Met	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**	**0%**
% Not Met	**100%**	**90%**	**100%**	**75%**	**92%**

III. Rationale for Recommendation

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Summit Academy Charter School (Summit Academy) has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include, "(a) Improve student learning and achievement;" and "(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure." NYS English Language Arts (ELA) and math assessment data shows that Summit Academy has made little progress toward these objectives.

Summit Academy's mission is to bridge the gap between aspirations and realities by preparing students in grades six through twelve to gain acceptance to, excel in and graduate from college. Summit Academy established the following three pillars of success: mastery of core subjects, character building, and community leadership.

The school entered its fifth year of operation at the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. Therefore, the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at Summit Academy. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and are based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores are based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to all schools citywide.

On its first three NYC DOE Middle School Progress Reports, for its overall grade, Summit Academy earned a C, a B, and a B, in 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, respectively. (Schools receive an ungraded progress report in their first year serving students. Summit Academy received its first ungraded High School Progress Report for the 2012-2013 school year but will not receive a graded one until it has its first graduation class.) On the progress section, since 2010-2011, the school has improved, earning a C, a C, and then an A in each subsequent progress report. Summit similarly improved its student performance grade from a C in 2010-2011 to a B in both 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

The data shows some gains in the levels of proficiency in both ELA and math, closing the difference in proficiency between the school and Community School District (CSD) 15. In ELA, Summit Academy increased its proficiency between the years of 2010-11 to 2011-2012; in math, the school made gains in its proficiency rates from 2009-10 to 2011-12.

In terms of student progress, Summit Academy has demonstrated gains in the 2012-2013 school year, despite previous years of mediocre growth in ELA and steady grown in math, as indicated by the Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report. The school improved its Student Progress grade on the 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report from a C to an A. The main growth metrics in the Student Progress section are Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles[1]. Summit increased its ELA Median Adjusted Growth Percentile by 21 points from 2011-2012 to 2012-2013. Based on Summit Academy's ELA Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles, the school ranked in the

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

top 17% of all middle schools citywide in 2012-2013, whereas it was in the bottom 5% of all middle schools in 2011-2012. Similarly, Summit Academy's Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles increased slightly and placed the school in the top 6% of all middle schools citywide in 2012-2013 and in the top 11% of middle schools citywide in 2011-2012.

As it pertains to applicable charter goals, Summit Academy met only 8% of its academic charter goals over the course of the four years that data is available for the charter term. Summit Academy did show improvement in the most recent year though, and met 25% of its goals.[2] For all of the years of its charter period, the school did not meet its goal of having students reach the 75th percentile on its internal assessments in reading and math.[3] The school's charter goals include being deemed in good standing with state and federal accountability, which the school did not meet in 2011-2012 or in 2012-2013.

Further, the school has partially developed a responsive education program and supportive learning environment. In comparison to previous site visits, the 2012 annual visit revealed that the school had made some efforts in creating a responsive education program that included professional development of teachers and the use of data to improve instruction; however, the school is still not adequately meeting the needs of the most at-risk learners. [4]

This was evidenced by the following:

- Review of Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) files, correspondence with the school, and interviews confirmed that current copies of IEP documents for 12 students were unavailable on the day of the visit.
- The school reported that it has a list of names and mandated services for these students, but not the original IEPs.
- For students, in the 2013-2014 school year, whose IEPs indicate self-contained classes, which Summit Academy does not provide, due process letters, indicating that the students' parents have been informed and are in agreement with the programs and services being provided, were not available at the time of the visit.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Summit Academy is a fiscally sound and viable organization.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has partially developed its governance structure and organizational design. The Board currently has nine members, which is more than the minimum number of seven members outlined in the school's bylaws. The Board holds management accountable for performance as agreed under their evaluation plan, and requires monthly financial reports given by the Board's Finance Committee.

While the school's founder, Natasha Campbell, is still serving as Executive Director for the school, and as an ex-officio Board member, the school leadership has experienced significant turnover in the last two years. The founding principal, Shahara Jackson, left mid-year in the fourth year of the school's operation. For the remainder of that school-year, the school was led by two interim-acting co-principals. The school recently hired a new principal, Thomas Gordon, who was brought on in July 2013.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has partially developed a stable school culture. For the 2012 and 2013 school years, the school has received a C and a D, respectively, in the Learning Environment section of the NYC DOE Progress Report. The school received mixed

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

[3] Summit Academy uses the Stanford 10 assessment to monitor student growth annually and has two charter goals related to this measure.

[4] Summit Academy Charter School Annual Site Visit Report 2011-2012, March 2012

results on the NYC School Survey over the charter term, with Average ratings across three out of four categories for the last two years. However, parent response rates for the NYC School Survey have fallen below the citywide average. In 2012-2013, the greatest percent of parents to date, 38%, responded to the survey. This falls below the citywide response rate of 54%.

As it pertains to related charter goals, Summit Academy did not meet its attendance goal of having an average daily attendance rate of at least 95% for three of the last four years (2009-2010: 94%; 2010-2011: 95%; 2011-2012: 92%; and 2012-2013: 94%). The school also failed to meet its enrollment goal, as defined in the school's charter agreement, for the last three years.

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

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, the Board of Trustees for the school has been compliant with some applicable laws, regulations, and provisions of the charter contract but not others.

Over the course of the charter term, Summit Academy has been compliant with applicable laws and regulations, with the exception of special education guidelines and mandates, and its annual enrollment per its charter agreement.

Based on the most recent visit, the school is out of compliance with students' IEPs. Since IEPs have not been reviewed, formalized progress reports regarding goals have not been done and shared with parents. In addition, the school does not have in place a formalized Response to Intervention (RTI) approach to provide a pre-referral process or intervention for students with disabilities.

The school has also been out of compliance with its stated charter enrollment for the last three school years.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

Summit Academy will continue to expand to its full grade span, growing from grades six through ten, to serve students in grades six through twelve.

For the aforementioned reasons, the NYC DOE recommends a short-term renewal, with a total authorized enrollment for grades 6-12 of 391 students, with the following conditions:

- **As indicated in the charter agreement between the NYC DOE and Summit Academy, the school must have at least 85% of its authorized enrollment by BEDS Day each year.**
- **As it pertains to meeting the needs of the most at-risk students, Summit must:**
    - **comply with IDEA and NYS guidelines and mandates in the first year of the new charter term;**
    - **develop a pre-referral/referral process that includes parent notification;**
    - **report on progress toward IEP goals for all students with IEPs in a timely manner, and develop a tracking system for Related Services of students with IEPs;**
    - **conduct timely annual reviews of all IEPs.**

Part 2: School Overview and History

Summit Academy Charter School is a middle and high school serving approximately 291 students[5] in sixth through tenth grade during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in the 2009-2010 school year, with sixth grade and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's intended grade span is six through twelve which it is expected to reach during its next charter term, pending renewal and approval. [6] The school is located in a NYC DOE facility in District 15, in Brooklyn and is co-located with Red Hook Neighborhood School.[7]

Summit Academy Charter School's mission is to bridge the gap between aspirations and realities by preparing 6th through 12th grade students to gain acceptance to, excel in and graduate from college by using three pillars of success: mastery of core subjects, character building, and community leadership.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades 6-10. There was no waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.[8]

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students[9]:

Special Populations

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL)	76.8%	78.9%	71.5%	73.5%
Students with Disabilities (SwD)	25.3%	24.6%	23.8%	16.8%
English Language Learners (ELL)	4.2%	2.9%	2.6%	2.6%

Summit Academy Board of Trustees is currently led by Eugene Moore. Eugene Moore, the Board's second Chair during the charter term, assumed this position in 2012. Mr. Moore was previously the Vice Chair of the Board, beginning in 2010. The school's founding Board Chair was Robert Brissett, who currently serves as the Board's Treasurer. The school's founder, Natasha Campbell, serves as the school's Executive Director and is an ex-officio member of the school's Board. The school's current principal is Thomas Gordon, who joined the school in July 2013. Mr. Gordon was appointed to replace the school's interim acting leaders: Andrew Hasty and Jessica Pasionek, who served as the school's Interim Acting Co-Principals from November 2012 through June 2013. Prior to this time, Shahara Jackson was the school's principal from the school's inception through November 2012.

[5] ATS data from 10/10/2013.
[6] NYC DOE internal data.
[7] NYC DOE Location Code Generating System database.
[8] Self-reported on Data Sheet Submitted with Renewal Application dated [date]
[9] Special population figures are pulled from ATS as of June 1st each year. These figures are compared against the total population which is pulled from ATS as of October 31st each year.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

Renewal Process

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

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

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

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

Renewal Report

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

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

Is the school an academic success?

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

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

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

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

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

Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the NACSA (National Association of Charter School Authorizers) Financial Framework[10].

The NYC DOE also 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,
- Audited authorized enrollment numbers, and
- Annual financial audits.

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

Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations?

As it pertains to compliance, CSAS identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Staff Representatives

The following NYC DOE representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on June 11, 2013 and September 24, 2013:

- Sonia Park, Executive Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Daree Lewis, Senior Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Maria Campo, Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Jorge Cruz, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Lynnette Aqueron, Senior School Improvement Specialist for Special Education, NYC DOE Division of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners,
- Jose Castro, National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) Fellow
- Simeon Stolzberg, Independent Consultant

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

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

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

Academic Attainment and Improvement

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

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	-	C	B	B
Student Progress	-	C	C	A
Student Performance	-	C	B	B
School Environment	-	A	C	D
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	-	1.0	4.1	3.3

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**17.8%**	**17.6%**	**20.0%**	**14.1%**
CSD 15	45.8%	50.3%	51.1%	35.6%
Difference from CSD 15	-28	-32.7	-31.1	-21.5
NYC	40.1%	40.0%	42.5%	24.8%
Difference from NYC	-22.3	-22.4	-22.5	-10.7
New York State	54.2%	51.8%	52.8%	31.6%
Difference from New York State	-36.2	-32.8	-33.8	-17.6

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**38.6%**	**46.1%**	**60.4%**	**18.8%**
CSD 15	59.8%	64.8%	65.2%	33.4%
Difference from CSD 15	-21.2	-18.7	-4.8	-14.6
NYC	53.0%	55.8%	57.3%	26.5%
Difference from NYC	-14.4	-9.7	3.1	-7.7
New York State	54.2%	51.8%	52.8%	31.6%
Difference from New York State	-36.2	-32.8	-33.8	-17.6

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

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**-**	**TBD**
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	TBD
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	TBD
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**-**	**TBD**
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	TBD
City Percent of Range	-	-		TBD
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	**2010-2011**	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**-**	**TBD**
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	TBD
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	TBD

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 or city.

Mission and Academic Goals

Over its charter term, the school achieved: 0 of 5 applicable academic charter goals in the first year of the charter, 1 of 10 in the second year, 0 of 10 in the third year, 1 of 4 in the fourth year. [11]

- It is worth noting that the school's charter goals include, "being deemed in good standing with state and federal accountability", which the school did not meet in three of the four years of the charter term.

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

	Met in 2009-10?	Met in 2010-11?	Met in 2011-12?	Met in 2012-13?
1) Each year, Summit Academy will administer a nationally norm-referenced test of basic skills, such as the Terra Nova or Stanford 10, in September of their first year of enrollment and at the conclusion of each school year. Students will demonstrate longitudinal growth in the core subjects of Reading and Math and results for cohorts will be tracked over multiple years. On average, cohorts will average 5 percentiles of growth each year until the cohort reaches the 75th percentile.	No	No	No	N/A
2) Each year, 75 percent of 7th – 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State	N/A	No	No	N/A

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

ELA examination.				
3) For the 2010-11 through 2014-15 school years, grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam.	N/A	No	No	N/A
4) Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of its Community School District.	No	No	No	No
5) Each cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between percent passing the ELA Regents examination and the previous cohorts' passing rate on the ELA Regents examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6) Each year, the percent of students performing at or above a score of 65 on the State English Regents exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of its Community School District.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
7) Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing an English Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
8) Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State ELA exam will meet its Adequate Yearly Progress.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9) Each year, Summit Academy will administer a nationally norm-referenced test of basic skills, such as the Terra Nova or Stanford 10, in September of their first year of enrollment and at the conclusion of each school year. Students will demonstrate longitudinal growth in the core subjects of Reading and Math and results for cohorts will be tracked over multiple years. On average, cohorts will average 5 percentiles of growth each year until the cohort reaches the 75th percentile.	No	No	No	N/A
10) Each year, 75 percent of 7th – 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Mathematics examination.	N/A	No	No	N/A
11) Each year, 75 percent of 9th – 10th grade cohorts will pass the New York State Regents examinations in Math.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12) For Years 2 through 5, grade-level cohorts of the same students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Math exam (baseline) and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Math exam. If the percentage of students scoring above proficiency in a grade-level cohort exceeded 75 percent on the previous year's Math exam, the school is expected to demonstrate growth (above 75 percent) in the current year.	N/A	No	No	N/A
13) Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of its Community School District.	No	No	No	No

14) For the 2010-11 through 2014-15 school years, each cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between percent passing the Math Regents examination and the previous cohorts' passing rate on the Math Regents examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15) Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing an Math Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
16) Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State Math exam will meet its Adequate Yearly Progress set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
17) Each year, 75 percent of 9th – 10th grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18) Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing an Science Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
19) Each year, the school's aggregate Performance Index on the State Science exam will meet its Adequate Yearly Progress set forth in the State's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability system.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
20) Each year, 75 percent of 9th – 10th grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
21) Each year, 75 percent of 9th – 10th grade cohorts will pass the New York State Regents examinations in Social Studies.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
22) Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing an Social Studies Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
23) Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing an Language other than English Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
24) From years 2-4, the school will receive a "B" or higher on the Student Progress section of the NYCDOE Progress report.	N/A	No	No	Yes
25) Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing."	No	Yes	No	No

Responsive Education Program

The school administers the Stanford-10 assessment, which is a nationally normed, standardized achievement test, in both ELA and math. The test has been administered twice a year, in the Fall and Spring, since the 2009-2010 school year. One of the school's charter goals is that students will demonstrate longitudinal growth for cohorts tracked over multiple years through the Standford-10 assessments. The goal states that the cohorts will average five percentiles of growth each year until the

cohort reaches the 75th percentile. This charter goal has yet to be met. The school self-reported the following data:

- The cohort that started the school in 2009, as of Fall 2011, had only grown in reading from 34.1 in 6th grade to 37.8 in 8th grade. In math, the same cohort for the same time period had declined from 40.7 in 6th grade to 34.1 in 8th grade.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited the school on June 11, 2013 and September 24, 2013. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
    - The school utilizes content coaches to support teachers in their content-area instruction, as well as ongoing support in Common Core Learning Standards alignment in their lesson plans. The coaches may also co-teach to support struggling teachers.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:
    - School leadership on the June 11th visit reported that professional development had been differentiated to better support teachers at various levels of experience, with an emphasis on data-driven instruction. However, on the September 24th visit, the new instructional school leadership reported a shift to focus on community building, classroom management, and content.
    - The 2012-2013 school year was the first year the school had planned the content of the professional development sessions throughout the year, according to school leadership.
    - The two-week summer training held before the start of the 2013-2014 school year started with a retreat for team building. The remainder of the training focused on the Common Core Learning Standards, and how the teachers would implement the Standards in their content areas. The training also included some discussion around curriculum and lesson planning.
    - School leadership reported a switch to using the Danielson Group's Framework for Teaching for the 2013-2014 teacher evaluations, which would be conducted by the new principal. In the previous school year, the school leaders reported using the Kim Marshall rubric for formal teacher observations.
    - The school also uses TeachBoost, an online system, to record specific observations documenting teachers' strengths and weaknesses. The school leaders reported using the data to determine trends across the faculty, which would inform professional development needs.
    - Over the two days of the visits, 26 classrooms, grades six through ten, were observed with the members of the school's instructional leadership.
    - In all observed classes, teachers were delivering direct instruction, with a few examples of classroom discussion and independent practice.
    - Class-sizes ranged from 8 to 25 students in size, typically with one teacher in all classrooms.
    - In the 2013-2014 school year, the school added one ICT classroom per grade in grades six through eight. ICT classrooms observed showed the special education teacher pulling students out of the room to provide instruction.
    - Forms of questioning during the twenty-six classroom observations included basic fact recall, though in some instances students were challenged to demonstrate understanding.
    - In most rooms, checks for understanding included questioning, polling, class work, and teacher observation.
    - Although school leadership reported that lesson planning included differentiation, during observations there was little evidence of differentiation of materials, tasks, and products during small group instruction or independent practice. The only classes observed with differentiation were reading classes, where students were reading books based on their reading level.
    - 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.

    - Based on debriefs with the school's instructional leaders after classroom visits, all classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners:
    - The school has five learning strategists that focus on specific middle school or high school grades to provide support to students with disabilities. The school also has a teacher dedicated to work with the English Language Learner (ELL) population. School leadership reported difficulty in recruiting teachers with the necessary special education certification. As of the September 24th visit, a Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETTS) teacher had been hired, but had not yet started at the school.
    - On the September 24th visit, school leadership reported that their short-term priority for the 2013-2014 school year is to better understand where individual students are in terms of their academic progress.
    - School leaders planned the assessment calendar to include Fountas and Pinnell, Stanford-10, Achievement Network (ANet) and Reading Plus assessments, and will use the data to inform the academic support program. Based on the data, individualized plans for each student who needs an academic intervention will be created. They also plan to support teachers in how to interpret and use the data.
- Interim Assessment System:
    - School leaders reported that they are also using ANet data to provide additional enrichment to students during lunch periods and to assign students to Saturday Academy for targeted interventions.
    - The school started using the Jupiter data system to capture data daily. Parents and students are given online access, allowing students to track their own mastery.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with fourteen teachers and four learning strategists.

- All interviewed teachers reported that professional development changed along with the changes in school leadership. For the 2013-2014 school year, the interviewed teachers reported an intensive summer training that focused first on community building and school culture, and then on understanding the Common Core standards. Some of the interviewed teachers in the September 24th visit reported that professional development, since the start of the 2013-2014 school year, has been focused on the Common Core and how to analyze and use data.
- The school's formal teacher evaluation has changed along with the changes in the school leadership.
    - In the 2012-2013 school year, some teachers interviewed reported the use of the Teacher Evaluation Rubric by Kim Marshall for formal teacher evaluations conducted by the school's Interim Co-Principals, while most of the interviewed teachers discussed the use of informal observations for receiving feedback from the teacher coaches.
    - In the 2013-2014 school year, some teachers interviewed reported the change to the use of the Danielson framework for formal teacher evaluations, to be conducted by the new principal. However, at the September 24th visit, no teachers reported having a formal evaluation to date. The interviewed teachers reported that they had been introduced to the Danielson framework during the summer training. Some of the interviewed teachers reported that they had some informal observations done by the teacher coaches, and the use of TeachBoost to receive feedback from the coaches.
- All interviewed teachers reported that learning strategists provide support to students with disabilities. The learning strategists reported that they provide push-in and pull-out interventions.
- Some teachers interviewed reported the use of office hours and Saturday Academy as targeted interventions for students.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has partially developed its governance structure and organizational design. On October 10, 2013, as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE held an interview with the school's Board of Trustees. Based on document review and the interview, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has nine active members. Board turnover has remained low over the course of the charter term, with one member leaving the Board in 2010-2011 and one leaving in 2012-2013. The Board has only kept its membership within the minimum of seven members and maximum of thirteen members, as established in the Board's bylaws, since 2011-2012. In 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, the Board size was five and six members, respectively.
- The Board has not consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The Executive Director updates the Board on academic progress and operations at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes. The Board utilizes an executive dashboard, which includes data on attendance, student and teacher attrition, and interim assessments.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organization chart and school leadership's monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.
- The Board has held the Executive Director accountable through the use of a scorecard that was developed through The High Bar tools and incorporated school-specific data points. The evaluation scorecard has evolved over the course of the charter term, and the Board continues to refine it on an annual basis.
- The Board has active and functioning committees, as required by its bylaws and as recorded in meeting minutes, including a Governance Committee, Finance Committee, Education Committee, and Facilities Committee.
- The school's founder, Natasha Campbell, is still the Executive Director of the school, as well as an ex-officio member of the school's Board. The school's founding principal, Shahara Jackson, left the school in November 2012. Andrew Hasty and Jessica Pasionek replaced Ms. Jackson, as the school's Interim Acting Co-Principals for the remainder of the 2012-2013 school year. Neither returned to the school for the 2013-2014 school year. The school's current principal is Thomas Gordon, who joined the school in July 2013.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- To date, the school has not met its charter goal of having a daily average student attendance rate of at least 95% for every year. It has only met this goal in the 2010-2011 school year.

Average Daily Attendance[12]	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
	94%	95%	92%	94%

- Staff turnover has been at or below 20% over the course of the charter term. In 2009-2010 and 2012-2013, there was no instructional staff turnover. In 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, instructional staff turnover was 8% and 20%, respectively.
- The school has not met its enrollment goal.
- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey results and response rates were:

[12] Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 1/2013

Summit Academy Charter School NYC School Survey Results

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

Summit Academy Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

	Parents	Citywide	**Teachers**	Citywide	**Students**	Citywide
2009-10	**24%**	49%	**60%**	76%	**82%**	82%
2010-11	**48%**	52%	**61%**	82%	**86%**	83%
2011-12	**27%**	53%	**77%**	82%	**52%**	82%
2012-13	**38%**	54%	**83%**	83%	**79%**	83%

- Over the course of its charter term, the school has not met its charter goal around parent satisfaction, as indicated in the NYC School Survey. The goal requires that it will only be met if 50% or more parents participate in the survey. As noted in the table above, the school did not achieve a parent response rate of 50% for any year of the charter term.

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

- The school created a Family Achievement Council (FAC), which holds meetings on weekends in order to increase parent attendance.
- To gauge parent satisfaction and gather feedback, the school has administered internal parent surveys. Based on the survey responses, the school identifies issues and concerns that it can address. One specific example cited was when the school amended its snack policy based on parent feedback.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Thirty-three participants attended the hearing, four speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 90% provided positive feedback regarding the school and 10% were neutral.

For grades six through ten, groups of ten students were interviewed in each grade. Based on student interviews conducted on the September 24th visit to the school, the following was noted:

- Across the grade levels, students found the rigor of their class work to be mixed, with some classes being more difficult than others. All students noted that they felt they could meet with their teachers if they needed any help.
- Across the grades, students reported that they feel safe, and that the behavior system was generally for their benefit, despite there being a lot of rules.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated an ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's unrestricted cash availability indicated a risk that the school would be unable to cover one month of its operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-2014 budget to the actual enrollment as of September of 2013 revealed that the school was 11% below its enrollment target, indicating a deviation from its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

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

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus over the three audited fiscal years, though the school operated at a deficit in FY13.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY13, the school had an overall negative cash flow from FY11 to FY13, and the school had a negative cash flow from FY12 to FY13. However, despite this the school maintains its surplus.

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

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

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

The Board is in compliance with:

- Membership size: Since the 2011-2012 school year, the Board has had a membership size that falls within the range of seven to thirteen members, outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws: However, in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, the Board membership size was five and six members, respectively, below the range of seven to thirteen members as outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws.
- Submission of minutes and agendas: The Board has made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings.

The Board is out of compliance with:

- Required number of monthly meetings: The school's bylaws indicate that the Board holds at least 10 meetings a year. Although the Board has held the minimum number of Board meetings each year of the charter term, with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, the Board did not have quorum at all of the meetings. Seven out of the eleven, seven out of ten, eight out of ten, and seven out of eight Board meetings had quorum, in 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013, respectively.
- Submission of all required documents: It is unclear if all current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms and do not demonstrate conflicts of interest. [13]
- Timely submission of documents: The Board has not provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the DOE.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of all required documents: The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Fingerprint clearance: As of the 2013-2014 school year, all staff has the required fingerprint clearance.
- Certification of staff: Staff is either certified or highly qualified, and those that are not, fall under the requirements outlined in the NYS Charter Schools Act. A school can have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower.
- Insurance requirements: The school has all appropriate insurance documents.

The school is out of compliance with:

- Special Education mandates: The school is not currently compliant with students' IEPs. As of the visit conducted on September 24th, out of 39 students with IEPs, 35 are out of compliance, with annual reviews more than a year past due.
    - The Special Education Associate and Special Education Coordinator have created a calendar to work with the Committee on Special Education to prioritize IEPs that are out of compliance.
    - As the IEPs have not been reviewed, the formalized progress reports regarding goals have not been done and shared with parents.
    - The school does not have a formalized Response to Intervention approach in place to provide a pre-referral process or intervention for students with disabilities.
- Charter enrollment: The school has been below its stated charter enrollment for the last three school years.

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

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

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

- The school will continue to its full grade span, growing from serving grades six through ten, to serving grades six through twelve. The school will continue to add one grade per year, until it reaches the full grade span in the 2015-2016 school year.
- The school's primary focus for the next charter term is increasing student academic achievement, through increased support for ELA and math teachers, improved data collection and analysis in ELA and math, and an emphasized use of differentiation in reading and writing.
- In response to the 2010 amendments to NYS Charter Schools Act requiring schools to attract and retain percentages of students who are designated as free and reduced lunch learners, students with disabilities, and English-language learners, the school is making demonstrated efforts to attract and retain these students.
    - The school has established outreach measures, such as creating translations of school materials into multiple languages, making available translators at school events, and advertising the school through various media outlets, in order to increase recruitment of specialized populations.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Statutory Basis for Renewal

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

- Improve student learning and achievement;
- Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system;
- Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.[14]

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.[15]

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.[16] As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act's renewal standards:

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

Where the NYC DOE approves a renewal application, it is required under the Act to submit the application and a proposed charter to the Board of Regents for its review and approval.[17]

[14] See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.
[15] See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.
[16] See §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).
[17] See § 2852(5)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Non-Renewal

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

The CSAS Accountability Framework

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

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

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

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

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

1c. Responsive Education Program

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

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

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

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

1d. Learning Environment

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

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

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

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

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

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

2a. Governance Structure and Organizational Design

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

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

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

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

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

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

Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have:

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

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

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

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

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

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

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

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

4b. Organizational Sustainability

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

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

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

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

4c. School or Model Improvements

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

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

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

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

Appendix A: School Performance Data

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**17.8%**	**17.6%**	**20.0%**	**14.1%**
CSD 15	45.8%	50.3%	51.1%	35.6%
Difference from CSD 15	-28.0	-32.7	-31.1	-21.5
NYC	40.1%	40.0%	42.5%	24.8%
Difference from NYC	-22.3	-22.4	-22.5	-10.7

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**38.6%**	**46.1%**	**60.4%**	**18.8%**
CSD 15	59.8%	64.8%	65.2%	33.4%
Difference from CSD 15	-21.2	-18.7	-4.8	-14.6
NYC	53.0%	55.8%	57.3%	26.5%
Difference from NYC	-14.4	-9.7	3.1	-7.7

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

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**18.0%**	**18.9%**	**21.7%**	**7.3%**
CSD 15	45.8%	53.8%	53.1%	35.4%
Difference from CSD 15	-27.8	-34.9	-31.4	-28.1
NYC	40.1%	43.6%	45.3%	23.3%
Difference from NYC	-22.1	-24.7	-23.6	-16.0

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**39.1%**	**47.3%**	**55.7%**	**19.5%**
CSD 15	59.8%	64.8%	65.7%	38.0%
Difference from CSD 15	-20.7	-17.5	-10.0	-18.5
NYC	53.0%	56.0%	59.3%	28.8%
Difference from NYC	-13.9	-8.7	-3.6	-9.3

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

% of Seventh Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**16.5%**	**23.6%**	**16.7%**
CSD 15	48.3%	47.1%	53.3%	37.4%
Difference from CSD 15	-	-30.6	-29.7	-20.7
NYC	38.2%	36.5%	43.3%	25.5%
Difference from NYC	-	-20.0	-19.7	-8.8

% of Seventh Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**45.1%**	**51.4%**	**19.2%**
CSD 15	60.4%	64.8%	69.6%	31.8%
Difference from CSD 15	-	-19.7	-18.2	-12.6
NYC	52.6%	55.5%	57.3%	25.0%
Difference from NYC	-	-10.4	-5.9	-5.8

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

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**14.5%**	**15.3%**
CSD 15	46.2%	47.2%	47.2%	34.0%
Difference from CSD 15	-	-	-32.7	-18.7
NYC	37.5%	35.0%	39.0%	25.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-24.5	-10.1

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Summit Academy Charter School	**-**	**-**	**74.3%**	**18.1%**
CSD 15	47.9%	59.5%	60.6%	30.1%
Difference from CSD 15	-	-	13.7	-12.0
NYC	46.3%	52.5%	55.2%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	19.1	-7.6

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

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Progress Reports

2012 – 2013 Academic Year
2011 – 2012 Academic Year
2010 – 2011 Academic Year
2009 – 2010 Academic Year

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

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