



**Department of
Education**

Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

**HELLENIC CLASSICAL CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR
JANUARY 2015**

Table of Contents

PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION	2
I. CHARTER SCHOOL OVERVIEW:	2
<i>Background Information</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Overview of School-Specific Data</i>	<i>3</i>
II. RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE	6
PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY	12
PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW	14
PART 4: FINDINGS	16
<i>Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? ...</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?.....</i>	<i>31</i>
PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS	32
PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK.....	35
APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA	47
APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA	49

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Background Information

Hellenic Classical Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Charles Capetanakis
School Leader(s)	Christina Tettonis
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 15
Physical Address(es)	646 Fifth Avenue, Brooklyn
Facility Owner(s)	Private
School Opened For Instruction	2005-2006
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	2/8/2015
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-8
Current Authorized Enrollment	450
Proposed New Charter Term	4.5 years [February 9, 2015 – June 30, 2019]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-8
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	480
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	Grades K-8: 2 sections per grade

Overview of School-Specific Data

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

Academic Goal Analysis						
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	Cumulative Charter Term Total
Total Achievable Goals	22	22	22	22	22	110
# Met	5	14	15	10	11	55
# Partially Met	0	3	4	4	4	15
# Not Met	10	5	3	4	4	26
# Not Applicable *	7	0	0	4	3	14
% Met	23%	64%	68%	45%	50%	50%
% Partially Met	0%	14%	18%	18%	18%	14%
% Not Met	45%	23%	14%	18%	18%	24%
% Not Applicable *	32%	0%	0%	18%	14%	13%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	33%	64%	68%	56%	58%	57%

* 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					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School	55.6%	59.9%	65.8%	34.1%	40.7%
CSD 15	52.1%	54.9%	56.9%	38.6%	41.6%
Difference from CSD 15 *	3.5	5.0	8.9	-4.5	-0.9
NYC	42.4%	43.9%	46.9%	26.4%	28.4%
Difference from NYC *	13.2	16.0	18.9	7.7	12.3
New York State **	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	2.4	7.1	10.7	3.0	10.1

% Proficient in Mathematics

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School	60.9%	77.5%	85.5%	44.0%	58.0%
CSD 15	61.4%	66.4%	70.4%	40.1%	46.4%
Difference from CSD 15 *	-0.5	11.1	15.1	3.9	11.6
NYC	54.0%	57.3%	60.0%	29.6%	34.2%
Difference from NYC *	6.9	20.2	25.5	14.4	23.8
New York State **	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-0.1	14.2	20.7	12.9	21.8

* 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					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School – All Students	66.0%	53.0%	69.0%	60.0%	63.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	20.3%	0.0%	65.2%	50.3%	61.8%
City Percent of Range- All Students	40.3%	0.0%	70.1%	35.8%	47.8%
Hellenic Classical Charter School – School's Lowest Third	64.0%	60.0%	72.0%	65.5%	71.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.7%	0.0%	52.0%	37.8%	61.9%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	9.9%	0.0%	54.7%	14.6%	36.4%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School – All Students	53.0%	68.0%	72.0%	56.0%	71.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	0.0% ¹	50.5%	72.3%	31.8%	77.9%
City Percent of Range- All Students	19.4%	54.7%	78.9%	25.3%	76.5%
Hellenic Classical Charter School – School's Lowest Third	57.5%	70.5%	71.5%	61.0%	77.5%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	5.7%	53.7%	58.4%	21.1%	82.7%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	18.7%	54.2%	64.9%	2.2%	67.8%

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

¹ In the 2009-2010 NYC DOE Progress Report for Hellenic Classical Charter School, the Peer Percent of Range for math median adjusted growth percentile was reported as -7.2%. This figure has been changed to 0.0% in this table for consistency, because the percent of range methodology was changed in 2010-2011 so that the lowest possible percent of range for a school was 0.0%.

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	45.5%	71.4%	42.1%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	44.4%	36.4%	35.3%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	31.3%	38.7%	44.8%	56.5%	59.0%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	45.5%	42.9%	47.4%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	55.6%	30.8%	47.1%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	25.5%	52.3%	50.0%	45.5%	73.8%

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

II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 4.5 year full-term renewal with a financial condition.

The financial condition is as follows:

1. As per the school's current and proposed charter agreement, in each year of the charter term, the school must maintain an escrow account with at minimum \$70,000. In the next charter term, the school must provide the NYC DOE with quarterly statements (within 30 days of January 1, April 1, July 1, and October 1) for the escrow account for the entirety of the charter term.

As part of the renewal application, Hellenic Classical Charter School submitted one material revision. The NYC DOE determination is as follows: regarding the material revision to increase the authorized maximum enrollment to 480 students during the next charter term, the NYC DOE approves this material revision.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Hellenic Classical Charter School (Hellenic) has 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 Hellenic indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting most of these objectives.

Mission and Vision

Hellenic Classical Charter School's mission is to provide students in grades kindergarten through eight with a rigorous classical education that is rich in challenging content. The school will instruct all students using the Core Knowledge curriculum and will supplement all instruction with the classical study of the Greek and Latin languages, as well as history, art, and other cultural studies. The school will utilize didactic instruction, coaching, and Socratic questioning (Paideia). All students will leave the school prepared intellectually, socially, and emotionally to gain entry to and to succeed in the best high schools in New York City. The school executes against this mission by reinforcing the classical and Greek theme to students daily, aligning ongoing and job-embedded professional development for staff to the mission and core values, and ensuring both parents and students are informed about the high school admissions process.

School Specific Academic Performance

The school entered its tenth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has New York State (NYS) assessment data and other academic indicator(s) for every year of the retrospective charter term to evaluate the academic

achievement and progress of the students at Hellenic.

Annual aggregate English Language Arts (ELA) and math proficiency rates for Hellenic have generally met or exceeded those of CSD 15, New York City, and New York State during the current charter term,² though individual grade-level proficiency at Hellenic has not consistently exceeded the CSD 15 proficiency rate across all five years of the retrospective charter term in either ELA or math. However, only 33% of Hellenic's students in the 2013-2014 school year resided in CSD 15; no CSD represented a majority of Hellenic students in 2013-2014. Including those students from CSD 15, the school served students from 18 NYC CSDs in 2013-2014, with 18% of students from Brooklyn CSD 20, 15% from Brooklyn CSD 17, and 9% from Brooklyn CSD 22.³ All of these CSDs had aggregate third through eighth grade ELA proficiency rates lower than the aggregate proficiency rate for CSD 15. In addition, both the aggregate third through eighth grade math proficiency rates and the individual grade-level math proficiency rates for CSDs 17 and 22 were lower than those for CSD 15.

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 2012-2013 are not directly comparable.

In 2012-2013, 44.0% of Hellenic's students were proficient in math. Hellenic's math proficiency was greater than or equal to that of 77% of elementary/middle schools citywide. When compared to elementary/middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools), Hellenic outperformed 50% of similar schools. In 2012-2013, 34.1% of Hellenic's students demonstrated proficiency in NYS assessments in ELA. With this level of proficiency, Hellenic outperformed 73% of elementary/middle schools citywide and 50% of its peer schools. In 2012-2013, Hellenic was the only school designated as an elementary/middle school (i.e. a "K-8 school") in CSD 15; as such, school-level comparisons to the CSD for Hellenic are not applicable for the 2012-2013 school year.

The following year, in 2013-2014, the percent of students at Hellenic who were proficient in math rose to 58.0%. For 2013-2014, Hellenic's math proficiency was higher than 88% of elementary/middle schools citywide. When compared to its peer schools, Hellenic outperformed 77% of similar schools. In 2013-2014, the percent of students at Hellenic who demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA also rose, to 40.7%. With this level of proficiency, Hellenic outperformed 80% of elementary/middle schools citywide and 57% of its peer schools. In 2013-2014, Hellenic was one of only two schools designated as K-8 schools in CSD 15; as such, school-level comparisons to the CSD for Hellenic are not appropriate for the 2013-2014 school year.

Over the five years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, Hellenic has met 57% of its applicable academic charter goals.^{4,5} Hellenic met 11 of 19 applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year. Because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's academic performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math

² The overall proficiency rates for Hellenic Classical Charter School students exceeded the citywide rates in both ELA and math every year. The school's overall proficiency rates exceeded the New York State rates in ELA every year and in math across four of the five years; in one year, the difference from New York State was not statistically significant. Similarly, the school's overall proficiency rates exceeded those of CSD 15 in ELA in three of the five years under review and in math in four of the five years under review.

³ Residential data reflects student addresses in the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system as of October 31, 2013.

⁴ 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 12 students).

⁵ 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 or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

assessments for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, due to a change in state regulation the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two; further, due to the elimination of the accountability instrument, the DOE will not evaluate goals related to NYC DOE Progress Report grades beginning with the 2013-2014 school year. The school has demonstrated an inconsistent trend of achievement of its stated charter goals during the retrospective charter term, with initial increases in the percent of applicable goals met, then a drop and stabilization at a lower success rate.

In 2012-2013, Hellenic's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 60.0% with a City Percent of Range of 35.8%, placing the school in the 24th percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide.⁶ The school's peer percentile was 57%.

In 2012-2013, Hellenic's math median adjusted growth percentile of 56.0% with a City Percent of Range of only 25.3%, which placed it in the 15th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer percentile was only 20%. This means that 85% of other elementary/middle schools across the city and 80% of school's in Hellenic's peer group had math median adjusted growth percentiles greater than or equal to Hellenic's math median adjusted growth percentile.

The following year, in 2013-2014, Hellenic's median adjusted growth percentile increased in both ELA and math. In 2013-2014, Hellenic's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 63.0% with a City Percent of Range of 47.8%, placing the school in the 38th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer percentile also rose to 60%.

In 2013-2014, Hellenic's math median adjusted growth percentile was 71.0% with a City Percent of Range of 76.5%, placing the school in the top of all elementary/middle schools citywide at the 86th percentile.⁷ The school's peer percentile also rose to 93%.

Under the current school leadership, the school has shown strong instructional leadership with established curriculum and enrichment programming. In a visit to the school in May 2012, reviewers noted that the school "vertically aligned the cross-curriculum, providing flexibility for teachers to adapt to their classroom needs,"⁸ and in June 2011, that the "instructional leaders at the school are regularly present in the classroom and teachers reported an open door policy with respect to pedagogical support."⁹ The school has found a balance between developing the whole child, while also maintaining rigorous standards, along with engaging instruction. In May 2012, reviewers noted that the school "sets social emotional goals for the students, in addition to academic goals" and that observed teachers "effectively used questioning to help students arrive at their own conclusions and become independent learners."¹⁰

The school has also consistently exhibited a strong data-driven culture over the course of the charter term, refining the use of assessments each year and ensuring that they are aligned to the CCLS in order to best monitor student progress. During the May 2012 school visit, reviewers noted that "school leaders and teachers use data tools, e.g., the PICCS portal for data driven decision making and TERC data system to conduct analyses, identify students for intervention and topics and skills for re-teaching, and differentiate classroom instruction."¹¹

⁶ 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 35.8% indicates that the school's median adjusted growth percentile was below the citywide elementary/middle school average but less than one standard deviation below the average (that only 35.8% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of Hellenic), while a citywide percentile of 24% indicates that Hellenic's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 24% of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

⁷ A City Percent of Range of 76.5% indicates that the school's math median adjusted growth percentile was greater than one standard deviation above the average. A citywide percentile of 86% indicates that Hellenic's math median adjusted growth percentile was higher than 86% of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

⁸ Hellenic Classical Charter School Annual Visit Report 2011-2012

⁹ Hellenic Classical Charter School Annual Visit Report 2010-2011

¹⁰ Hellenic Classical Charter School Annual Visit Report 2011-2012

¹¹ Hellenic Classical Charter School Annual Visit Report 2011-2012

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, Hellenic received an overall grade of C with a grade of C for Student Progress, a grade of B for Student Performance, and an A grade in School Environment. This ranked Hellenic in the 32nd percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. For the 2011-2012 NYC DOE Progress Report, the school earned an overall grade of A and ranked in the 89th percentile of all elementary schools citywide. In school years 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 the school earned overall grades of C and B, respectively.

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,¹² 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 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, 73.8% of Hellenic'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 Hellenic in the 97th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, only 59.0% of Hellenic's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; however, this places Hellenic in the 78th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 47.4% of Hellenic'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 Hellenic in the 59th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, 42.1% of students with disabilities 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 Hellenic in the bottom 15th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 47.1% of Hellenic'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 Hellenic in the 73rd percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, 35.3% of English Language Learner students at Hellenic 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 Hellenic in the 34th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

¹² 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.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

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

- Hellenic Classical Charter School's Board of Trustee bylaws;
- Hellenic Classical Charter School's Board of Trustee meeting minutes;
- Hellenic Classical Charter School's self-reported staffing data;
- Hellenic Classical Charter School's financial disclosure forms;
- Hellenic Classical Charter School's FY11, FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- Hellenic Classical Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- Hellenic Classical Charter School's 2014-2015 student and family handbook; and
- Hellenic Classical Charter School's FY15 budget.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a partially developed governance structure, but a developed organizational design, with six of the seven current Board members having been with the school since 2005 and the remaining member having joined in 2010. This level of membership is consistent with the minimum of five and maximum of 11 members established in the Board's bylaws. There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organization chart and school leadership's monthly reports to the Board, as recorded in Board meeting minutes. The Board's bylaws require a standing Executive Committee (chaired by the Board Chair), a Finance Committee, an Education Committee, an Accountability Committee, and a Personnel Committee. According to the Board's roster, Education, Finance, and Facility committees are in place.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has developed a stable school culture. The three core members of the leadership team – the Principal, Assistant Principal, and Director of Operations – have each been at the school together for over seven years. Staff turnover has been low, ranging between a high of 15% in 2012-2013 to a low of 2% in 2013-2014 during the current charter term. All instructional staff who teach core subject areas are certified.

The school offers a comprehensive Greek program that includes the Greek language, culture, and history. Hellenic is in a partnership with the Greek government, which provides the Greek teaching staff, their professional development, and curriculum materials for Greek instruction.

Average daily attendance for students during the retrospective charter term (2009-2010 through 2013-2014) was 95.7%;¹³ the school met its attendance goal of 95% in all years of the current charter term. Across the charter term, the school has achieved favorable results on the NYC School Survey, with high rates of teacher, parent and student satisfaction in recent years.

Overall, the school is in a weak position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has at least \$21,521 of unrestricted cash on hand to meet current liabilities totaling \$2,613,957, of which \$1,519,345 is related to the construction costs for the school's recently renovated facilities. Cash on hand represents only one day of operating expenses. Overall, there are concerns about the financial sustainability of the school based on its current practices.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits from FY11 to FY13. However, there was one finding noted in the independent financial audit for FY14; the finding was associated with the school's failure to maintain an appropriate escrow account balance. In response, the school issued a corrective action plan on July 7, 2014.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

¹³ Reflects attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2009-2010 through 2013-2014

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

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 five and maximum of 11 members.

For the entirety of the current charter term, the school's bylaws indicated that the Board is to hold no fewer than 10 meetings per year. Six meetings were held in both year one (2009-2010) and year two (2010-2011), and quorum was achieved at all meetings in each year. Five meetings were held in year three (2011-2012), all of which achieved quorum. In both years four and five (2012-2013 and 2013-2014, respectively), the Board held only four meetings. Quorum was achieved at all meetings in each year. The current Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months, per year. The Board has updated its bylaws to comply with this law.

The Board consistently submitted the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term. Charter law requires a school to post to its website the annual audit for each year of the charter term; however, the school has only posted its annual audit for two years.

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

The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy that is in use for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be compliant with federal law.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

Although the school does not plan to serve any additional grades beyond its currently authorized grades of kindergarten through eight, it is requesting to increase its maximum authorized enrollment with the addition of 30 students across all grades. The school also plans to increase its percentage of students with disabilities and ELL students, and is revising its admissions policy to include a preference for ELL students.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Hellenic Classical Charter School is an elementary/middle school serving 476 students¹⁴ in kindergarten through eighth grade during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2005-2006 school year with kindergarten through fourth grade and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's authorized full grade span is for grades kindergarten through eight, which it reached in the 2009-2010 school year.¹⁵ The school currently offers a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in a privately operated facility in Community School District 15, in Brooklyn.

Hellenic's mission is "to provide students in grades kindergarten through eight with a rigorous classical education that is rich in challenging content. The school will instruct all students using the Core Knowledge curriculum and will supplement all instruction with the classical study of the Greek and Latin languages, as well as history, art, and other cultural studies. The school will utilize didactic instruction, coaching, and Socratic questioning (Paideia). All students will leave the school prepared intellectually, socially, and emotionally to gain entry to and to succeed in the best high schools in New York City." The school utilizes the workshop model and Paideia across content areas and in all grade levels. Along with the rigorous academic program, the school also ensures both students and parents are informed about the high school admissions process, beginning in the sixth grade. Further, for the Greek curriculum, the school partners with the Greek government to provide the Greek teachers implementing the program.

Hellenic's Board of Trustees is led by chair Charles Capetanakis, who has been on the Board since the school's inception. Six of the seven current Board members have been on the Board since the school's inception. The school is led by Principal Christina Tettonis, who has been at the school since July 2007. The school also has an Assistant Principal, Natasha Caban, who joined the school in 2008-2009, and a Director of Operations, Joy Petrakos, who has been with the school since it opened in 2005.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades kindergarten through eight. There were 402 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery. The school does backfill students from the waitlist during the school year across all grades.¹⁶

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.

Enrollment

Grade-Level Annual Enrollment *	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Kindergarten	51	52	52	50	58
Grade 1	52	51	53	53	55
Grade 2	53	52	52	55	55
Grade 3	49	51	50	52	56
Grade 4	49	50	51	47	57
Grade 5	26	46	48	52	48
Grade 6	26	26	48	50	52
Grade 7	25	22	25	48	43
Grade 8	27	23	21	25	47
Total Enrollment	358	373	400	432	471

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

¹⁴ ATS data as of October 31, 2014

¹⁵ NYC DOE internal data

¹⁶ Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	2	29
Grade 1	2	28
Grade 2	2	28
Grade 3	2	28
Grade 4	2	29
Grade 5	2	24
Grade 6	2	26
Grade 7	2	22
Grade 8	2	24
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	99	

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

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

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

As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with relevant laws and regulations as identified in the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework.

Staff Representatives

The following experts participated in the review of this school, including the renewal visit to the school on October 21 – 22, 2014:

- Maria Campo, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kaitlin Padgett, Director of Evaluation and Policy, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Ola Duru, 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
- Paul Yen, Data Analyst, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Anita Skop, Community Superintendent, District 15

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal, Hellenic Classical Charter School has demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has internal academic performance data and NYS assessment data for all years of the retrospective charter term. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments, 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					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School	55.6%	59.9%	65.8%	34.1%	40.7%
CSD 15	52.1%	54.9%	56.9%	38.6%	41.6%
Difference from CSD 15 *	3.5	5.0	8.9	-4.5	-0.9
NYC	42.4%	43.9%	46.9%	26.4%	28.4%
Difference from NYC *	13.2	16.0	18.9	7.7	12.3
New York State **	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	2.4	7.1	10.7	3.0	10.1

% Proficient in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School	60.9%	77.5%	85.5%	44.0%	58.0%
CSD 15	61.4%	66.4%	70.4%	40.1%	46.4%
Difference from CSD 15 *	-0.5	11.1	15.1	3.9	11.6
NYC	54.0%	57.3%	60.0%	29.6%	34.2%
Difference from NYC *	6.9	20.2	25.5	14.4	23.8
New York State **	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-0.1	14.2	20.7	12.9	21.8

* 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

Elementary/Middle School Progress Report Grades	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Overall Grade	C	B	A	C	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	F	C	B	C	
Student Performance	D	B	A	B	
School Environment	A	A	A	A	

Mission and Academic Goals

According to the Renewal Application submitted to the NYC DOE by Hellenic Classical Charter School, as well as annual reports submitted to the NYSED, over each year of the retrospective charter term, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- 5 of 15 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 14 of 22 in the second year,
- 15 of 22 in the third year,
- 10 of 18 in the fourth year,¹⁹ and
- 11 of 19 in the fifth year.

Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals*

Academic Goals	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1. 75% of third through eighth 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 NYS ELA exam.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A	Not Met
2. 75% of third through eighth 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 NYS Math exam.	Not Met	Met	Met	N/A	Not Met
3. 75% of fourth and eighth grade students must score a 3 or above on NYS Science Exam.	Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Met
4. 75% of all eighth grade students who have been in the school for at least four consecutive BEDS days will pass the NYS High School Greek Regents Exam.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Met
5. Grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS ELA exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS ELA Exam.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A	Not Met
Academic Goals	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014

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 2012-2013 school year. Goals that refer to comparative academic performance of the school (e.g. to the Community School District) were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

6.	Grade-level cohorts of students will reduce by one half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's NYS Math exam and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's NYS Math Exam.	Not Met	Met	Met	N/A	Not Met
7.	The percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math examination in each tested grade will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools as determined by the NYC DOE Progress Report.	Not Met	Not Met	Met	Not Met	N/A
8.	The percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA examination in each tested grade will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools as determined by the NYC DOE Progress Report.	Not Met	Not Met	Met	Not Met	N/A
9.	The school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Report Card.	Met	Met	Met	Met	N/A
10.	75% of all kindergarten students will be able to recognize all Greek letters in their print form, as measured by a Greek Letter Recognition and Writing Common Assessment.	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
11.	75% of all kindergarten students will be able to communicate verbally as measured by the Hellenic Greek Verbal Common Assessment.	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
12.	75% of all kindergarten students who were enrolled at the school on BEDS day will perform at a Level 1 on the rhyme recognition, rhyme generation, syllable clapping, initial consonants, and at a Level 2 on the final consonants, blending, segmenting, ABC recognition, writing, spelling, decoding, sight words, and emergent reading strands on the Spring administration of the ECLAS-2.	Met	Met	Partially Met	Met	Partially Met
13.	75% of all first grade students who were enrolled on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above a Level 4 on the spelling, decoding, vocabulary, sight words, reading accuracy and reading comprehension strands on the Spring administration of the ECLAS-2.	Met	Met	Partially Met	Met	Met
14.	75% of all first grade students who were enrolled on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will be able to write all the Greek alphabet in print, as measured by a Greek Letter Recognition and Writing Common Assessment.	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
15.	75% of all first grade students who were enrolled on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform proficiently in listening, as measured by the Hellenic Greek Listening Common Assessment.	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
16.	75% of all first grade students who were enrolled on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will be able to perform proficiently in reading, as measured by the Hellenic Greek Reading Common Assessment.	N/A	Met	Met	Not Met	Met
Academic Goals		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014

17.	75% of all first grade students who were enrolled on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will be able to communicate verbally as measured by the Hellenic Greek Verbal Common Assessment.	N/A	Met	Met	Met	Met
18.	75% of all second grade students who were enrolled on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above a Level 6 on the spelling, decoding, vocabulary, sight words, reading accuracy and reading comprehension strands on the Spring administration of the ECLAS-2.	Not Met	Met	Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
19.	75% of students in grades two through seven who were enrolled on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform proficiently in oral, reading, listening and writing skills, as measured by the Hellenic Greek Verbal, Reading, Listening and Writing Common Assessments.	N/A	Partially Met	Met	Met	Met
20.	Grade level cohorts of students in grade two and above will reduce by one-half the gap between their average NCE in the previous administration of the ITBS, a nationally-normed reading test, and NCE of 50 (grade level) in the current Spring. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.	Not Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
21.	Grade level cohorts of students in grade two and above will reduce by one-half the gap between their average NCE in the previous administration of the ITBS, a nationally-normed mathematics test, and NCE of 50 (grade level) in the current Spring. If a grade-level cohort exceeds an NCE of 50 in the previous year, the cohort is expected to show at least an increase in the current year.	Not Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	Partially Met
22.	Hellenic will have an average daily student attendance rate of at least 95%.	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met

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

Responsive Education Program

The school administered Fountas and Pinnell's Running Records (F&P), ECLAS-2 (which was replaced by Fox in a Box as the commercially available ECLAS-2 product), and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) for most of the charter term. The following was found:

- According to the results of the ITBS, the percent of Hellenic students at or above grade level, in both ELA and math, was inconsistent across the years 2010-2011 to 2013-2014, and the school had mixed results in meeting its grade level targets for students at or above grade level.
- According to the results of the ECLAS-2 (and later Fox in the Box, the commercially available ECLAS-2 product), Hellenic met a majority of its grade-specific goals related to this assessment over the course of its charter term.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on October 21 – 22, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**

- School leadership reported that they made adjustments to the curriculum to reflect the rigorous standards of the CCLS, beginning in the 2011-2012 school year. In ELA, the school aligned its literacy curriculum to the CCLS and enhanced instructional practices, such as increasing student reading stamina, reading across the content areas, and common planning time for grade level teams that is facilitated by the Literacy Coach. The school has also integrated the ELA modules from EngageNY into curriculum planning.
 - In math, the school began implementing Individual Learning Plans (ILPs) for students who were not meeting grade level requirements. The school adopted enVisionMATH Common Core, and is using the modules provided through EngageNY as a supplemental resource. In addition, the school expanded the use of Time to Know from being used only in grades four and five, to being used in grades four through seven and as a form of intervention for at-risk grade eight students. Amplify Learning is being implemented as a supplemental resource in the middle school grades.
 - School leadership reported that the teachers took part in a “norming” meeting, which consisted of studying and discussing assessment tools such as rubrics, learning progressions, and checklists. The purpose of the meeting was to align scoring performance assessment across grade levels and within adjoining grade levels, to establish standards in alignment with the CCLS.
- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**
 - The school supports at-risk learners through an intervention program called Reading Rescue, which is aligned with a Response to Intervention (RtI) model. The program focuses on the bottom quartile students in the first grade (and second grade, if needed) by providing intensive one-on-one instruction. Teaching assistants, as designated tutors, deliver the instruction. Since adopting Reading Rescue in 2009, the school has served 40 students in first and second grade who, on average, enter the program at least one grade level below reading benchmarks and move on from the program having gained at least five reading levels to meet grade level by the end of the school year. The school’s implementation of Reading Rescue was awarded by the New York State Education Department as a best practice; the school was selected to be a participant in the NYS Charter Dissemination grant.
 - The school provides a special education program that includes Resource Room and Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS), as well as related services such as Speech Therapy and Occupational Therapy. The school has on staff three special education teachers, including one who also serves as the Special Education Coordinator, and a Speech Therapist for grades kindergarten through eight.
 - The school has an intervention staff consisting of two Reading Specialists and one Math Academic Intervention Services Specialist. These specialists provide push-in and pull-out instruction in both one-to-one and small group settings in the elementary school grades. The school offers tutoring blocks for all content area teachers in the middle school grades.
 - The school has on staff one English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher for grades kindergarten through eight. Over the last three years of the charter term, the school has declassified 21% of its ELL students.
 - The school provides enrichment programming including opportunities to participate in higher level math classes in the middle school grades and take the NYS Integrated Algebra Regents exam at the end of eighth grade. The school started offering an eighth grade Regents-level Earth Science course in the 2012-2013 school year. The school also offers a Regents-level Greek course in eighth grade.
 - The school provides Kaplan Test Prep for the specialized high school admissions test for all interested students.
 - **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**
 - School leadership reported that the formal evaluation of and feedback to teachers is through the use of the Danielson Framework for Teaching and Learning. School leadership encourages teachers to utilize the process of self-reflection and goal setting, which is facilitated by the Principal. Teachers are expected to use the Danielson rubric to

- reflect on their classroom practices and to set pedagogical goals as one of several strategies to increase student achievement.
- The school has developed a calendar of regularly administered assessments, both formative and summative, and reporting requirements for teachers. The school's data driven culture was supported by customized technology provided through TERC Using Data and through the Partnership for Innovation in Compensation for Charter Schools (PICCS), which provides funding for training and professional development in the use of data analysis tools and resources, and best practices in the use of data. The school has been able to maintain the school-wide data culture after PICCS through its own resources. Teachers and instructional staff have access to tools and resources such as SunGard PerformancePLUS suite of instruction and curriculum management resources.
 - School leadership reported that the professional development provided for all staff is effective, flexible, and data driven. The school utilizes Data Teams and Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), as well as a peer review program and protocols (which are based on *The Power of Protocols* by Joseph McDonald). Other professional development opportunities include: a week-long training for all teachers, workshops on various topics ranging from teacher and principal evaluation to using data effectively, and ongoing training through staff meetings by school leadership.
 - During the renewal visit, the NYC DOE observed 28 classrooms across grades kindergarten through eight with the school's Principal, Assistant Principal, and the Literacy Coach.
 - In a majority of the observed classes, teachers were following a workshop model, mostly consisting of either one or two instructor(s). In a few of the observed classes, special education services were being provided either with a pull-out group, or with a push-in instructor.
 - Class-sizes observed ranged from 20 to 27 students in size, with one or two teacher(s) in all classrooms. When two teachers were in the classroom, they followed mostly a lead and monitor model.
 - The form of questioning most frequently observed during the classroom observations was challenging students to demonstrate understanding, such as through explain or restate, along with basic fact recall questions. In a few of the classrooms, questioning included challenges for students to analyze and apply.
 - In most classrooms, the checks for understanding that were observed included questioning, observing, polling, classwork, and exit tickets.
 - In approximately half of observed classrooms, there was evidence of differentiation, including differentiated tasks and materials. For example, during independent practice in a math class, students were given different worksheets that corresponded to the students' skill levels. In a few observed classes, the teacher utilized small group instruction while the remainder of the students worked independently.
 - In all observed classes, all students demonstrated awareness of classroom rules or procedures.
 - In all observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task.
 - 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 12 teachers, the Guidance Counselor, the Youth Development Counselor, and the Data Coordinator consultant. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported having multiple opportunities for receiving professional development. The professional development opportunities discussed by the interviewed teachers included the one-week summer training, Teachers College trainings provided to both elementary and middle school teachers off-site, differentiated workshops on the Paideia method, implementing reading and writing workshop for students with disabilities, and Teachers College staff coming on-site to provide coaching, and training for data analysis. A majority of the interviewed teachers who discussed professional development said they found it to be relevant and very useful.

- Most interviewed teachers mentioned the use of the Danielson Framework for formal teacher observations, along with the pre-observation and post-observation meetings conducted by the school's Principal two to three times per year. Some of the interviewed teachers mentioned completing a self-evaluation in conjunction with the Principal, to determine which domain to focus on during the school year. Most interviewed teachers also discussed having informal observations or pop-ins to the classroom, conducted by the school's Principal, with either immediate feedback or feedback given during prep.
- Some of the interviewed teachers mentioned that the school made several changes to become better aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards. Some of the changes discussed included a shift to higher level questioning, an added period of ELA to the daily schedule, increased opportunities during the school day for reading, and curriculum and lesson plans aligned to the CCLS in all core content subjects.
- Some of the interviewed teachers discussed the use of data to determine groupings by both abilities and needs. The teachers gather data from informal assessments such as observations and questioning, as well as formal assessments such as Fountas and Pinnell, ITBS, and the NYS ELA and math assessments.

One group of 10 fifth grade students and one group of 10 eighth grade students were interviewed. Based on student interviews conducted on the October 22, 2014 visit to the school, the following was noted:

- Students interviewed reported that the school work was challenging, with some classes being more difficult than others. They felt that the teachers had high academic expectations for them.
- Students interviewed reported that teachers would call their parents for both positive and negative reasons, such as doing well in class or forgetting to do their homework.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 99% of parents agree “that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child” and 100% of parents who responded to the survey agree “that the school has high expectations for [their] child.”²⁰

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 84% of teachers agree that “order and discipline are maintained at the school” and only 10% agree with the statement that “at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school.”²¹

²⁰ According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 75% of parent respondents strongly agree that Hellenic Classical Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 24% agree with the statement. Similarly, 80% of parent respondents strongly agree that Hellenic Classical Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 20% agree with the statement.

²¹ According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 58% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at Hellenic Classical Charter School; another 26% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 70% strongly disagree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 20% of teacher respondents disagree with the statement; 3% agree with the statement; and 7% strongly agree with the statement.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

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

On November 5, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE attended a meeting of the school's Board of Trustees and met with a representation of the school's Board of Trustees independent of the school leadership team. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has seven active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of five members and maximum of 11 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Chair, Treasurer and Secretary roles are specified positions in the Board's bylaws and are currently filled; however, the bylaws also reference a Vice Chair position, which is not filled.
- All board meetings that were held over the course of the charter term achieved quorum.
- The Board is updated by the Principal, the Assistant Principal, and the Director of Operations as recorded in all available meeting minutes.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational chart.
- The Board's bylaws require a standing Executive Committee (chaired by the Board Chair), a Finance Committee, an Education Committee, an Accountability Committee, and a Personnel Committee. According to the Board's roster, Education, Finance, and Facility committees are in place.
- The school's Chairperson has been on the Board since the school's inception in July 2005. The school's Director of Operations, Joy Petrakos, has also been at the school since its inception. The current Assistant Principal, Natasha Caban, joined the leadership team in 2008-2009. Christina Tettonis, the school's Principal, has led Hellenic Classical Charter School since July 2007.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- To date, the school has met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% in every year of the charter term. Average daily attendance for students over the course of the retrospective charter term (2009-2010 through 2013-2014) is 95.7% according to the data in the table below.²²

Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School	95.9%	95.7%	96.0%	95.6%	95.2%
NYC	93.4%	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	2.5	2.5	2.1	2.0	2.0

* NYC attendance figures reflect average attendance across all general education district schools.

²² The table reflects average daily attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2009-2010 through 2013-2014. Please note that the school self-reported different attendance rates in its Renewal Application than those recorded in ATS for three years, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, though the differences are not significant. The school self-reported attendance rates of 95.9%, 96.2% and 95.8% for school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, respectively.

- The school has experienced very low instructional staff turnover during the course of the charter term, with turnover below 10% in four of the five years of the current charter term.²³ For the most recent period, 2013-2014, the turnover rate for instructional staff was 2%, reflecting the departure of one instructional staff person.²⁴
- 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 not had challenges with retaining students.

Mobility

Student Mobility out of Hellenic Classical Charter School *					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Number of Students who Left the School	34	32	13	33	19
Percent of Students who Left the School	10.3%	9.1%	3.4%	8.1%	4.8%

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

- The NYC DOE has made changes to the NYC School Survey during the entirety of the retrospective charter term. Questions asked have been altered, added or deleted from year to year. Also, beginning with the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, survey categories will not be measured in total points out of 10 possible points. To allow for consistency during the evaluated charter term, selected questions, consistent with the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework were identified as relevant for charter schools. These are presented below for the duration of the retrospective charter term. In the most recent year of survey results, 2013-2014, the percentage of teachers agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for all of the four selected questions; the percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for all of the three selected questions; and the percentage of students agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for all of the three 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. The response rates for Hellenic students, parents and teachers were above NYC averages in all years.

²³ The highest rate of instructional staff turnover was reported for the 2012-2013 school year; the rate was reported as 15.0%.

²⁴ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form in November 2014

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree							
Survey Question		Hellenic Classical Charter School					Citywide Average
		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	89%	84%	92%	75%	78%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	67%	75%	46%	70%	83%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	98%	89%	89%	90%	99%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	100%	99%	98%	100%	99%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	97%	97%	97%	98%	99%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	98%	99%	98%	99%	99%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	85%	80%	96%	80%	84%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	100%	100%	100%	97%	100%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	-	-	97%	97%	100%	81%

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

** This question was phrased as "My teachers inspire me to learn" in the 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 School Surveys.

*** This question was not introduced until the 2011-2012 School Survey.

NYC School Survey Results

Response Rates						
		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	Hellenic Classical Charter School	99%	100%	95%	99%	99%
	NYC	82%	83%	82%	83%	83%
Parents	Hellenic Classical Charter School	81%	86%	73%	75%	71%
	NYC	49%	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	Hellenic Classical Charter School	88%	100%	100%	100%	94%
	NYC	76%	82%	81%	83%	81%

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

- The school's charter goals include, "parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and

Respect.” The school met this goal in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.

- The school’s charter goals include, “staff will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect.” The school met this goal in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school’s charter goals include, “students will express satisfaction with the school’s program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect.” The school met this goal in the 2012-2013 school year and partially met the goal in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years.²⁵ This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.

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:

- Hellenic Classical Charter School maintains an active Parent Teacher Association (PTA) that works closely with the school’s leadership team to foster strong communication between families and the school. The PTA also sponsors school-based events and provides support for the school through fundraising.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing on October 22, 2014 at Hellenic Classical Charter School located at 646 5th Ave, Brooklyn, NY 11215 for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 15 participants attended the hearing with two people speaking in support of the school’s renewal and none 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 in October 2014 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% of parent/guardian respondents provided positive feedback and 0% provided negative feedback regarding the school.

²⁵ If the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, the goal was considered ‘partially met.’ In the 2009-2010 and 2011-2012 school years, Hellenic received fewer than 7.5 points in both the Communication and Safety and Respect categories. In 2010-2011 the school received fewer than 7.5 points in the Communication category only.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the fiscal year 2014 (FY14) financial audit and follow up, the school's current ratio of 0.15 indicated a risk that the school may be unable to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit and follow up, the school's unrestricted cash amount of \$21,521 indicated a risk that the school will be unable to cover at least one month of its operating expenses without an infusion of cash. The school's cash on hand represents only one day of operating expenses.
- 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 met its debt obligations.

Financial Sustainability

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

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus of 6% over these audited fiscal years, and in FY14 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit and follow up, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 1.15 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY14, the school generated overall negative cash flow from FY11 to FY14, though the school generated positive cash flow in FY13.

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent annual financial audits for FY11 to FY13. However, there was one finding noted in the independent financial audit for FY14. It was as follows:

- Hellenic is required to maintain a separate escrow account of no less than \$70,000 to pay for expenses if dissolution occurs. Hellenic did not maintain the minimum balance in its escrow account at the time of the audit.
 - In response, the school issued a corrective action plan on July 7, 2014, with the school replenishing the funds by July 7, 2014.

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

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

As of the review in December 2014, the Board of Trustees for Hellenic Classical 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 five and maximum of 11 members.
- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** One Board member, Rick Gimeranez left the Board in 2010-2011 and was replaced by Dean Angelakos, allowing the number of members to remain at seven.

As of the review in December 2014, the Board of Trustees for Hellenic is out of compliance with:

- **Required number of board meetings.** For the entirety of the current charter term, the school's bylaws indicated that the Board was to hold no fewer than 10 meetings per year. Six meetings were held in both year one (2009-2010) and year two (2010-2011), and quorum was achieved at all meetings in each year. Five meetings were held in year three (2011-2012), all of which achieved quorum. In both years four and five (2012-2013 and 2013-2014, respectively), the Board held four meetings. Quorum was achieved at all meetings in each year. The current Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months, per year. The Board has updated its bylaws to comply with this law.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have not submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. Two out of the seven current Board members did not submit the conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms in the 2013-2014 NYSED Annual Report. The documents that have been submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.²⁶
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has inconsistently made board minutes and agendas available to the public. Agendas are available at meetings for review, however, only some minutes are publically available following a meeting. As of the December 2014 review, Board Meeting minutes are available on the school's website for November 21, 2013, January 16, 2014, March 19, 2014, July 24, 2014, and September 23, 2014.
- **Timely submission of documents.** The Board consistently submitted 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. However, the NYS Charter Schools Act requires schools to post to the website the annual audit for each year of the charter term; Hellenic has only posted its annual audit for two years, FY13 and FY14.

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

- **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.
- **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 2013-2014 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 5, 2014 and lottery date of April 10, 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 did consistently adhere to this requirement.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Fire Emergency.** One of the school leaders was trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.

²⁶ Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

- **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 that is in use for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be compliant with federal law.

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

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members do not have appropriate fingerprint clearance. One staff member has not received clearance.

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.²⁷
- In all years of operation, including the most recently completed school year 2013-2014, Hellenic Classical Charter School:
 - served a lower percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to both the CSD 15 and citywide percentages;
 - served a lower percentage of students with disabilities compared to both the CSD 15 and citywide percentages; and
 - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to both the CSD 15 and citywide percentages.

²⁷ Please see the following website for more information: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/enrollment-retention-targets.html>

Enrollment of Special Populations²⁸

Special Population		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Proposed)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	Hellenic Classical Charter School	58.4%	64.1%	66.8%	63.7%	64.5%	69.3%
	CSD 15	73.1%	70.0%	69.9%	69.0%	67.8%	
	NYC	86.3%	81.6%	83.9%	82.9%	82.4%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Hellenic Classical Charter School	9.8%	9.4%	7.8%	7.4%	8.7%	17.6%
	CSD 15	19.7%	18.9%	18.4%	18.9%	19.4%	
	NYC	18.1%	18.0%	18.0%	18.5%	20.0%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	Hellenic Classical Charter School	3.6%	5.6%	4.8%	3.0%	3.8%	22.7%
	CSD 15	19.9%	20.3%	20.3%	20.8%	20.5%	
	NYC	16.2%	16.1%	15.5%	15.1%	14.7%	

Additional Enrollment Information					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	K-8	K-8	K-8	K-8	K-8
CSD(s)	15	15	15	15	15

²⁸ 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 NYSED. 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?

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

- Although the school does not plan to serve any additional grades, it did request a material revision to increase its maximum authorized enrollment from 450 students to 480 students.
- The school plans to revise its admissions policy to include a preference for ELL students. The school plans on modifying and expanding its student outreach and recruitment initiatives, with a specific focus on ELL students.
- The school is adding the position of Operations Manager, who would report to and support the Director of Operations.

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.²⁹

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.³⁰ 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;
- 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

²⁹ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

³⁰ See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

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.³¹

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.³²

³¹ § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.

³² 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 or without 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 Reports³³

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

³³ 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 learning (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 location³⁴ 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

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

³⁴ 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.

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					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School					
Grade 3	64.0%	84.6%	59.2%	39.2%	44.6%
Grade 4	50.0%	61.2%	88.2%	41.3%	52.6%
Grade 5	62.5%	53.2%	68.1%	40.4%	34.0%
Grade 6	50.0%	50.0%	52.1%	14.0%	39.6%
Grade 7	41.7%	38.1%	58.3%	36.7%	22.7%
Grade 8	61.5%	45.5%	61.9%	32.0%	46.8%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 15 *					
Grade 3	7.2	28.5	-0.1	-3.1	1.2
Grade 4	-7.4	-1.8	27.1	1.1	8.3
Grade 5	8.8	-4.5	6.2	1.3	-9.3
Grade 6	4.2	-3.8	-1.0	-21.4	4.0
Grade 7	-6.6	-9.0	5.0	-0.6	-16.9
Grade 8	15.3	-1.7	14.7	-2.0	7.0
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC					
Grade 3	17.5	36.5	10.2	11.1	14.7
Grade 4	4.4	10.2	35.8	14.1	21.5
Grade 5	16.3	4.2	15.9	11.7	5.6
Grade 6	9.9	6.4	6.8	-9.3	14.3
Grade 7	3.5	1.6	15.0	11.3	-4.0
Grade 8	24.0	10.5	22.9	6.6	17.9

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Hellenic Classical Charter School					
Grade 3	84.0%	96.2%	78.0%	41.2%	82.1%
Grade 4	58.3%	78.0%	94.1%	78.3%	78.9%
Grade 5	54.2%	68.1%	91.5%	53.8%	44.0%
Grade 6	54.2%	53.8%	79.2%	26.0%	58.5%
Grade 7	32.0%	90.5%	84.0%	18.4%	25.0%
Grade 8	61.5%	68.2%	85.7%	52.0%	48.9%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 15 *					
Grade 3	22.7	31.4	7.6	-5.8	28.1
Grade 4	-9.6	7.4	17.3	30.3	25.1
Grade 5	-13.1	-3.0	16.7	16.0	-7.6
Grade 6	-5.6	-11.0	13.5	-12.0	19.4
Grade 7	-28.4	25.7	14.4	-13.4	-16.5
Grade 8	13.6	8.7	25.1	21.9	28.5
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC					
Grade 3	29.7	41.4	21.0	8.0	43.5
Grade 4	-0.1	15.7	28.4	43.0	39.0
Grade 5	-5.5	5.2	26.3	24.3	5.3
Grade 6	1.2	-2.2	19.9	-2.8	24.7
Grade 7	-20.6	35.0	26.7	-6.6	-4.6
Grade 8	15.2	15.7	30.5	26.3	26.2

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

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](#)