



Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
2014-2015

ST. HOPE LEADERSHIP ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW REPORT

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR

Part 1: School Overview

Charter Authorization Profile

St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	
Authorized Grades	Grades 6-8
Authorized Enrollment	300
School Opened For Instruction	2008-2009
Charter Term Expiration Date	June 30, 2018
Last Renewal Term Type	Full Term (5 years)

School Information for the 2014-2015 School Year

St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Lauren Mirsky
School Leader(s)	Constance Bond, Ph.D.
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 5
Borough(s) of Location	Manhattan
Physical Address(es)	222 West 134 Street, New York, NY 10030
Facility Owner(s)	DOE
School Type	Middle School
Grades Served 2014-2015*	Grades 5-8
Enrollment in 2014-2015**	278
Charter Universal Pre-Kindergarten Program	No

* During the 2014-2015 school year St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School applied to the NYC DOE to alter its grade configuration to serve students in grades six through eight (i.e. to truncate its fifth grade). The NYC DOE Chancellor approved this revision request in December 2014. Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School will serve students in grades six through eight only.

** Enrollment data as of October 1, 2014

Enrollment Policies (School Year 2014-2015)*	
Primary Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	Grades 5-6
Additional Grade Level(s) for Which Student Applications for Admission are Accepted	Grades 7-8
Does School Enroll New Students Mid-Year	Yes
Number of Applicants for Admission	189
Number of Students Accepted via the Charter Lottery	143
Lottery Preferences (School Year 2014-2015)**	
Attends a Failing School	No
Does Not Speak English at Home	No
Receives SNAP or TANF Benefits	No
Eligible for Free or Reduced-Price Lunch	No
Has IEP and/or Receives Special Education Services	No
Homeless or Living in Shelter or Temporary Residence	No
Lives in New York City Housing Authority Housing	No
Unaccompanied Youth	No

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

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

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

School Reported Current Key Design Elements	
Key Design Element	Description
Rigorous Standards-Based Grading	St. HOPE Leadership Academy's standards-based grading (SBG) helps teachers prioritize skills and content to plan differentiated instruction. SBG shifted conversations with stakeholders from achievement on specific tasks to analyzing how scholars are learning and being evaluated on specific skills and content. This data is used with interim assessments to guide data cycles. Scholars review their SBG weekly with their advisor, helping them reflect on and plan progress towards their academic and social goals.
Character Education and Restorative Practices	The school was recently named a 2015 New York State School of Character (one of only nine schools in the state – and the only middle school), a distinction the school received for the unique ways in which its scholars, faculty, and staff speak about and live their HARLEM values. When scholars do not live the school's HARLEM values, the school employs restorative practices such as peer mediation, rich conversations between teachers and students and, in the coming year, peer juries.
Differentiated Professional Development	The school is fortunate to have a diverse staff. Each teacher has two individual professional goals aligned with a specific domain on the Danielson Framework established with their coach-evaluator. Development and accountability on goals comes with weekly observations, weekly grade team meetings, department meetings to plan and revise vertical curriculum, and twice monthly sessions in yearlong Inquiry Study Groups.
High School Readiness	The school offers a rigorous academic program which prepares scholars for success in a college-prep high school, including history/science classes that culminate in Regents exams. Scholars work with the school's high school placement counselor to gain admission to a top-rated high school. In 2014-2015, 72% of students were accepted to one of their top three choices (44% to their top choice), with 35% accepted to a U.S. News and World Report Nationally Ranked Gold/Silver/Bronze winner (including Bronx Science) and six to an audition school.
Rich Vertical and Horizontal Curriculum	Each department (ELA, math, social studies and science) has worked to create a solid understanding of the Common Core Learning Standards, building a nuanced standards continuum that defines what grade level expectations are for each standard. This way, each grade has an understanding of what students learned prior, and what will be expected of them in the future. They have shared these understandings across departments so that all grade level teachers are holding students to the same level of rigor in all subjects.
Developing the Whole Child	The school believes that developing the whole child is the purpose of education. School staff work relentlessly to know each scholar as an individual and help him/her discover their innate potential, offering opportunities in art, on athletic teams, and in various clubs including debate, robotics, show choir, and computers. As school staff help develop the whole child, they are able to know their strengths and aspirations, which also makes staff better able to find a high school that will further cultivate the student's unique strengths.

Grade-Level Enrollment (School Year 2014-2015)		
Grade Level	Number of Students	Section Count
Grade 5	38	2
Grade 6	77	3
Grade 7	87	3
Grade 8	76	3
Total Enrollment	278	11

* Enrollment data as of October 1, 2014

Part 2: Annual Review Process Overview

Rating Framework

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

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

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

Essential Questions

Is the school an academic success?

To assess whether a school is an academic success, the NYC DOE considers performance measures, including, but not limited to the following (as appropriate for grades served):

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

Is the school a fiscally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization, OSDCP focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the National Association of Charter School Authorizers' Core Performance Framework.¹

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

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

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

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

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

Part 3: Summary of Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the school an academic success?

Overview of School-Specific Data Since 2012-2013

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	7.3%	6.5%
CSD 5	13.8%	15.7%
Difference from CSD 5 *	-6.5	-9.2
NYC	25.7%	27.4%
Difference from NYC *	-18.4	-20.9
New York State **	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-23.8	-24.1
% Proficient in Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	12.1%	11.6%
CSD 5	11.8%	13.2%
Difference from CSD 5 *	0.3	-1.6
NYC	27.3%	31.5%
Difference from NYC *	-15.2	-19.9
New York State **	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-19.0	-24.6

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

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

Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School - All Students	52.5%	59.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	9.1%	38.2%
City Percent of Range- All Students	9.1%	34.3%
St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School - School's Lowest Third	68.0%	76.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	1.9%	40.0%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	6.4%	47.5%
Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School - All Students	62.0%	54.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	45.2%	36.7%
City Percent of Range- All Students	50.3%	31.4%
St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School - School's Lowest Third	75.0%	72.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	46.3%	45.6%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	51.2%	46.6%

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

Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	44.9%	44.4%
English Language Learner Students	14.7%	37.5%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	33.6%	42.3%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics		
	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	55.1%	34.2%
English Language Learner Students	40.0%	26.5%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	46.1%	42.9%

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

Progress Towards Attainment of Academic Goals in 2013-2014²

Academic Goals	
Charter Goals	2013-2014
1. Each year, 75% of fifth through eighth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA Exam.	Not Met
2. Each year, 75% of fifth through eighth grade students will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math Exam.	Not Met
3. Each year, 75% of eighth grade students who have been at the school for at least two years will pass the NYS Earth Science Regents Exam.	Not Met
4. Each year, eighth grade students will complete a 2,000 word historical research paper; 90% of students will meet or exceed the academic standards measured by this assignment.	Met
5. Each year, 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
6. Each year, 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
7. Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA Exam in each grade tested will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools.	Not Met
8. Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math Exam in each grade tested will place the school in the top quartile of all similar schools.	Not Met
9. Each year, the school will make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in ELA and Math.	Not Met
10. Each year, the school will have a daily attendance rate of at least 95%.	Met

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

Self-Reported Responsive Education Program & Learning Environment³

Curriculum Changes and/or Adjustments

- The school shifted to a standards-based grading system; mastery of standards is tracked in real-time and information is shared with students.
- The school implemented a daily, school-wide Drop Everything and Read (DEAR) program to ensure scholars have additional, focused time to improve their reading levels.
- The school implemented more frequent use of Achieve3000 in all grades to ensure weekly student access to leveled non-fiction text and provide teachers with real-time data linked to Common Core Learning Standards.
- The school implemented fiction and non-fiction guided reading groups in all grades.
- The school added a “Problem of the Day” to all math classrooms to develop Common Core aligned critical thinking skills.
- The school implemented targeted, small group instruction in all math classrooms at least once per week to build proficiency in key Common Core Learning Standards.
- The school piloted whole-class grade-level novel reading in grades five and eight.

Interim Assessments

- The school uses Achievement Network (ANet) for math interim assessments, NY Ready for ELA interim assessments and Prior Earth Science and U.S. History Regents for interim exams in Science and Social Studies.

Approach to Data-Driven Instruction

- Every quarter, the school engages in a data dive to look at all data points.
- Standards based grading is used and is considered core to the school’s data driven instruction.
- Evidence of mastery includes formal assessments such as quizzes, tests, interim assessments, scholar writing, and teacher observation of classwork.
- Teachers update grades at least weekly and use that mastery data to reflect on skills and content needed to be retaught and reassessed the following week. Teachers reflect on this data in grade team meetings during “Kid Talk” protocols and in Department Meetings to guide future instruction.
 - Quarterly, teachers analyze data comparisons of scholars’ performance on standards as assessed by externally designed interim assessments, A3K Lexile levels, and standards based grades. Teachers use this data to plan units, amend long-term plans, and build small groups.
- At the school level, data is used to identify effective instructional practices and coach teachers to adopt those strategies. For example, in sixth grade math, the school observed gains on scholars’ performance on interim assessments. This was attributed to the use of a Problem of the Day from a previously covered unit. Teachers in the math department and across the sixth grade observed this routine and then integrated it into their daily instruction.

Philosophy on Special Education and English Language Learner Service Provision

- The school uses an inclusion model, which places all scholars with disabilities in general classrooms with support. All classrooms are Collaborative Team Teaching settings, with one general education teacher and one special education teacher.
- To serve the needs of scholars with disabilities and English Language Learner students (ELLs), the school focuses on using data to diagnose areas of strength and weakness and targeting teaching to those areas so scholars receive the help they need.

Professional Development Opportunities

- The school hosts weekly professional development (PD) for teachers. Past topics included:
 - Effective Co-Teaching (yearlong PD with Goldmansour and Rutherford);
 - School Culture - Safe, Structured and Nurturing;
 - Restorative Practice in Action;

³ Self-reported information from school-submitted ACR self-evaluation form on 5/1/15.

- Special Education and ELL Collaborative with the Charter Center;
- School-Wide Interim Data Dives with Achievement Network Coach;
- Using Jump rope; and
- Standards-Based Grading II.
- The school implemented year-long Inquiry Groups that meet twice monthly. Topics included:
 - Hands-On Learning;
 - Learning about Learning;
 - Restorative Practices; and
 - Questioning Questions.
- The school holds weekly professional development specifically for all special education staff. Topics range from the autism spectrum to writing Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals
- The school offers teachers the opportunity to attend external professional development opportunities based on individual needs.

Teacher Evaluation

- In September and June, each teacher rates himself/herself on the Danielson Framework, as does the teacher's coach. The teacher then compares his/her ratings with the coach's. Based on their reflection, the coach assigns novice teachers two goals on which they will be evaluated. Veteran teachers choose their goals with their coach's support. Teachers meet weekly with their coach for support with their goals. Coaching includes modeling instruction, grading with teachers, leading small groups, and helping design curriculum.
- In February and June, evaluators meet with teachers to reflect on and rate their performance. Teachers are invited to include a written reflection of their work in their mid-year and final evaluations.
- If a teacher consistently demonstrates unsatisfactory performance, he or she is placed on an improvement plan that is filed with Human Resources (HR). This document outlines areas for professional growth, supports that have and will continue to be provided to the teacher, and a timeline to meet expectations.
- In April, teachers are invited to return the following year with the same salary or a 3%, 5% or 7% raise. Raises are based on the Leadership Team's reflections about the teacher's value to the school, including his/her impact on scholars' growth and achievement, contributions to the school's culture, and professionalism. Final evaluations are included in the teacher's HR file.

Differentiated Instruction

- The school leverages its school-wide co-teaching model to differentiate instruction. Using standards-based grades and data-driven instruction, teachers plan small groups that are varied appropriately and are based on content and skill standards scholars have not yet mastered.
- Teachers also plan opportunities for scholar choice by designing curriculum that includes project menus and blended learning programs that give scholars and teachers easy access to different tasks that work towards mastery of the same standards.
- In ELA classes, scholars read independent books that are at or around their reading level. Scholars also participate in in-class book clubs organized by reading levels.
- In math classes, scholars work in stations to review specific standards with which they need additional help. Additionally, math classes often break into high, medium, and low groups, with two groups working with a teacher and one practicing independently. During whole-group instruction with one teacher leading the class, the second teacher in the room supports instruction, redirecting scholars and clarifying misconceptions individually so that the flow of the lesson can continue without scholars falling behind.

Adjustments Based on 2013-2014 Data

- The implementation of the NYReady tests for interim exams, the daily, school-wide DEAR program, and greater use of Achieve3000 in all grades, were major programmatic changes at the school.
- In addition, the school moved to ensuring that all students, regardless of ability level, receive targeted, small group instruction at least once per week to build proficiency in key standards.
- Lastly, the school hired a co-teacher for its Earth Science program.

Learning Environment

- Students are identified as requiring intervention services through multiple mechanisms. The school implements a school-wide universal screening of basic math, reading comprehension, and decoding skills at the beginning of the school year to identify students in need.
- The Child Study Team collaborates with faculty and staff to identify students who may require intervention. The Child Study Team supports the academic and personal success of all students through early identification of scholar difficulties and pro-active implementation of supportive interventions. The Child Study Team works to empower teachers to support scholar success in school by reinforcing and promoting high expectations for academic achievement, helping develop and implement meaningful academic interventions and learning strategies for the general education classroom, including students in specific tier one, tier two, and tier three interventions, and addressing mental health concerns that represent barriers to learning.

NYC DOE School Visit

Representatives of the OSDCP team visited the school on June 1, 2015. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

School Leadership Team

- School leadership reported that shifting to standards-based grading has shifted school conversations away from tasks and activities to mastery of standards. This has also promoted open conversations with students and families about mastery of standards.
 - Leadership reported that a horizontal and vertical team model helps teachers differentiate between academic and emotional issues in the classroom, and ensure that the appropriate, corresponding interventions are in place.
 - Leadership reported the success of teacher development through new Inquiry Groups, including one working on restorative practices. Teachers in this group had lower suspension rates. The school is considering implementing restorative practices school-wide in the 2015-2016 year.

Classroom observations

- Nineteen classrooms were observed (including reading intervention classes), with class sizes ranging from 2 (for a Wilson intervention) to 26, with an average of 19 students.
- All classrooms (excluding intervention sessions) included two teachers, with all classrooms using lead and assist, lead and monitor and/or parallel teaching models.
- In a majority of classes, questions asked students for basic recall or to demonstrate understanding, few questions asked for analysis, application, synthesis or evaluation.
- There were some observed examples of differentiation of tasks, but few of materials, modalities, products or assessments.
- The majority of checks for understanding took the form of classwork, with some questioning and observation.
- A majority of students appeared aware of expectations for behavior. There were some classes where students were off task.

Teacher Interviews

- Five teachers were interviewed as a part of the visit.
 - A majority of teachers reported using data to drive instruction. All teachers reported using results from ANet, Achieve3000, Fountas & Pinnell, or exit tickets to adjust teaching plans.
 - A majority of teachers reported frequent observations that provided very helpful or helpful feedback.
 - A majority of teachers reported that the professional development provided each week was helpful; some teachers reported being supported by the administration to find additional, external professional development, others reported the helpfulness of the inquiry groups.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

School Leadership Team (School Year 2014-2015)		
Title	Name	Number of Years With the School
1. Principal/Executive Director	Constance Bond	3
2. Assistant Principal	Meghann Persenaire	6
3. Assistant Principal	Laurel Schwartz	3
4. Literacy Coach	Elizabeth Lacy	4
5. Math Coach	Daniel Mejias	2
6. Director of Special Education	Jane Steffen	1
7. Director of Operations	Winsome Warden	6

Board of Trustees (School Year 2014-2015)		
Board Member Name	Position/ Committees	Was all Documentation Submitted to OSDCP? Was Board Member Approved by OSDCP?
1. Lauren Mirsky	Chair- <i>Accountability Committee, Executive Committee</i>	Yes
2. Takako Kono	Vice Chair- <i>Executive Committee</i>	Yes
3. Maureen Higgins	Secretary- <i>Executive Committee</i>	Yes
4. Ankur Dalal	Treasurer- <i>Executive Committee</i>	Yes
5. Dean Guzman	Member- <i>Accountability Committee, Nominating Committee</i>	Yes
6. Rebecca Ostrov	Member- <i>Accountability Committee, Finance Committee</i>	Yes
7. Arun Yang	Member- <i>Accountability Committee, Nominating Committee</i>	Yes
8. Jonathan Howard	Member- <i>Finance Committee</i>	Yes
9. Bryan Winther	Member- <i>Finance Committee, Nominating Committee</i>	Yes
10. Christopher Greeley	Member- <i>Finance Committee</i>	Yes
11. Steven Colon	Member- <i>Accountability Committee</i>	Yes

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

School Climate & Community Engagement

St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2013-2014)*	27.6%
Instructional Staff Turnover (School Year 2014-2015)**	9.4%
Number of Instructional Staff Members Not Returning from the Previous Academic Year*	3
Does the School have a Parent Organization?	No
• If Yes, how many times did it meet?	N/A
• If Yes, how many parents attended these meetings?	N/A
Average Daily Attendance Rate (School Year 2013-2014)**	96.6%

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

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

** Attendance was taken from ATS.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree				
Survey Question		St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School		Citywide Average
		2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	84%	79%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	85%	94%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	97%	95%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	91%	94%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	92%	95%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	92%	94%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	100%	71%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	100%	88%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	97%	91%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.	100%	79%	81%

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

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

NYC School Survey Response Rates			
		2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	99%	97%
	NYC	83%	83%
Parents	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	91%	100%
	NYC	54%	53%
Teachers	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	100%	94%
	NYC	83%	81%

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

Financial Health

Short-Term Financial Health				
	Indicator	Benchmark	School's Measure	Status
Cash Position	Number of days of operating expenses the school can cover without an infusion of cash	60 days (2 months)	187 days	Strong
Liabilities	School's position to meet liabilities expected over the next 12 months	Current assets sufficient to cover current liabilities (ratio should be greater than or equal to 1.00)	10.00	Strong
Projected Revenues	Actual enrollment for 2014-2015 is compared to projected enrollment for 2014-2015 to allow for accounts receivable of budgeted per pupil revenues	Actual enrollment within 15% of authorized enrollment (ratio should be greater than or equal to 0.85)	0.92	Strong
Debt Management	School debts as provided in audited financial statements, as well as payments on those debts	School is meeting all current debt obligations	Not in Default	Strong

Long-Term Financial Sustainability				
	Indicator	Benchmark	School's Measure	Status
Total Margin	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the previous fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	-0.02	Weak
	Did the school operate at a surplus or deficit during the past three fiscal years?	Value should be greater than 0.00	0.02	Strong
Ratios	Debt to Asset Ratio	Ratio should be less than 1.00	0.08	Strong
	Debt Service Coverage Ratio	Ratio should be greater than 1.00	13.26	Strong
Cash Flow	Most recent fiscal year's cash flow	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$(330,691)	Strong
	Trend of cash flow over the past three fiscal years	Value should be greater than 0.00	\$(571,629)	Strong

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

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

Board Compliance

Board of Trustee Compliance	
Total Number of Board Members as of April 1, 2015	11
Number of Board Members Required per the Bylaws	5
Number of Board Members Who Either Did Not Return Following the 2013-2014 School Year or Who Left During the 2014-2015 School Year:	0
Number of Board Members Who Joined the Board Prior to or During the 2014-2015 School Year	3
Board Meeting Minutes From Most Recent Meeting Posted on the School's Website?	Yes
Number of Board Meetings in the 2014-2015 School Year with a Quorum of Board Members Present / Number Meetings Required per Bylaws*	10

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

School Compliance

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

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

Teachers (School Year 2014-2015)						
Number of Teachers:	Number of NYS Uncertified Teachers:	Percent NYS Uncertified Teachers:	Number of Highly Qualified Teachers:	Percent Highly Qualified Teachers:	Number of Teachers without Fingerprint Clearance:	Percent of Teachers Not Fingerprinted:
32	5	15.6%	30	93.8%	0	0.0%

Student Discipline

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

Compliance Area	Evidence Submitted?	Language of Compliance Evident in the Documents Submitted?
Disciplining students	Yes	Yes
Removing students (i.e., suspending)	Yes	Yes
Procedures for expelling students	Yes	Yes
Notice and opportunities to be heard for Short Term Removals (10 days or fewer)	Yes	Yes
Notice and opportunities to be heard for Long Term Removals (more than 10 days)	No	Yes
Appropriate procedures for providing alternative education to students when students are removed (i.e., suspended)	No	Yes
Specifically addresses student discipline policy for students with disabilities	No	Yes
Does the school distribute the student discipline policy to all students and/or their families?	Yes	Yes
Number and percentage of students suspended in 2014-2015*	In School Suspensions: 63 (18%) Out of School Suspensions: 99 (21%)	

*Suspensions during the 2014-2015 school year as of April 1, 2015

Enrollment and Retention Targets⁴

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

⁴ State enrollment and retention targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). The NYC DOE used the calculator posted on the SED website as of April 1, 2015. Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific target. The CSD for a multi-district school is the primary CSD as determined by each school. The enrollment is determined by the total number of students enrolled as of October 1 for each school year. Any school with an unusual grade configuration (i.e. K, 6-9) should use an available grade configuration provided by SED that is most aligned as determined by the DOE, otherwise a school's actual grade span is used. For more information regarding SED's methodology behind the calculation of charter school enrollment and retention targets, please refer to the memo at <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2012Meetings/July2012/712brca11.pdf>.

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

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

- In school year 2014-2015, St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School served:
 - a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to its SED-derived enrollment target for students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch;
 - a higher percentage of English Language Learner students compared to its SED-derived enrollment target for English Language Learner students; and
 - a higher percentage of students with disabilities than its SED-derived enrollment target for students with disabilities.
- In school year 2014-2015, St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School retained:
 - a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to its SED-derived retention target for students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch;
 - a higher percentage of English Language Learner students compared to its SED-derived retention target for English Language Learner students; and
 - a higher percentage of students with disabilities than its SED-derived retention target for students with disabilities.

Enrollment of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	97.0%	94.2%
	Effective Target	91.3%	91.2%
	Difference from Effective Target	+5.7	+3.0
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	21.6%	19.4%
	Effective Target	16.3%	16.2%
	Difference from Effective Target	+5.3	+3.2
English Language Learners (ELL)	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	15.0%	14.7%
	Effective Target	13.2%	13.1%
	Difference from Effective Target	+1.8	+1.6

Retention of Special Populations

Special Population		2013-2014	2014-2015
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	81.2%	-
	Effective Target	78.3%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+2.8	-
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	75.4%	-
	Effective Target	71.2%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+4.2	-
English Language Learners (ELL)	St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School	86.7%	-
	Effective Target	73.2%	-
	Difference from Effective Target	+13.5	-

Enrollment Information Used to Generate Targets		
	2013-2014	2014-2015
Grades Served	5-8	5-8
Enrollment	301	278
CSD(s)	5	5

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

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

- During the 2014-2015 school year St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School applied to the NYC DOE to alter its grade configuration to serve students in grades six through eight (i.e. to truncate its fifth grade). The NYC DOE Chancellor approved this revision request in December 2014. Beginning in the 2015-2016 school year, St. HOPE Leadership Academy Charter School will serve students in grades six through eight only.
- The Board has no plans to expand, contract or replicate the model in the coming year, aside from the first year of implementing the grade truncation noted above.
- As of April 1, 2015, the school leadership reported a number of changes that are being proposed for implementation for the 2015-2016 school year (subject to change). These include:
 1. To support the shift from a grade five through eight program to a grade six through eight program, the math curriculum will likely shift from Singapore Math and NY Ready materials to Math in Focus, a curriculum based on the Singapore model but more accessible to scholars who begin to learn math through the exploratory Singapore method later in their educational career.
 2. In fifth grade ELA the school saw increased engagement when scholars read Bud Not Buddy as a whole class. Because of this success, the school will likely read more full-class texts in ELA classes during the 2015-2016 school year.
 3. To improve scholars' ability to analyze non-fiction texts, social studies and science classes will increase the volume of reading and writing, teaching more to the Common Core Learning Standards in History, Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects.
 4. The science team will likely extend into labs in all grades during the 2015-2016 school year.
 5. The school is considering transitioning to the NWEA MAP Assessment to be administered three times during the 2015-2016 school year in conjunction with internally designed interim assessments, which would be administered quarterly.

Please note that the school's identification of future plans as presented above does not construe application by the school or approval by the NYC DOE of any associated revision. The information presented above is for informational purposes only; it reflects proposed, not approved, future plans of the school. A formal non-material or material charter revision request would need to be submitted as appropriate, consistent with the NYC DOE's timelines and requirements, as the charter authorizing entity.