



**Department of  
Education**

*Carmen Fariña, Chancellor*

**HARLEM CHILDREN'S ZONE PROMISE ACADEMY II CHARTER SCHOOL  
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR  
FEBRUARY 2015**

# Table of Contents

<b>PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
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 .....	7
<b>PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>PART 4: FINDINGS .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<i>Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? ...</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?.....</i>	<i>37</i>
<b>PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA .....</b>	<b>56</b>

## Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

### I. Charter School Overview:

#### Background Information

Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Geoffrey Canada
School Leader(s)	Sheryl Ragland (Lower ES), Debra Sostre (Upper ES), Kevin Dougherty (MS), Asif Padela (HS)
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	Community Based Organization: Harlem Children's Zone
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 5
Physical Address(es)	2005 Madison Avenue, Manhattan (Grades K-5)
	35 East 125th Street, Manhattan (Grades 6-10)
Facility Owner(s)	DOE and Private
School Opened For Instruction	2005-2006
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	4/14/2015
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-12
Current Authorized Enrollment	1,040
Proposed New Charter Term	4.5 years [April 15, 2015 - June 30, 2019]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-12
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	1,040
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	Grades K-12: 4 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	18	18	18	18	18	90
# Met	5	4	4	2	3	18
# Partially Met	0	1	1	0	1	3
# Not Met	6	5	5	4	4	24
# Not Applicable *	7	8	8	12	10	45
% Met	28%	22%	22%	11%	17%	20%
% Partially Met	0%	6%	6%	0%	6%	3%
% Not Met	33%	28%	28%	22%	22%	27%
% Not Applicable *	39%	44%	44%	67%	56%	50%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	45%	40%	40%	33%	38%	40%

\* 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
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	62.1%	60.0%	56.1%	25.2%	26.4%
CSD 5	29.3%	31.1%	29.6%	13.4%	15.4%
Difference from CSD 5 *	32.8	28.9	26.5	11.8	11.0
NYC	46.1%	48.0%	48.4%	26.4%	28.4%
Difference from NYC *	16.0	12.0	7.7	-1.2	-2.0
New York State **	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	8.9	7.2	1.0	-5.9	-4.2

% Proficient in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	81.4%	81.1%	76.4%	34.8%	45.3%
CSD 5	38.4%	40.0%	39.0%	13.1%	14.8%
Difference from CSD 5 *	43.0	41.1	37.4	21.7	30.5
NYC	57.4%	59.0%	60.9%	29.6%	34.2%
Difference from NYC *	24.0	22.1	15.5	5.2	11.1
New York State **	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	20.4	17.8	11.6	3.7	9.1

\* 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
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School - All Students</b>	<b>46.5%</b>	<b>61.0%</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>55.0%</b>	<b>71.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	0.0% <sup>1</sup>	37.1%	59.4%	24.5%	88.7%
City Percent of Range- All Students	0.0% <sup>2</sup>	26.2%	40.9%	18.4%	77.2%
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School - School's Lowest Third</b>	<b>57.0%</b>	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>59.0%</b>	<b>67.0%</b>	<b>79.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	8.0%	19.3%	33.4%	26.8%	73.4%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	2.8%	11.5%	14.1%	19.5%	63.6%

<sup>1</sup> In the 2009-2010 NYC DOE Progress Report for Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School, the Peer Percent of Range for ELA median adjusted growth percentile was reported as -5.7%. 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%.

<sup>2</sup> In the 2009-2010 NYC DOE Progress Report for Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School, the City Percent of Range for ELA median adjusted growth percentile was reported as -17.1%. 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%.

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School - All Students</b>	<b>57.5%</b>	<b>72.0%</b>	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>53.0%</b>	<b>72.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	33.9%	65.4%	14.9%	25.1%	77.9%
City Percent of Range- All Students	29.1%	60.6%	13.3%	15.5%	79.6%
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School - School's Lowest Third</b>	<b>63.5%</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>79.0%</b>
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	40.1%	52.8%	31.7%	27.8%	71.4%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	37.9%	48.1%	23.0%	16.7%	72.9%

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					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	10.0%	52.8%	57.4%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	17.6%	13.6%	45.5%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	38.9%	23.8%	38.0%	58.7%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	-	19.0%	33.3%	57.4%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	17.6%	31.8%	45.5%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	35.3%	20.8%	46.7%	55.9%

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

Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School enrolled its first class of ninth grade students beginning in the 2013-2014 school year. As a result, data on high school graduation rates is not available for the current charter term. In addition, Regents Pass Rates and Credit Accumulation data are available for only the 2013-2014 school year.

### Weighted Regents Pass Rates

2014					
	English	Math	Science	Global History	U.S History
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	-	1.23	1.29	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	67.3%	70.6%	-	-
City Percent of Range	-	67.7%	59.5%	-	-

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

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

### Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	-	-	-	-	76.5%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	-	-	27.9%
City Percent of Range	-	-	-	-	47.3%

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

## II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

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

The academic condition is as follows:

1. Due to the planned change in curriculum and assessments prior to the 2015-2016 school year, Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School will provide the NYC DOE with ELA and math interim assessment results for grades three through eight twice yearly for each year of the charter term, with results of a baseline assessment at a minimum. The NYC DOE will require the school to submit interim assessment data within 30 days of receiving results to the NYC DOE for continued monitoring.

### A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School (HCZ Promise Academy II) 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 HCZ Promise Academy II indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting most of these objectives.

#### **Mission and Vision**

The mission of the Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School II (HCZ Promise Academy II) is to provide high quality, standards-based academic programs for students, grades K-12, from underserved communities and underperforming school districts, and to provide students with the skills they need to be accepted by and succeed in college. HCZ Promise Academy II promotes high achievement in all subjects through a demanding curriculum, extensive supportive services and the use of data-driven teaching methods. HCZ Promise Academy II is committed to promoting academic accomplishment, positive character development, healthy lifestyles and leadership skills. In partnership with the Harlem Children's Zone, HCZ Promise Academy II addresses the educational and developmental needs of each student.

#### **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 five years of New York State (NYS) assessment data and five years of other academic indicator(s) to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at HCZ Promise Academy II. As the school has not yet had a graduating

cohort, however, the NYC DOE does not have four- or six-year graduation rates to evaluate for the current charter term.

Aggregate English Language Arts (ELA) and math proficiency rates on the NYS assessments for HCZ Promise Academy II have consistently exceeded those of Community School District (CSD) 5 and New York City during the current charter term, with the exception of the last two years of ELA proficiency rates, which exceeded CSD 5 rates but not the aggregate rates for New York City.

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, 34.8% of HCZ Promise Academy II's students were proficient in math on the NYS assessments. HCZ Promise Academy II's math proficiency was higher than 64% of elementary/middle schools citywide. When compared to elementary/middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools), HCZ Promise Academy II outperformed 77% of similar schools. In addition, the school outperformed 83% of CSD 5 elementary/middle schools. In 2012-2013, 25.2% of HCZ Promise Academy II's students demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA. With this level of proficiency, HCZ Promise Academy II outperformed 60% of elementary/middle schools citywide, 73% of its peer schools, and 100% of CSD 5 elementary/middle schools.

The following year, in 2013-2014, the percent of students at HCZ Promise Academy II who were proficient in math on the NYS assessments rose to 45.3%. For 2013-2014, HCZ Promise Academy II's math proficiency was higher than 67% of elementary/middle schools citywide. When compared to peer schools, HCZ Promise Academy II outperformed 80% of similar schools; additionally, the school outperformed 83% of CSD 5 elementary/middle schools. In 2013-2014, the percent of students at HCZ Promise Academy II who demonstrated proficiency on NYS assessments in ELA also rose, to 26.4%. With this level of proficiency, HCZ Promise Academy II outperformed 54% of elementary/middle schools citywide, 77% of its peer schools, and 83% of elementary/middle schools in CSD 5.

In 2013-2014, HCZ Promise Academy II's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 71.0% with a City Percent of Range of 77.2%, placing the school in the 86<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide.<sup>3</sup> The school's peer and Community School District percentiles were 90% and 83%, respectively. This means that only 10% of other elementary/middle schools in HCZ Promise Academy II's peer group and only 17% of other elementary/middle schools in CSD 5 had an ELA median adjusted growth percentile greater than HCZ Promise Academy II's median ELA adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

In 2013-2014, HCZ Promise Academy II's math median adjusted growth percentile was 72.0% with a City Percent of Range of 79.6%, placing it in the 89<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer group and CSD percentiles were both 83%. This means that only 17% of other elementary/middle schools in HCZ Promise Academy II's peer group and in CSD 5 had a math median adjusted growth percentile greater than HCZ Promise Academy II's math median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

As the school has only had one complete year serving high school students in the current charter term, the NYC DOE has minimal academic data associated with high school performance to

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 lower than the school under consideration. A City Percent of Range of 77.2% indicates that the school's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was above the citywide average and more than one standard deviation above the average (that 77.2% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of HCZ Promise Academy II), while a citywide percentile of 86% indicates that HCZ Promise Academy II's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than 86% of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

evaluate. The following represents one year of credit accumulation and weighted regents pass rate results for HCZ Promise Academy II. In the most recent school year, 2013-2014, as self-reported by the school, 76.5% of first year students at HCZ Promise Academy II earned 10 or more credits, placing the school in the bottom 11% of its peer group schools and in the 31<sup>st</sup> percentile of all high schools citywide.

Weighted Regents pass rates are available for only one year in math and science; therefore, a performance trend cannot be identified. In 2013-2014, the school generally compared favorably against its peer group schools and all high schools citywide when analyzing weighted Regents pass rates: the school's peer group percentiles were 78% and 76% for the math and science weighted Regents pass rates, respectively. The school earned citywide percentile ranks of 69% and 74% for its weighted Regents pass rates in math and science, respectively. In addition, the school's weighted Regents pass rates were above the citywide average in both math and science.<sup>4</sup> For HCZ Promise Academy II students who took Regents exams in 2013-2014, the school had a Regents pass rate of 100% on both the Integrated Algebra and Living Environment exams in 2013-2014.

Over the five years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, HCZ Promise Academy II has met 40% of its applicable academic charter goals.<sup>5,6</sup> HCZ Promise Academy II met three of eight 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 include goals that measure a school's academic performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams for the 2012-2013 school year. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, due to a change in state regulation, the NYC DOE will not evaluate goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two; further, due to the elimination of the accountability instrument, the DOE will not evaluate goals related to NYC DOE Progress Report grades beginning with the 2013-2014 school year. The school has demonstrated a trend of relatively stagnant achievement of its stated academic charter goals over the five years of the charter term under review.

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Elementary/Middle School Progress Report, HCZ Promise Academy II received an Overall grade of C, as well as a C grade in all sections, with the exception of Student Performance, for which it received a B grade. This ranked HCZ Promise Academy II in the 13<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide and marked a deterioration in its citywide ranking from the prior year. On its 2011-2012 NYC DOE Elementary/Middle School Progress Report, the school earned an overall grade of C, with a D grade in Student Progress, an A grade in Student Performance and a C grade for School Environment, placing it in the 30<sup>th</sup> percentile compared with all elementary/middle schools citywide. As its Overall Grade, the school earned a C and B in 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, respectively. As the school did not serve high school grades until 2013-2014 and the NYC DOE Progress Report was discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, HCZ Promise Academy II did not receive a NYC DOE High School Progress Report during the current charter term.

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

---

<sup>4</sup> The school's City Percent of Range scores were above 50.0% for both its Math Weighted Regents Pass Rate and its Science Weighted Regents Pass Rate, indicating that the school's pass rates were above the citywide average.

<sup>5</sup> 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 forward) or the goal not yet measurable for the school at the time of the annual reporting (e.g. high school graduation rate for an academic year in which the school was not serving grade twelve students).

<sup>6</sup> It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not evaluate 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.

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,<sup>7</sup> 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, 55.9% of HCZ Promise Academy II'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 HCZ Promise Academy II in the 69<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, 58.7% of the school's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this level places HCZ Promise Academy II in the 74<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 57.4% of HCZ Promise Academy II's students with disabilities experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places HCZ Promise Academy II in the 89<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, 57.4% of the school's students with disabilities experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this level places HCZ Promise Academy II in the 68<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 45.5% of HCZ Promise Academy II's English Language Learner students experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other English Language Learner students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places HCZ Promise Academy II in the 69<sup>th</sup> percentile of elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, 45.5% of the school's English Language Learner students experienced growth in ELA that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other English Language Learner students citywide with the same starting ELA scores; this places HCZ Promise Academy II in the 70<sup>th</sup> percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

As the school did not have a high school graduating class in the retrospective charter term, closing the achievement gap data is not available for the high school grades. The NYC DOE does not have closing the achievement gap data associated with four-year weighted diploma rates or

---

<sup>7</sup> 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.

the College and Career Preparatory Course Index (CCPCI) to evaluate at the time of this charter renewal.

## **B. Governance, Operations & Finances**

HCZ Promise Academy II is an operationally sound and fiscally viable organization. This assessment was made based on a review of the following indicators of operational and fiscal viability:

- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's FY10 and FY11 (FY10/FY11) combined independent financial audit;
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's 2014-2015 student/family handbook;
- On-site review of HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's financial and operational records;
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's FY15 budget and five-year projected budget;
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's Board of Trustees financial disclosure forms;
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's Board of Trustees minutes;
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's Board of Trustees by-laws; and
- HCZ Promise Academy II Charter School's self-reported staffing data.

Over the course of the school's current charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. Board Chair Geoffrey Canada and Chair Emeritus Kenneth Langone have been on the Board since the school's founding. The Board's level of membership has stayed consistently within the minimum of seven members and maximum of 17 members established in the Board's bylaws. The school leaders provide standing updates to the Board on the academic progress at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes. Operational and financial updates are provided by the school's operations and finance staff, as well as by the school's CEO. Finally, the Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in the meeting minutes that were reviewed for Board meetings held for school years 2011-2012 through the current school year, 2014-2015 (27 meetings in total through December 2014). However, according to the school's renewal application, in school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 the Board did not hold the required number of monthly meetings as specified in its bylaws.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the HCZ Promise Academy II has developed a stable school culture. The school's leadership turnover has been relatively low; its current principals were all part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization (either at the central support level or the school's sister school, Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy I Charter School) prior to taking on principal roles at HCZ Promise Academy II. However, the school's primary instructional staff attrition has fluctuated between 17% and 45% throughout the charter term, with the year of highest turnover (2011-2012) coinciding with a decrease in the school's ELA and math proficiency levels on state assessments.

Though its student satisfaction results have been mixed based on the NYC DOE School Survey, the school's parent satisfaction results on the NYC DOE School Survey have been consistently high and its teacher satisfaction results have significantly improved over the past three years of the charter term. Additionally, the school has an active parent association and provides a range of supportive academic and social services for both students and families.

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has approximately at least 152 days of unrestricted cash on hand totaling \$5,966,881 to meet near-term obligations.

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

There was no material weakness noted in the most recent independent financial audit for fiscal year 2014 (FY14); however material weaknesses were noted for the combined FY10 and FY11 financial audit, as well as the FY12 and FY13 financial audits.

**C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations**

Over the charter term, HCZ Promise Academy II has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations but not others.

Although the Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term, it did not consistently submit the independent financial audit portion of this report by the deadline of November 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for fiscal years 2011, 2012, and 2013. However, the school has posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law.

The school's bylaws indicate that the Board is to hold 10 meetings a year, inclusive of its annual meeting. In school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2013-2014, the Board did not hold the required number of monthly meetings, as evidenced by the Board Yearly Meeting Schedule and the posted meeting minutes. Required meetings are those which met quorum. Further, the Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months per year.

All staff members do not have appropriate fingerprint clearance. The NYC DOE was able to confirm that the school does not have fingerprint clearances for four staff members and is unable to produce verification documentation for an additional 20 teachers due to known system difficulties.

The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is not 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. The school is out of compliance with 8 uncertified teachers at the time of review.

The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is not in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization, with 98.8% of its students fully immunized.

**D. Plans for Next Charter Term**

As part of its next charter term the school plans to:

- Continue phase-in of high school with expansion of grades served from kindergarten through ten to kindergarten through twelve; and
- Continue phase-in of maximum authorized enrollment to 1,040 students.

## Part 2: School Overview and History

HCZ Promise Academy II is an elementary/middle/high school serving 798 students<sup>8</sup> in kindergarten through tenth grade during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2005-2006 school year with kindergarten and first grade and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's authorized full grade span, as per the original charter application as approved by the NYC DOE, is for grades kindergarten through twelve. However, the school is authorized to serve grades kindergarten through ten only in the fifth year of its current charter term, i.e. the current school year, 2014-2015. Prior to the current charter term, the school was renewed for a full-term in school year 2009-2010. The school's current charter term expires on April 14, 2015.<sup>9</sup> The school currently affiliates with a community-based early childhood center (CBECC) to offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in a New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE)-operated facility in Community School District 5 (CSD 5) in Manhattan, as well as a privately-operated facility in CSD 5.<sup>10</sup> The school's elementary school grades are co-located with The Urban Assembly School for Global Commerce, Choir Academy of Harlem, and Democracy Prep Harlem Charter School.<sup>11</sup>

HCZ Promise Academy II's mission is to provide high-quality, standards-based academic programs for students in grades kindergarten through twelve from underserved communities and underperforming school districts, and to provide students with the skills they need to be accepted by and succeed in college.

To reach its goals, the school partners with community based organization the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ), which provides financial, operational, and academic support. Support includes back office support, financial contributions, fundraising, facility use, food services, and other in-kind contributions. As a community based organization, HCZ supports a second charter school, Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy I Charter School, also authorized by the NYC DOE Chancellor. School leadership reported that in fiscal year 2014, HCZ Promise Academy II received a total of \$3,123,354, or 30% of total revenue, in financial and in-kind support from HCZ. Among the HCZ programs that HCZ Promise Academy II students and families have access to are HCZ's early childhood programs, including: Baby College, a nine-week parenting program; Three-Year Old Journey, a multi week, tri-lingual educational program; and HCZ's Pre-Kindergarten program, Harlem Gems. HCZ also provides a healthy living program (Healthy Harlem), an obesity program, counseling, and after-school programming for remediation, enrichment, recreational, and athletic programs. In addition, HCZ offers HCZ Promise Academy II access to its College Success Program, a set of post-secondary supports for current college students.

HCZ Promise Academy II's Board of Trustees is led by Chair Emeritus Kenneth Langone and Chair Geoffrey Canada, both of whom are founding Board members. The school's grades are subdivided into four schools, a lower and upper elementary school, middle school, and high school, each with its own leader. HCZ Promise Academy II's lower elementary school (grades kindergarten through two) is led by Sheryl Ragland, who has been at the school for eight years and in her current position for eight years; its upper elementary school (grades three through five) is led by Debra Sostre, who has been part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization for six years and in her current position for one year. HCZ Promise Academy II's middle school (grades six through eight) is led by Kevin Dougherty, who has been part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization for six years and in his current position for two years; and its high school is led by Asif Padela, who has been part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization for nine years and in his current position for two years. The school also has a superintendent, Dr. Achil Petit, who has been part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization for 10 years, and a Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Anne Williams-Isom, who has been a part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization for six years; prior to the 2014-2015 school year, Ms. Williams-Isom was the organization's Chief Operating Officer. The superintendent and CEO positions have responsibilities for both HCZ Promise Academy II and Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy I Charter School.

---

<sup>8</sup> ATS data as of October 31, 2014

<sup>9</sup> NYC DOE internal data

<sup>10</sup> NYC DOE internal data

<sup>11</sup> NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System

HCZ Promise Academy II typically enrolls new students in all grades, though kindergarten is considered the primary entry grade and the only grade for which the school holds a lottery. There were 116 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery. The school reports backfilling students from the waitlist during the school year.<sup>12</sup>

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	97	89	94	76	72
Grade 1	95	90	76	83	78
Grade 2	75	96	81	69	80
Grade 3	69	70	91	72	69
Grade 4	39	71	68	85	69
Grade 5	34	42	76	64	73
Grade 6	-	41	35	74	71
Grade 7	-	-	34	36	77
Grade 8	-	-	-	34	40
Grade 9	-	-	-	-	35
Grade 10	-	-	-	-	-
Total Enrollment	409	499	555	593	664

\* 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.

### Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	4	18
Grade 1	4	20
Grade 2	4	20
Grade 3	3	23
Grade 4	3	23
Grade 5	3	24
Grade 6	3	24
Grade 7	4	19
Grade 8	3	13
Grade 9	3	12
Grade 10	-	-
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	100	

<sup>12</sup> Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

---

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

Please see additional demographic data in Section 4 of this report for information regarding the enrollment of special populations at HCZ Promise Academy II. This information includes enrollment data for the percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities as compared to the CSD and citywide averages, as well as targets proposed by the New York State Education Department.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup>

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.

---

<sup>14</sup> Please refer to the following website for more information:  
[http://nacsa.mycrowdwisdom.com/diweb/catalog/item/id/126547/q/%20q=performance\\*20framework&c=82](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 January 14-15, 2015.

- Gabrielle Mosquera, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Courtney Fields, Partnerships Manager, 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
- Lynnette Aqueron, Education Administrator and Senior School Improvement Specialist, NYC DOE Office of Special Education
- Jamal Young, Independent Consultant

## Part 4: Findings

### Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal HCZ Promise Academy II has demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

#### High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has five years of academic performance data and five years of New York State assessment data for elementary and middle school grades at the time of this report. For high school grades, as the school only began serving ninth grade in the 2013-2014 school year, only one year of academic performance data and New York State Regents assessment data is available. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments as well as other academic indicators, please see Appendix A.

NOTE: The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 ELA and math proficiency percentages should not be compared directly with prior-year results. Unlike prior years, proficiency on the NYS assessments for ELA and math in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 were based on the Common Core Learning Standards – a more demanding set of knowledge and skills necessary for 21<sup>st</sup> 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
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	62.1%	60.0%	56.1%	25.2%	26.4%
CSD 5	29.3%	31.1%	29.6%	13.4%	15.4%
Difference from CSD 5 *	32.8	28.9	26.5	11.8	11.0
NYC	46.1%	48.0%	48.4%	26.4%	28.4%
Difference from NYC *	16.0	12.0	7.7	-1.2	-2.0
New York State **	53.2%	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	8.9	7.2	1.0	-5.9	-4.2

% Proficient in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	81.4%	81.1%	76.4%	34.8%	45.3%
CSD 5	38.4%	40.0%	39.0%	13.1%	14.8%
Difference from CSD 5 *	43.0	41.1	37.4	21.7	30.5
NYC	57.4%	59.0%	60.9%	29.6%	34.2%
Difference from NYC *	24.0	22.1	15.5	5.2	11.1
New York State **	61.0%	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	20.4	17.8	11.6	3.7	9.1

\* 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	C	C	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	F	B	D	C	
Student Performance	A	A	A	B	
School Environment	A	B	C	C	

HCZ Promise Academy II did not receive high school progress reports during school years 2009-2010 through 2012-2013 as the school did not enroll ninth grade students until the 2013-2014 school year. NYC DOE Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.

### Mission and Academic Goals

According to the Renewal Application submitted to the NYC DOE by HCZ Promise Academy II, as well as annual reports submitted to the New York State Education Department, over each of the five years in the retrospective charter term, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- 5 of 11 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 4 of 10 in the second year,
- 4 of 10 in the third year,
- 2 of 6 in the fourth year,<sup>15</sup> and
- 3 of 8 in the fifth year.

<sup>15</sup> It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that 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 evaluate 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.

**Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals \***

Academic Goals	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1. Each year, the school will have an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% as calculated by ATS.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
2. Each year, 75% of students in grades three through eight who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA exams.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A	Not Met
3. Each year, 75% of students in grades three through eight who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS math exams.	Met	Met	Met	N/A	Not Met
4. Each year, 75% of students in grades four and eight who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science exams.	Met	Met	Met	Not Met	Met
5. Each year, 75% of students in grades five and eight who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Social Studies exams.	Met	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
6. Each year, grade-level cohorts of the same students (i.e. students who were continuously enrolled in the school at least two years on BEDS day) will reduce the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and 90% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam. In the event that the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 90% on the previous year's ELA exam, the school will demonstrate growth (from proficient to advanced) in the current year.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A	Not Met
7. Each year, grade-level cohorts of the same students (i.e. students who were continuously enrolled in the school at least two years on BEDS day) will reduce the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State math exam and 90% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State math exam. In the event that the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 90% on the previous year's math exam, the school will demonstrate growth (from proficient to advanced) in the current year.	Not Met	Partially Met	Partially Met	N/A	Partially Met

Academic Goals		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
8.	Each year, the school will earn a score sufficient to place it in the 75th percentile of all elementary/middle schools on the NYC DOE Progress Report.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A
9.	Each year, the school will earn a score sufficient to place it in the 75th percentile of all elementary/middle schools on the "Performance" section of the NYC DOE Progress Report.	Met	Met	Met	Met	N/A
10.	Each year, the school will earn a score sufficient to place it in the 75th percentile of all elementary/middle schools on the "Progress" section of the NYC DOE Progress Report.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	N/A
11.	Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Report Card.	Met	Met	Met	Met	Met
12.	Each year, 75% of students enrolled in grades nine through twelve will accumulate 10 or more credits towards graduation. The school will report this each September by submitting a report of student credit accumulation from the previous school year to the NYC DOE.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Met
13.	Each year, beginning in 2016-2017, 75% of the high school cohort will have scored at least 65 on the NYS Regents examinations in ELA.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
14.	Each year, beginning in 2016-2017, 75% of the high school cohort will have scored at least 65 on the NYS Regents examinations in Math.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
15.	Each year, beginning in 2016-2017, 75% of the high school cohort will have scored at least 65 on the NYS Regents examinations in Science (Living Environment, Chemistry, or other).	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
16.	Each year, at least 75% of each student cohort (as defined by NYSED) graduates within five years.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
17.	Each year, the school will earn a score sufficient to place it in the 75th percentile of all high schools on the NYC DOE Progress Report.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
18.	Each year, the school will earn a score sufficient to place it in the 75th percentile of all high schools in credit accumulation as measured by the NYC DOE Progress Report.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

\* 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 currently uses i-Ready as its school-wide ELA and math interim assessment system. In 2011-2012 this replaced several interim assessment tools the school had used throughout the charter term, including Acuity, Achieve 3000, and Study Island.
  - The school changed interim assessments in response to the increased proficiency cutoff scores for state assessments, as well as in preparation for the shift to Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS).

- The school currently administers i-Ready assessments three times per school year. Each assessment is followed by a Data Day where the staff reviews results and uses them to determine grouping and interventions for the next eight-week cycle of Tiers 2 and 3 of its Response to Intervention (RtI) program. These assessments are also used to determine intervention levels and programming in HCZ Promise Academy II's afterschool program.
- All i-Ready tools are available online, and the school has purchased tablets for classrooms so that these tools can be accessed at any time. Additionally, students are able to use the program at home and are rewarded for home usage.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on January 14-15, 2015. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**

- Beginning in 2010, the school has partnered with Columbia University's Teachers College Reading & Writing Project to implement the university's reading and writing workshop model as HCZ Promise Academy II's ELA program in grades kindergarten through eight.
  - The school follows the Project's units of study, which are revised yearly, and has implemented all Common Core-aligned changes made to the model. These study units are supplemented with the school's in-house developed Common Core-aligned interim unit assessments, which are now used across both HCZ Promise Academy charter schools.
  - The school also uses the Project's ELA benchmarks, which have been adjusted to align with CCLS, to monitor reading level progress five times per year. These are used in addition to Running Records, which are administered monthly.
- The school began using EngageNY as its math curriculum in grades kindergarten through eight in school year 2014-2015, integrating these modules with its existing math workshop instructional approach.
- School leadership reported an increased professional development (PD) focus across subjects on various elements of Common Core-aligned instruction, including higher-level questioning, analysis and inquiry, and authentic tasks. The school has increased its use of video studies to help model these techniques for both new and returning teachers.
- Partially in response to state assessment results, the school changed its grade configurations in school year 2014-2015 to enable increased concentration on instruction in grades kindergarten through two to better prepare students for testing grades. The school now consists of the following grade configurations: lower elementary, grades kindergarten through two; upper elementary, grades three through five; middle school, grades six through eight, and high school, grades nine and ten.

- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**

- HCZ Promise Academy II utilizes a three-tiered Response to Intervention (RtI) approach. The following intervention strategies are used to meet the needs of at-risk students:
  - Academic small group or one-to-one pull-out tutoring from Title I support staff and Teaching Assistants;
  - Differentiated small-group instruction by classroom teachers;
  - Differentiated small-group and one-to-one intervention from licensed Special Education teachers;
  - Individual action plans for students at risk of academic failure;
  - Afterschool tutoring from HCZ Promise Academy II instructors and afterschool staff; and
  - Saturday Academy.
- Classroom teachers are observed by learning specialists and offered strategies to better meet the needs of struggling students.

- School leadership reports that the school provides internal PD for teachers regarding struggling learners. At the time of the renewal visit, one on-going topic of PD discussion was the utilization of a cognitive approach to behavior and social emotional focus.
  - The school provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) in small groups as well as individually when mandated by a student's Individualized Education Program (IEP). At the time of the renewal visit, the school reported that pull-out and push-in services for SETSS are grouped based on students' abilities, and that SETSS teachers work with classroom teachers in planning to support students in and out of the classroom. Progress towards completion of students' IEP goals is reported to parents three times a year.
  - The school has hired a licensed speech teacher to provide mandated speech services and has also coordinated external providers, which the school feels has improved the service delivery to students. The school continues to use NYC DOE service providers for all remaining IEP-mandated speech services, all occupational therapy and physical therapy services, as well crisis paraprofessionals and hearing instructors.
  - The school has a psychologist on staff that supports students needing additional behavioral support through observation and the development of individual behavior intervention plans.
  - School leadership reports that providing services to English Language Learners (ELLs) has been a challenge during the charter term, specifically with respect to finding a certified English as a Second Language (ESL) teacher to provide these services.
    - At the time of the renewal visit, school leadership reported that ELL students with IEPs are receiving supports through SETSS and ELA instruction.
    - The school's learning specialists provide additional language supports for students identified as English Language Learners.
  - HCZ Promise Academy II supports accelerated learners through its partnership with the Bard Early Colleges Program. Current tenth grade students receive training in pre-college seminar courses and, in school year 2015-2016, will become the school's first cohort of students to enroll in credit-bearing college courses while still in high school. Thirteen ninth grade students and fifteen tenth grade students participate in the program in 2014-2015.
- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**
  - Beginning in 2010, the school adjusted its ELA coaching model and hired several ELA interventionists and coaches to provide real-time embedded professional development focused on instructional rigor.
  - Elementary school leadership reported that in response to ELA results on state assessments, the school has increased daily ELA instructional time from 90 minutes to 120 minutes.
    - Much of this time is focused on close reading, particularly in grades one and two, in which the school has implemented five-day close reading and assessment cycles.
    - Starting in school year 2014-2015, the school has implemented weekly PD sessions in its upper elementary grades that are facilitated by an ELA coach.
  - In addition to the instructional observation rubric utilized by Teacher's College, the school has adopted the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS) for informal and formal observation. School leadership reported that this system was chosen for its emphasis on positive feedback loops between teachers and students and is part of the school's efforts to increase student engagement.

During the renewal visit on January 14 – 15, 2015, 44 classrooms in grades kindergarten through ten were observed with the school's principals, assistant principals, and instructional coaches.

- In most observed elementary and middle school classes, teachers employed the Teachers College reading and writing workshop model or the school's own math

workshop model, usually with classes divided into three groups for more tailored instruction.

- Class sizes observed across all grade levels ranged from 11 to 18 students, with two teachers in all classrooms except for some focused on academic intervention. Observed instruction largely followed the model of one lead teacher delivering most instruction and the second teacher either monitoring or observing.
- Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations included some basic fact recall, but more frequently instructors challenged students to demonstrate understanding or to analyze and apply.
- In most classrooms, observed checks for understanding included questioning, polling, classwork, teacher observation, and use of student turn and talk.
- In most observed classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, and products, through small group instruction or independent practice, was observed. These methods of differentiation were consistent with the school's model.
- In all observed classrooms, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
- In all observed classrooms, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were off task for a short duration.
- Based on debriefs with the school's leadership team members after classroom visits, most 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 17 teachers. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers said they received regular PD on a weekly and monthly basis as well as through Teachers College on a rotating basis.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through both formal assessments (such as i-Ready) and informal assessments (such as observational notes, Running Records, and exit slip assessments). Teachers stated that classroom groupings were based on i-Ready data and adjusted based on informal assessments.
- Some interviewed teachers mentioned the use of the Danielson Rubric for formal and informal teacher evaluations conducted by the Principals, Assistant Principals, and coaches, while others spoke about the CLASS being used for these evaluations.
- Most interviewed teachers spoke readily and in positive terms regarding the performance expectations that had been communicated to them by school leadership.
- Most interviewed teachers described the school's approach to discipline as warm or positive, and many cited several types of positive incentives the school provides for good behavior in the classroom.
- All interviewed teachers reported having substantial resources for their lesson planning and general classroom instruction.

NYC DOE representatives conducted group interviews with 38 students in grades kindergarten through ten. The following was noted:

- Most interviewed students reported feeling academically challenged at the school, but at a level that was appropriate for them.
- All interviewed students reported that their teachers had high academic expectations for them and also felt supported by teachers in trying to reach those expectations.
- All interviewed students were able to name staff members who they could easily approach when in need of academic and/or social-emotional support.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 98% of parents agree or strongly agree “that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child” and 97% of parents who responded to the survey agree or strongly agree “that the school has high expectations for [their] child.”<sup>16</sup>

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey only 71% of teachers agree or strongly agree that “order and discipline are maintained at the school” and only 73% disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that “at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school.”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 52% of parent respondents strongly agree that HCZ Promise Academy II has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 46% agree with the statement. Similarly, 54% of parent respondents strongly agree that HCZ Promise Academy II has high expectations for their child; another 43% agree with the statement.

<sup>17</sup> According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 24% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at HCZ Promise Academy II; another 47% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 19% strongly disagree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 54% of teacher respondents disagree with the statement; 19% 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 developed its governance structure and organizational design.

On January 26, 2015, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE interviewed a representation of the school's Board of Trustees independent of the school leadership team. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has nine active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of seven members and maximum of 17 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Chair, Chief Executive Officer, and Treasurer positions, as specified in the bylaws, are currently filled. However, the bylaws specify a position of Secretary, which is vacant.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in the meeting minutes that were reviewed for Board meetings held for school years 2011-2012 through the current school year, 2014-2015 (27 meetings in total through December 2014).<sup>18</sup> However, according to the school's renewal application, in school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014 the Board did not hold the required number of monthly meetings as specified in its bylaws.<sup>19</sup>
- The school leaders provide standing updates to the Board on the academic progress at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes. Operational and financial updates are provided by the school's operations and finance staff, as well as by the school's CEO.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational chart and school leadership's monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.
- The Board eliminated the standing committee requirements from its bylaws in June 2014, as the content covered during prior standing committee meetings Finance, Executive, Student Achievement and Evaluation is addressed via regular updates by Board members, school leadership, and HCZ network leadership at every board meeting.
- The school's founder, Geoffrey Canada, is also its current Board Chair. HCZ Promise Academy II's lower elementary school (grades kindergarten through two) is led by Sheryl Ragland, who has been in her current leadership position for eight years; its upper elementary school (grades three through five) is led by Debra Sostre, who has been in her current leadership position for one year. HCZ Promise Academy II's middle school (grades six through eight) is led by Kevin Dougherty, who has been in his current leadership position for two years; and its high school is led by Asif Padela, who has been in this leadership position for two years. Prior to taking on their principal roles, the leaders of the upper elementary school, middle school and high school were in other roles with the Harlem Children's Zone organization.<sup>20</sup> The school also has a superintendent, Dr. Achil Petit, who has been part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization for 10 years and in his current position since June 2014, and a Chief Executive Officer (CEO), Anne Williams-Isom, who has been a part of the Harlem Children's Zone organization for six years and in her position as CEO since July 2014.

### **School Climate & Community Engagement**

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

---

<sup>18</sup> The NYC DOE did not collect Board minutes from HCZ Promise Academy II in school year 2010-2011.

<sup>19</sup> Self-reported information from the school's Renewal Data Collection Template, submitted November 2014.

<sup>20</sup> The leader of the lower elementary school, Sheryl Ragland, has been with HCZ Promise Academy II since the school's founding.

- The school has not met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% in any year of the retrospective charter term. Average daily attendance for students over the course of the charter term is provided in the table below.<sup>21</sup>

### Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School*</b>	<b>93.7%</b>	<b>93.0%</b>	<b>94.1%</b>	<b>94.1%</b>	<b>93.5%</b>
NYC**	93.4%	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	0.3	-0.2	0.2	0.5	0.3
High School Attendance					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School*</b>	-	-	-	-	<b>94.9%</b>
NYC**	-	-	-	-	86.5%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-	-	8.4

\* Attendance was taken from ATS.

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

- Instructional staff turnover has not been consistent over the charter term. In 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, the percentage of primary instructional staff who did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year was 17%, 45%, 17%, and 31%, respectively.<sup>22</sup> There is evidence that this has affected student performance in at least the 2011-2012 school year, during which time the school experienced 45% turnover in primary instructional staff.
- 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 Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School *					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Number of Students who Left the School	29	37	54	44	48
Percent of Students who Left the School	7.1%	7.4%	9.7%	7.4%	7.9%

\* 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.

<sup>21</sup> 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 aggregate attendance rates in its Renewal Application which differ from the aggregate attendance recorded in ATS for school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The school self-reported attendance rates of 94.0%, 93.0% and 93.0% for school years 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, respectively.

<sup>22</sup> Self-reported information from the school's Renewal Data Collection Form, submitted in November 2014

- 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 one of four selected questions. The percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for one of the three selected questions. The percentage of students agreeing or strongly agreeing was not above citywide averages for any 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 each parents, teachers and students (if participating) are presented below for each year of the charter term. In general, the response rates for HCZ Promise Academy II students have been above NYC averages (with the exception of the 2010-2011 school year) and the response rates for HCZ Promise Academy II parents have been above NYC averages in all years. The response rates for HCZ Promise Academy II teachers were above NYC averages in four of the five years of the retrospective charter term.

### NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree							
Survey Question		Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II 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.**	-	87%	59%	47%	42%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	-	48%	45%	44%	43%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	-	82%	74%	73%	78%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	98%	98%	95%	95%	96%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	94%	92%	92%	92%	93%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	97%	93%	91%	94%	94%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	89%	31%	39%	61%	71%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	100%	79%	79%	81%	96%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	100%	100%	94%	89%	91%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	-	-	52%	67%	80%	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*	Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School	-	82%	100%	100%	99%
	NYC	-	83%	82%	83%	83%
Parents	Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School	75%	67%	94%	84%	93%
	NYC	49%	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School	95%	71%	96%	96%	100%
	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, "each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC DOE School Survey in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more parents participate in the survey." 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, "each year, teachers will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the teacher section of the NYC DOE School Survey in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more teachers participate in the survey." The school met this goal in the 2009-2010 school year and partially met this goal in the 2010-2011 school year.<sup>23</sup> The school did not meet this goal in the 2011-2012 or 2012-2013 school years. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school's charter goals include, "each year, for students in grades five and higher, students will express satisfaction with the school as determined by the teacher section of the NYC DOE Learning Environment Survey in which the school will receive scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more of students enrolled participate in the survey." The school partially met this goal in the 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 school years.<sup>24</sup> This goal was not applicable for the 2009-2010 or 2013-2014 school years.

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:

- In response to challenges meeting organizational goals related to engagement, safety, and respect, HCZ Promise Academy II has implemented several measures to strengthen school culture.
  - Due to several incidents of violence in the community surrounding its primary campus, the school has developed and implemented lockdown protocols. School leadership reported that incidents of outside violence have decreased in recent years from eight

<sup>23</sup> 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 2010-2011 school year, HCZ Promise Academy II received fewer than 7.5 points based on teacher responses in all categories except the Academic Expectations category.

<sup>24</sup> 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 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years, HCZ Promise Academy II received fewer than 7.5 points based on student responses in all categories except the Academic Expectations category. In the 2012-2013 school year HCZ Promise Academy II received fewer than 7.5 points based on student responses in two of the four categories— Engagement, and Safety and Respect.

lockdowns in school year 2012-2013 to four in 2013-2014 and none in 2014-2015 by the time of the renewal visit in January 2015.

- The school uses “Safety Knights” to accompany students through potentially unsafe areas to access public transportation.
- The school implements character education programs at the middle school and high school levels. Middle school students attend a daily advisory program wherein groups of 10 or fewer students discuss developmentally relevant character traits and participate in team-building exercises. The high school launched a personal and social development program in 2014-2015 that involves in-class activities, workshops, and mentoring.
- The school has ceased using a “safe room” for in-school suspensions and no longer implements Saturday detentions. At the time of the renewal visit in January 2015, school leadership reported that there were no out-of-school suspensions at the elementary school level in 2014-2015 and that overall suspension totals had decreased substantially from those of the prior school year.
  - According to the school’s Renewal Data Collection Form, in the 2013-2014 school year 6% of students received in-school suspensions. Though this is a relatively low percentage, it was the highest of the school’s charter term.
- The school created student government structures at the middle school and high school levels to provide students with increased leadership opportunities.
- The school has significantly expanded its athletics program during the charter term, supplementing its existing basketball and cheerleading programs with girls volleyball at the high school level as well as co-ed volleyball, baseball, girls softball, and track and field at the middle school level.
- The school has also made several efforts to increase overall yearly attendance due to failure to meet its organizational goal of 95% during any year of the current charter term.
  - After discovering in 2011 that students who had moved to the Bronx were disproportionately late and absent compared to their peers still residing in Harlem, the school began using private buses to transport these students.
  - The school now incorporates attendance into its promotional criteria, and absence reports are generated weekly to identify students with repeated absences. Students with consistently high attendance receive incentives.
- The school developed a partnership with Jazz at Lincoln Center (JALC) in school year 2012-2013 in order to provide all students and teachers with the following enrichment opportunities:
  - Students in grades kindergarten through two receive weekly instruction from JALC clinicians during their general music periods.
  - Students in grades three and four may attend three in-house concerts per school year given by staff members of JALC’s Jazz for Young People program.
  - Students in grades four through seven may join the school’s “beginning band,” which is taught by HCZ Promise Academy II staffers and utilizes JALC’s Marsalis Beginning Band Method curriculum.
  - Students in grade five may attend concerts at JALC’s Rose Hall at no cost.
  - Students in grades eight through ten may join the school’s jazz band, taught by both HCZ Promise Academy II and JALC staffers.
  - The school’s music teachers may receive PD from JALC, including the chance to attend the organization’s Band Director Academy.
- All HCZ Promise Academy II students and families have access to the HCZ pipeline of services, including: Baby College, a nine-week parenting program; Three-Year Old Journey, a multi week, tri-lingual educational program; HCZ’s Pre-Kindergarten program, Harlem Gems; Healthy Harlem, an obesity prevention program; counseling; and after-school programming for remediation, enrichment, recreational, and athletic programs. In addition, HCZ offers HCZ Promise Academy II access to its College Success Program, a set of post-secondary supports for current college students.
- HCZ Promise Academy II leadership reports that the school has an active Parents As Partners Association (PAPA) that holds monthly meetings which are open to the public. The school’s parent coordinators are the staffers primarily responsible for liaising with the PAPA and engaging its assistance in organizing school events and improving parent communication strategies.

- All HCZ Promise Academy II families have access to the Infinite Campus Parent Portal, which provides information related to each student's attendance and grades, as well as school-wide special announcements. The school also uses Infinite Campus Messenger to send parents automated phone calls, text messages, and emails regarding important school information.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school on January 14, 2015 at 35 East 125th Street New York, NY 10035 in an effort to elicit public comments. About 45 participants attended the hearing with 12 persons speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made during December 2014 and January 2015 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.

## Financial Health

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

- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's current ratio of 2.14 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash of \$5,966,881 representing 152 days to cover its operating expenses for at least two months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of November 30, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

## Financial Sustainability

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

- Based on the financial audits from FY10/FY11 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus over these audited fiscal years, though the school operated at a deficit in FY14.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.46 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY10/FY11 through FY14, the school generated overall positive cash flow from FY10/FY11 to FY14, and the school had positive cash flow in each measurable year.

There was no material weakness noted in the FY14 independent financial audit; however, the following material weaknesses were noted in the audited financials for FY10/FY11 through FY13.

- A material weakness in the internal control over financial reporting with regard to the school's journal entry process and the auditors noted a lack of segregation of duties.
- A significant deficiency in the internal control over financial reporting with regard to the following:
  - Accounting for 457(f) Plan – the school did not retain adequate documentation or approval of calculations performed for payments made to terminated employees and the school did not have formal policies or procedures in place for the payments to terminated employees.
  - Accounting for in-kind contributions – the school recorded an expense and payable for bonuses pertaining to FY13, however these bonuses were paid by HCZ, not the school. The school recorded an incorrect amount of in-kind revenue and expense for employer payroll taxes that were paid by HCZ for the school's employees. The school did not record in-kind revenue and expense for the free space provided by HCZ.
  - Bank Reconciliation – the school did not complete bank reconciliations on a monthly basis for its payroll account.
  - Accounting Staff – the school did not implement adequate monitoring controls and there were significant processes that were not supported by up-to-date written policies and procedures.

Based on document review and an interview during the visit to the school, the following was noted:

- HCZ handles the accounting function on behalf of both HCZ Promise Academy II and its sister school, Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy I Charter School. The office has been reorganized to segregate duties by function (accounts payable, bank reconciliation, etc.) as opposed to by organization. The permanent Chief Financial Officer was hired as of June 2014. He has hired two assistant controllers and additional finance support staff.

- The school agreed with the financial auditors that the ability to both prepare and post journals was not a proper segregation of duties but noted there were no improper journal entries as a result.
- Accounting for the 457(f) plan was transferred to the new Controller and, effective FY14, they will ensure each payment to employees is properly authorized and documented.
- Effective FY14, HCZ implemented weekly staff meetings for the financial and business office personnel of HCZ and the school to better ensure proper coordination of accounting and payments between the two parties.
- HCZ has implemented a new staffing plan to better define roles and add resources to improve the quality and timeliness of internal and external financial reporting.

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

As of the review in January 2015, the Board of Trustees for HCZ Promise Academy II is in compliance with:

- **Membership size.** Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, a minimum of seven and maximum of 17 members.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.<sup>25</sup>
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has consistently made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting them to the school's website.
- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** The board has consistently submitted board resignation notices or new board member credentials within the required five days of change to OSDCP for review and, if necessary, approval.

As of the review in January 2015, the Board of Trustees for HCZ Promise Academy II is out of compliance with:

- **Required number of monthly meetings.** The school's bylaws indicate that the Board is to hold 10 meetings a year, inclusive of its annual meeting. In school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2013-2014, the Board did not hold the required number of monthly meetings, as evidenced by the Board Yearly Meeting Schedule and the posted meeting minutes. Required meetings are those which met quorum. Further, the Charter Schools Act requires that the Board hold monthly meetings over a period of 12 calendar months per year. The Board has not updated its bylaws to comply with this law.
- **Timely submission of documents.** Although the Board did consistently submit the Annual Report to the New York State Education Department by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term, it did not consistently submit the independent financial audit portion of this report by the deadline of November 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for fiscal years 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013. The school has posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law.

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

- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Insurance.** The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2014-2015 school year, the school had an application deadline of July 13, 2012 and lottery date of August 6, 2012, 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.<sup>26</sup>
- **Fire Emergency.** One or more of the school leaders were trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.
- **Student Discipline Plan.** The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of its Student Discipline Policy for the 2014-2015 academic year. This policy was determined to be compliant with federal law.

---

<sup>25</sup> Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

<sup>26</sup> The school conducts its lottery two years in advance of each school year and encourages lottery participants to attend either HCZ's or other community pre-kindergarten programs.

- **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.

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

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members do not have appropriate fingerprint clearance. At the time of this report, the NYC DOE is able to confirm that there are four staff members for whom the school does not have fingerprint clearance, and an additional 20 teachers for whom the school is unable to produce verification documentation due to known system difficulties.
- **Teacher certification.** The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is not 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. The school is out of compliance with 8 uncertified teachers.
- **Immunization.** The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is not in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization, with 98.8% of its students fully immunized.

### 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.<sup>27</sup>
- In all years of the retrospective charter term, including the most recently completed school year 2013-2014, HCZ Promise Academy II:
  - served a lower percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to both the CSD 5 and citywide percentages;
  - served a lower percentage of students with disabilities compared to both the CSD 5 and citywide percentages; and
  - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to both the CSD 5 and citywide percentages.

---

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

## Enrollment of Special Populations<sup>28</sup>

Special Population		2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Proposed)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>78.6%</b>	<b>77.5%</b>	<b>75.4%</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>90.5%</b>
	CSD 5	95.2%	93.4%	93.4%	90.4%	87.8%	
	NYC	86.7%	81.7%	84.0%	82.9%	82.0%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	<b>12.7%</b>	<b>14.2%</b>	<b>15.1%</b>	<b>15.5%</b>	<b>18.2%</b>	<b>16.7%</b>
	CSD 5	20.9%	21.1%	19.9%	21.1%	23.3%	
	NYC	17.7%	17.8%	17.9%	18.5%	20.1%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>4.7%</b>	<b>5.9%</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>13.5%</b>
	CSD 5	16.7%	16.9%	14.7%	13.8%	12.3%	
	NYC	18.1%	17.0%	15.9%	15.1%	14.5%	

Additional Enrollment Information					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Grades Served	K-5	K-6	K-7	K-8	K-9
CSD(s)	5	5	5	5	5

<sup>28</sup> Comparisons of a charter school's special populations to the CSD and City are made relative only to the grades served by the school. For example, if a charter school serves grades kindergarten through five, comparisons of that school's special populations will only be made relative to grades kindergarten through five in the CSD and citywide. CSD comparisons are particular to the grades served in each CSD each year. Enrollment rates reflect demographic characteristics as of June 1 and enrollment as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.

State enrollment targets were generated by a calculator developed by the State Education Department (SED). Once a school's CSD, total enrollment and grade span are entered, the calculator generates a school-specific enrollment target. The CSD for a multi-district school is the primary CSD as determined by each school. The enrollment is determined by the total number of students enrolled as of October 31, 2013. Any school with an unusual grade configuration (i.e. K, 6-9) should use an available grade configuration provided by SED that is most aligned as determined by the DOE, otherwise a school's actual grade span is used. For more information regarding SED's methodology behind the calculation of charter school enrollment and retention targets, please refer to the memo at <http://www.regents.nysed.gov/meetings/2012Meetings/July2012/712brca11.pdf>.

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

As part of its next charter term the school plans to:

- Continue phase-in of high school with expansion of grades served from kindergarten through ten to kindergarten through twelve; and
- Continue phase-in of maximum authorized enrollment to 1,040 students.

The school also noted that it plans to make the following changes as part of its next charter term:

- The school revised its organizational structure to reflect lines of reporting related to a stronger role the central office will assume in the next charter term.
- The school revised its medical services policies to align with NYC DOE immunization requirements and to reflect current internal protocols.
- The school revised its promotion criteria to align with NYC DOE promotion standards, including the revision to Chancellor's Regulation A-501.
- The school revised its Behavior and Discipline Code to align with NYC DOE Chancellor's Regulations related to student discipline.
- The school decreased its number of instructional days from 210 to 202 to provide staff with more professional development time during the summer months.
- The school revised its fiscal protocols to align with procedural changes within HCZ's fiscal department.

## 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.<sup>29</sup>

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.<sup>30</sup> 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;

---

<sup>29</sup> See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

<sup>30</sup> See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction; and
- The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal.<sup>31</sup>

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.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.

<sup>32</sup> See § 2852(5).

## Part 6: NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

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

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

### ***Full-Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions***

In cases where a school has demonstrated exceptional results with its students, a five-year renewal will be granted. A school must show that its program has clearly and consistently demonstrated high academic attainment and/or consistent and significant student academic progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has demonstrated operational viability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

### ***Short Term Renewal, With or Without Conditions***

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

### ***Non-Renewal***

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

### ***Grade Expansions or Enrollment Changes***

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

## The NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

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

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

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

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

### **1. Is the School an Academic Success?**

#### **1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement**

Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below:

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

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

- Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute and comparative performance, individual student progress, progress for at-risk populations, etc.)
- HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates
- Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results
- Grades 8-12 College Readiness Credit Accumulation
- Percentage of Students Applying to and Being Admitted to College
- Percentage of Students Taking AP Courses and/or Percentage of Students Passing AP Courses
- When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results
- Results on state accountability measures
- Charter School Academic Goals
- School-reported internal assessments
- NYC DOE Progress Reports or School Quality Reports<sup>33</sup>

### **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

<sup>33</sup> 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 location<sup>34</sup> 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

<sup>34</sup> School-specific targets for enrollment and retention are to come from the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

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

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

### **3c. Applicable Regulations**

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

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

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

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

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

### 4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

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

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

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

- Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Renewal application revised charter submission, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Charter revision or merger applications
- Leadership and Board interviews

### 4b. Organizational Sustainability

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

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

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

- Charter renewal application
- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organizational chart
- Staff rosters
- Staff handbook
- Leadership and staff interviews
- Budget

#### **4c. School or Model Improvements**

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

- Review performance carefully and even without major changes through expansion or replication, are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success
- Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission

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

- Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Renewal application revised charter including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and Board interviews
- Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) with partners or important vendors

## Appendix A: School Performance Data

### Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>					
Grade 3	66.7%	55.7%	44.6%	32.4%	10.1%
Grade 4	50.0%	62.3%	71.6%	11.9%	39.1%
Grade 5	66.7%	57.1%	55.1%	34.9%	15.3%
Grade 6	-	66.7%	51.2%	19.4%	31.0%
Grade 7	-	-	64.7%	44.7%	27.3%
Grade 8	-	-	-	15.2%	42.5%
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 5 *</b>					
Grade 3	33.8	27.1	14.3	18.9	-3.4
Grade 4	22.2	29.1	42.5	0.2	23.1
Grade 5	39.5	24.4	24.2	23.8	2.2
Grade 6	-	36.6	19.6	5.5	15.3
Grade 7	-	-	38.2	29.7	10.6
Grade 8	-	-	-	0.4	25.6
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM NYC</b>					
Grade 3	20.2	7.6	-4.4	4.3	-19.8
Grade 4	4.4	11.3	19.2	-15.3	8.0
Grade 5	20.5	8.1	2.9	6.3	-13.1
Grade 6	-	23.1	5.9	-3.9	5.7
Grade 7	-	-	21.4	19.3	0.5
Grade 8	-	-	-	-10.3	13.6

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics					
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
<b>Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School</b>					
Grade 3	82.6%	77.1%	59.8%	56.3%	34.8%
Grade 4	76.3%	94.3%	94.0%	20.2%	62.3%
Grade 5	84.8%	65.1%	84.5%	42.9%	22.2%
Grade 6	-	82.1%	70.7%	31.0%	60.6%
Grade 7	-	-	76.5%	26.3%	38.2%
Grade 8	-	-	-	28.1%	62.5%
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 5 *</b>					
Grade 3	43.9	42.2	22.9	40.3	17.5
Grade 4	38.2	51.1	54.4	4.9	43.9
Grade 5	46.3	23.0	43.2	34.2	8.1
Grade 6	-	42.4	31.2	14.6	41.4
Grade 7	-	-	38.6	15.5	25.3
Grade 8	-	-	-	17.1	55.7
<b>DIFFERENCE FROM NYC</b>					
Grade 3	28.3	22.3	2.8	23.2	-3.9
Grade 4	17.9	32.0	28.3	-15.0	22.4
Grade 5	25.1	2.2	19.3	13.3	-16.5
Grade 6	-	26.1	11.4	2.2	26.8
Grade 7	-	-	19.2	1.3	8.6
Grade 8	-	-	-	2.4	39.7

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

### Regents Pass Rates

Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy II Charter School	
	2013-2014
Integrated Algebra	100.0%
Algebra 2 / Trigonometry	-
Comprehensive English	-
U.S. History	-
Chemistry	-
Physics	-
Living Environment	100.0%
Language Other Than English	-

## Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

### NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Comprehensive Report 2013-2014](#)

[Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-2013](#)

[Annual Site Visit Report 2011-2012](#)