Department of Education
Carmen Fariña, Chancellor

KIPP ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT

2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR
APRIL 2015

Table of Contents

PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION **2**

I. CHARTER SCHOOL OVERVIEW: 2

Background Information *2*

Overview of School-Specific Data *3*

II. RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE 6

PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY **14**

PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW **17**

PART 4: FINDINGS **19**

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success? *19*

Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization? *31*

Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? *38*

Essential Question 4: What are the School's Plans for the Next Charter Term? *42*

PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS **43**

PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK **46**

APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA **58**

APPENDIX B: HIGH SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA **61**

APPENDIX C: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA **67**

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Background Information

KIPP Academy Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	David Massey (through March 2015)
School Leader(s)	Carolyn Petruzziello (ES), Frank Corcoran (MS), Natalie Webb (HS), Josh Zoia (KIPP NYC Superintendent)
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	KIPP NYC LLC
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 7
Physical Address(es)	730 Concourse Village West, Bronx (Grades K-4)
	250 East 156 Street, Bronx (Grades 5-8)
	201 East 144th Street, Bronx (Grades 9-12)
Facility Owner(s)	DOE (the elementary and high school sites are Charter Partnership buildings)
School Opened For Instruction	2000-2001
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	5/16/2015
Current Authorized Grade Span	K-12
Current Authorized Enrollment	855
Proposed New Charter Term	4 years [May 17, 2015 – June 30, 2019]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	K-12
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	1,220
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	Grades K-8: 3-4 sections per grade; Grades 9-12: N/A

Overview of School-Specific Data

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

Academic Goal Analysis					
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	Cumulative Charter Term Total
Total Achievable Goals	29	29	29	29	116
# Met	11	9	16	12	48
# Partially Met	1	2	0	0	3
# Not Met	4	5	8	12	29
# Not Applicable *	13	13	5	5	36
% Met	38%	31%	55%	41%	41%
% Partially Met	3%	7%	0%	0%	3%
% Not Met	14%	17%	28%	41%	25%
% Not Applicable *	45%	45%	17%	17%	31%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	69%	56%	67%	50%	60%

* Some goals may not be applicable in all years. For example, goals related to the NYC Progress Report are not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year as Progress Reports were not issued that year.

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP Academy Charter School	51.7%	63.3%	26.8%	20.8%
CSD 7	20.3%	23.5%	9.1%	9.2%
Difference from CSD 7 *	31.4	39.8	17.7	11.6
NYC	41.0%	45.0%	26.2%	28.4%
Difference from NYC *	10.7	18.3	0.6	-7.6
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-1.1	8.2	-4.3	-9.8

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP Academy Charter School	86.9%	84.5%	43.4%	51.4%
CSD 7	36.0%	38.0%	8.9%	12.6%
Difference from CSD 7 *	50.9	46.5	34.5	38.8
NYC	56.7%	59.3%	28.5%	34.2%
Difference from NYC *	30.2	25.2	14.9	17.2
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	23.6	19.7	12.3	15.2

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself served. CSD comparisons are particular to the CSD in which the school was sited each year.
** New York State proficiency rates were taken from data.nysed.gov.

Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP Academy Charter School - All Students	**65.0%**	**75.0%**	**61.0%**	**56.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	23.6%	97.9%	52.8%	27.0%
City Percent of Range- All Students	36.7%	92.5%	39.2%	22.1%
KIPP Academy Charter School – School's Lowest Third	**72.5%**	**81.0%**	**69.5%**	**68.5%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	33.6%	100.0%	35.1%	30.1%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	31.2%	80.3%	27.6%	27.9%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP Academy Charter School - All Students	**82.0%**	**80.0%**	**75.0%**	**67.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	82.9%	96.8%	96.9%	60.1%
City Percent of Range- All Students	88.8%	97.8%	87.8%	64.3%
KIPP Academy Charter School – School's Lowest Third	**83.0%**	**76.5%**	**80.0%**	**69.0%**
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	87.1%	77.6%	76.1%	31.1%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	86.1%	77.9%	71.0%	38.7%

Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities *	50.0%	60.0%	51.5%	44.9%
English Language Learner Students	35.1%	45.9%	47.2%	31.6%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	39.3%	55.9%	50.9%	44.3%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities *	68.2%	44.0%	66.7%	49.0%
English Language Learner Students	54.1%	59.5%	58.3%	37.5%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	62.5%	53.3%	77.1%	51.4%

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

KIPP Academy Charter School is one of four charter schools supported by the KIPP NYC LLC (KIPP NYC) Charter Management Organization (CMO) that share high school resources, staff, and space at 201 East 144th Street, Bronx. The KIPP NYC CMO refers to this building, and the four schools sharing staff and resources within it, as KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School.[1] KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School is not a legal charter school, but rather the collection of the high school grades of four unique charter schools: KIPP Academy Charter School, KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School, and KIPP Infinity Charter School. Only three of these schools are authorized by the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) Chancellor. Beginning in the 2010-2011 school year, the NYC DOE began grouping the high school grades of the four KIPP NYC CMO schools together for public reporting and accountability purposes, including the NYC School Survey, NYC DOE Progress Reports, and the 2013-2014 NYC School Quality Reports.

The high school graduation rates presented below reflect high school students from KIPP Academy Charter School only.

For high school performance data reflecting all students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School (i.e. high school students enrolled in the four KIPP NYC CMO schools serving high school students), including data on weighted Regents pass rates, credit accumulation, and closing the achievement gap metrics, please see Appendix B.

[1] The four KIPP NYC CMO schools whose high school grades together make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School are KIPP Academy Charter School, KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School and KIPP Infinity Charter School. KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School is not authorized by the NYC DOE Chancellor.

HS Performance Compared to NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013***	**2013-2014**
KIPP Academy Charter School	-	-	87.9%	96.4%
NYC **	-	-	66.0%	68.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	21.9	28.0

* 2012-2013 was the first school year in which KIPP Academy Charter School served 12th grade students.
** The New York State graduation rate calculation method was first adopted in NYC for the Cohort of 2001 (Class of 2005). The cohort consists of all students who first entered ninth grade in a given school year (e.g., the Cohort of 2005 entered ninth grade in the 2005-2006 school year). Graduates are defined as those students earning either a Local or Regents diploma and exclude those earning either a special education (IEP) diploma or GED.

II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 4 year short term renewal with one operational/compliance condition.

The operational/compliance condition is as follows:

1. **As part of its oversight of KIPP Academy Charter School in its next term, the NYC DOE will require the school to report twice per school year on the results of its planned corrective actions to address the high rate of uncertified teachers employed by the school. This report should show that the school has made significant progress in reducing the number of uncertified teachers in order to be in compliance with the Charter Schools Act, which 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, by the end of the next charter term.**

As part of the renewal application, KIPP Academy Charter School submitted one material revision. The NYC DOE determination is as follows: regarding the material revision to increase the authorized maximum enrollment to 1,229 students during the next charter term, the NYC DOE approves this material revision consistent with the length of the new renewal charter term (four years). This will increase the maximum authorized enrollment for KIPP Academy Charter School to 1,220 students. Under the school's current charter (which expires on May 16, 2015), enrollment was permitted up to 15% above the maximum authorized enrollment; in the renewal charter agreement, the 15% allowance over maximum authorized enrollment has been eliminated for all NYC DOE Chancellor-authorized schools.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, KIPP Academy Charter School 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 KIPP Academy Charter School indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting some of these objectives.

Mission and Vision
KIPP Academy Charter School's (KIPP Academy) mission is to graduate students with the strength of character and academic abilities to succeed in life—and in so doing, to prove what is possible in urban schools. The school executes against this mission by providing a results-focused instructional program that emphasizes both academic achievement and character building. KIPP Academy students benefit from a continuum of services throughout their education, including KIPP Through College, a program designed to ensure that all KIPP Academy middle school graduates, including those who do not attend KIPP Academy's high school, attend and graduate from college.

School Specific Academic Performance
The school entered its fifteenth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The New York City Department of Education has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data and four years of other academic indicator(s) to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at KIPP Academy Charter School over the course of the retrospective charter term.

Annual aggregate English Language Arts (ELA) and math proficiency rates on the NYS assessments for KIPP Academy Charter School have generally exceeded those of both Community School District (CSD) 7 and New York City during the current charter term.[2]

Beginning with the 2012-2013 school year, NYS assessments were aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS). As such, proficiency rates for school years prior to the 2012-2013 year are not directly comparable.

In 2012-2013, 43.4% of KIPP Academy Charter School's students were proficient in math on the NYS assessments. KIPP Academy Charter School's math proficiency was greater than or equal to that of 75% of all elementary/middle schools citywide and 100% of elementary/middle schools in CSD 7. When compared to elementary/middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools) KIPP Academy Charter School outperformed 90% of similar schools. In 2012-2013, 26.8% of KIPP Academy Charter School's students demonstrated proficiency on state assessments in ELA. With this level of proficiency, KIPP Academy Charter School outperformed 62% of all elementary/middle schools citywide and 100% of elementary/middle schools in CSD 7. KIPP Academy Charter School also outperformed 87% of its peer schools.

The following year, in 2013-2014, the percent of students at KIPP Academy Charter School who were proficient in math on the NYS assessments rose to 51.4%. KIPP Academy Charter School's math proficiency was higher than 76% of all elementary/middle schools citywide. When compared to peer schools, KIPP Academy Charter School again outperformed 90% of similar schools and outperformed 100% of CSD 7 elementary/middle schools. However, in 2013-2014 the percent of students at KIPP Academy Charter School who demonstrated proficiency on the NYS assessments in ELA fell to 20.8%. With this level of proficiency, KIPP Academy Charter School

[2] The only exception is for ELA proficiency in 2013-2014, when KIPP Academy Charter School's aggregate ELA proficiency was 7.6 percentage points below the overall NYC proficiency for the comparable grade span.

outperformed only 42% of all elementary/middle schools citywide and 53% of elementary/middle schools in its peer group. However, the school still outperformed 100% of elementary/middle schools in CSD 7.[3]

In 2013-2014, KIPP Academy Charter School's median adjusted growth percentile on the NYS ELA assessments was 56.0% with a City Percent of Range of only 22.1%, placing the school in the bottom 10% of all elementary/middle schools citywide.[4] Similarly, the school's peer and CSD percentiles were 17% and 0%, respectively. This means that all other elementary/middle schools in CSD 7 and more than four-fifths of the all other elementary/middle schools in KIPP Academy Charter School's peer group had an ELA median adjusted growth percentile greater than KIPP Academy Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

In 2013-2014, KIPP Academy Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile on the NYS assessments was 67.0% with a City Percent of Range of 64.3%, placing it in the 70th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. The school's peer group and CSD percentiles were 57% and 100%, respectively. This means all other elementary/middle schools in CSD 7 and more than half of other elementary/middle schools in KIPP Academy Charter School's peer group had math median adjusted growth percentiles lower than KIPP Academy Charter School's math median adjusted growth percentile in 2013-2014.

As noted above, KIPP Academy Charter School is one of four KIPP NYC CMO charter schools that share high school resources, staff, and space. The high school grades of these schools are collectively known as KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. For more information on the aggregate academic performance of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, which is not a legal or stand-alone chartered entity, please see Appendix B. The high school graduation and Regents pass rate information presented below reflects high school students from only KIPP Academy Charter School.

For the 2013-2014 school year, KIPP Academy Charter School's four-year graduation rate was 96.4%. This rate was higher than the citywide average by 28.0 percentage points. For KIPP Academy Charter School students who took Regents exams in 2013-2014, more than 90 percent of these students passed Regents exams in Integrated Algebra (92.9%), Comprehensive English (96.1%), U.S. History (98.4%), Living Environment (94.7%) and a Language other than English (98.4%).[5] In addition, between 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 KIPP Academy Charter School's Regents pass rates increased for four exams, including three of the previously mentioned Regents exams: Comprehensive English, U.S. History, Physics and Living Environment.

Over the four years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, KIPP Academy Charter School has met 60% of its applicable academic charter goals.[6] KIPP Academy Charter School met 12 of 24 applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year.[7] Because of

---

[3] Please note that there were only four elementary/middle schools in CSD 7 in the 2013-2014 school year.

[4] 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 22.1% indicates that the school's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was below the average and more than one standard deviation below the average (that only 22.1% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of KIPP Academy Charter School), while a citywide percentile of 10% indicates that KIPP Academy Charter School's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 10% of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

[5] In 2013-2014, 98.4% of KIPP Academy Charter School students passed the Spanish Regents exam with a score of 65 or above.

[6] 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).

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

the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not evaluate goals that measure a school's academic performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math 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's achievement rate of its stated charter goals over the retrospective charter term has been greater than or equal to 50% each year; however, the school experienced its lowest achievement rate (50%) in the most recent school year.

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Elementary/Middle School Progress Report, KIPP Academy Charter School received an Overall grade of A, as well as an A grade for Student Performance and School Environment. The school received a B grade for Student Progress. This ranked KIPP Academy Charter School in the 85th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide, but represented a slight decline in overall performance from the prior year. On its 2011-2012 NYC DOE Middle School Progress Report, KIPP Academy Charter School received an A grade in all sections, including as its Overall grade. This ranked KIPP Academy Charter School in the 99th percentile of all middle schools citywide.[8] On its 2010-2011 Progress Report, the school also earned an overall A grade.

As previously noted, KIPP Academy Charter School is one of four KIPP NYC CMO charter schools, only three of which are authorized by the NYC DOE Chancellor, that feed into KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. KIPP Academy Charter School did not receive a high school Progress Report for the 2012-2013 school year that reflected performance, progress, and environment for the high school students specifically registered to KIPP Academy Charter School. However, a Progress Report was produced for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School based on the high school performance data of students enrolled at all four KIPP NYC charter schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. For more information on the Progress Report for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, please see Appendix B.

NYC DOE Progress Reports graded each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and were based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores were based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of 40 schools with similar student populations and to all schools citywide. The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report was the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constituted 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section was primarily based on median adjusted growth percentiles,[9] 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

---

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.

[8] In school years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 KIPP Academy Charter School was classified as a middle school for purposes of the NYC DOE Progress Report.

[9] 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.

performance of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, 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, 51.4% of KIPP Academy Charter School's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level of growth places KIPP Academy Charter School in the 58th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, 44.3% of KIPP Academy Charter 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 places KIPP Academy Charter School in the 16th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 49.0% of KIPP Academy Charter School's students with disabilities experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students with disabilities citywide with the same starting math scores. This level of growth places KIPP Academy Charter School in the 63rd percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. In the same year, 44.9% of KIPP Academy Charter 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 places KIPP Academy Charter School in the 21st percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 37.5% of KIPP Academy Charter School's English Language Learner students experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other English Language Learner students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places KIPP Academy Charter School in 44th percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide. Similarly, 31.6% 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 KIPP Academy Charter School in only the 23rd percentile of all elementary/middle schools citywide.

Please see Appendix B for high school closing the achievement gap data, which reflects high school students from all KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School and is not limited to those enrolled at KIPP Academy Charter School.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

KIPP Academy Charter School 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:

- KIPP Academy Charter School's FY11, FY12, FY13, and FY14 independent financial audits;
- KIPP Academy Charter School's FY15 budget and five-year projected budget;
- KIPP Academy Charter School's 2014-2015 staff handbook;
- KIPP Academy Charter School's 2014-2015 student/family handbook;
- On-site review of KIPP Academy Charter School's financial and operational records;
- KIPP Academy Charter School's self-reported staffing data;
- KIPP Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees meeting minutes;
- KIPP Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees bylaws; and
- KIPP Academy Charter School's financial disclosure forms.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. The Board Chair as of the time of this report, David Massey, has been on the Board since January 1994. Mr. Massey is stepping down from the KIPP Academy Charter School Board at the end of March 2015. The current KIPP Academy Charter School Board Treasurer and Secretary, Rafael Mayer, has been nominated as the new Board Chair. The Board's level of membership has stayed consistently within the minimum of five members and maximum of 25 members established in the Board's bylaws; the Board currently has seven members.

Over the course of the school's retrospective charter term, the Board's bylaws did not require a specified number of regular Board meetings. In the past four academic years including the current year, 2011-2012 through 2014-2015, the Board held between three and four meetings which met quorum during the academic year, including its annual meeting. The NYC DOE reviewed 12 sets of Board minutes from the retrospective charter term, all of which met quorum. The KIPP Academy Charter School Board of Trustees holds its meeting concurrently with the meetings of the other four KIPP NYC affiliated charter schools and the KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School advisory Board.

The Superintendent, an employee of the collective KIPP NYC charter schools' Boards of Trustees, regularly updates the Board on academic progress at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes, and regular operational and financial updates are provided by the KIPP NYC operations and finance staff. These non-academic updates are provided by members of the KIPP NYC support team and not the KIPP Academy school leadership team.

Over the course of the school's current charter term, the school has developed a stable school culture. The members of the core school leadership team have held their positions since 2011 at the latest. The school's leadership team includes: Carolyn Petruzziello, Elementary School Principal, who has held this position since 2009; Frank Corcoran, Middle School Principal, who has held this position since 2011; and Natalie Webb, High School Principal, who has held this position since July 2009. Ms. Petruzziello will end her tenure in June 2015; current Assistant Principal Tyritia Groves will take over the role of Elementary School Principal at that time. The school is also overseen by KIPP NYC Superintendent Josh Zoia, who joined KIPP NYC in 2011 and has held the position of KIPP NYC Superintendent since July 2012. Mr. Zoia will end his tenure in this position in June 2015. Starting in July 2015, Jim Manly will assume the position of KIPP NYC Superintendent.

Instructional staff turnover has averaged 18% over the four academic years in the retrospective charter term. At KIPP Academy, instructional staff turnover has fluctuated between a low of 15% and a high of 24%. In 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013, and 2013-2014, the percentage of staff who did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year was 16%, 16%, 24%, and 15%, respectively.

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 22.39 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities. Additionally, based on the FY14 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash in the amount of $3,796,969, representing 74 days of operating expenses, 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 school's actual enrollment as of October 31, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue. As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

Overall, the school is financially sustainable based on its current practices. Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus over these audited fiscal years, though in FY14 the school operated at a 6% deficit. Additionally, based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.31 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities. Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY14, the school generated overall positive cash flow from FY11 to FY14, though the school's cash flow fluctuated from negative to positive each fiscal year.

There were no material weaknesses noted in the past three independent financial audits from FY12 to FY14; however, there was a significant deficiency noted for the FY11 financial audit related to the internal control over financial reporting with regard to untimely account reconciliations and adjustments. The school's plan to address this deficiency is outlined on page 37.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

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

Over the current charter term, the Board's level of membership has stayed consistently within the minimum of five members and maximum of 25 members established in the Board's bylaws; the Board currently has seven members.

Over the course of the school's retrospective charter term, the Board's bylaws did not require a specified number of regular Board meetings although they do specify an annual meeting will be held. In the past four academic years including the current year, 2011-2012 through 2014-2015, the Board held between three and four meetings which met quorum during the academic year, including its annual meeting. The NYC DOE reviewed 12 sets of Board minutes from the retrospective charter term. Beginning with the 2014-2015 academic year, the Board has not held the number of board meetings required by the Charter Schools Act. 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 requirement.

All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms, and these documents do not demonstrate conflicts of interest. The board has consistently submitted board resignation notices or new board member credentials within the required five days of change to the Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) for review and, if necessary, approval.

Although the Board has not consistently made all Board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting on the school's website, it does consistently post its most recent Board minutes and agendas online. Similarly, although the school has not posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law, it has posted the audit pertaining to FY13.

The school's annual report is posted to the school's website for the three most recent academic years, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014. The Board did consistently submit its 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.

All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.

The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.

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.

The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.

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

Over the course of the charter term, the school did consistently submit complete invoicing and reconciliation documents by the associated deadlines.

The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is not compliant with state requirements for 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. As of the review in March 2015, the school has 26 uncertified instructional staff members. The school's plan to address this area of non-compliance is outlined on page 39.

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.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

Although the school does not plan to serve any additional grades beyond its currently authorized grades of kindergarten through twelve, it is requesting to increase its maximum authorized enrollment to 1,229 by the end of the fifth year of the next charter term.

Part 2: School Overview and History

KIPP Academy Charter is an elementary/middle/high school serving 985 students[10] in kindergarten through twelfth grade during the 2014-2015 school year. It opened in the 2000-2001 school year with grades five and six and is under the terms of its third charter. The school's authorized full grade span is grades kindergarten through twelve, which it reached in school year 2013-2014. The school's current charter term expires on May 16, 2015.[11] The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in three NYC DOE-owned[12] buildings in Community School District 7 in the Bronx; though as Charter Partnership buildings, the school's elementary and high school sites are operated by the charter entity. The school's elementary school grades are co-located with P.S. X188, Bronx Leadership Academy II High School, New Explorers High School, and Urban Assembly School for Careers in Sports. The school's middle school grades are co-located with P.S./M.S. 31 The William Lloyd Garrison and J.H.S. 151 Lou Gehrig.[13] The school's high school grades are co-located with the high school grades of KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School and KIPP Infinity Charter School; together the high school grades of these four KIPP NYC schools form KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School.[14]

KIPP Academy Charter School is an elementary, middle, and high school located across three different campuses in the South Bronx. The school sets out to provide a results-focused instructional program that emphasizes both academic achievement and character building. KIPP Academy students benefit from a continuum of services throughout their education, including KIPP Through College, a program designed to ensure that all KIPP Academy middle school graduates, including those who do not attend KIPP Academy's high school, attend and graduate from college.

KIPP Academy Charter School is supported by KIPP NYC LLC, a service provider with a separate non-profit Board (herein characterized as a Charter Management Organization for purposes of this report) that supports four other KIPP charter schools throughout New York City: KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP Infinity Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School, and KIPP Washington Heights Academy Charter School. KIPP NYC LLC's Shared Services Team provides services to KIPP Academy in the areas of leadership development, professional development, human resources, data management, operations, facilities management, fundraising, payroll, finance and purchasing, as well as staff and teacher recruitment. KIPP Academy pays a fee for these services equal to 11% of net state and federal government revenue received by the school to KIPP NYC LLC.

KIPP Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees is led by chair David Massey, who has been on the Board since January 1994. Mr. Massey is stepping down from his role on the individual KIPP NYC affiliated school boards effective at the end of March 2015. Rafael Mayer, the current KIPP Academy Board Treasurer and Secretary, has been nominated to assume the Board Chair role for KIPP Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees. The school leadership team includes: Carolyn Petruzziello, Elementary School Principal, who has held this position since 2009; Frank Corcoran, Middle School Principal, who has held this position since 2011; and Natalie Webb, High School Principal, who has held this position since July 2009. Ms. Petruzziello will end her tenure in June 2015; current Assistant Principal Tyritia Groves will take over the role of Elementary School Principal at that time. The school is also overseen by KIPP NYC Superintendent Josh Zoia, who joined KIPP NYC in 2011 and has held the position of KIPP NYC Superintendent since July 2012. Mr. Zoia will end his tenure in this position in June 2015. Starting in July 2015, Jim Manly will assume the position of KIPP NYC Superintendent.

The school typically enrolls new students in all grades, though kindergarten is considered the primary entry grade. There were 2,815 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery. Although the school

[10] ATS data as of October 31, 2014
[11] NYC DOE internal data
[12] NYC DOE internal data
[13] NYC DOE Location Code Generation and Management System
[14] Please note that KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School is not a legal charter school entity nor is it separately chartered.

reported on the annual charter school survey that it does not enroll new students from the waitlist during the school year, DOE ATS records indicate that KIPP Academy Charter School did enroll students mid-year minimally in the 2014-2015 school year.[15]

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 *	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Kindergarten	93	103	94	104
Grade 1	93	100	97	99
Grade 2	-	97	95	97
Grade 3	-	-	84	90
Grade 4	-	-	-	75
Grade 5	70	73	67	74
Grade 6	67	66	68	67
Grade 7	65	64	64	68
Grade 8	59	62	64	62
Grade 9	52	66	62	88
Grade 10	34	53	63	69
Grade 11	-	33	53	59
Grade 12	-	-	30	54
Total Enrollment	533	717	841	1,006

* 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.

[15] Self-reported information collected through the 2014-2015 DOE Annual Charter School Survey

Additional Enrollment Data

School Year 2013-2014 Information	Section Count	Average Class Size
Kindergarten	4	26
Grade 1	4	25
Grade 2	4	24
Grade 3	4	23
Grade 4	4	19
Grade 5	3	25
Grade 6	2	34
Grade 7	3	23
Grade 8	2	31
Grade 9	**	**
Grade 10	**	**
Grade 11	**	**
Grade 12	**	**
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	204	

* 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.
** Section counts and average class sizes for grades nine through twelve are not reported in the table above because the section counts and average class size data available includes all students enrolled at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, not simply those students enrolled in KIPP Academy Charter School.

Pease see additional demographic data in Section 4 of this report for information regarding the enrollment of special populations at KIPP Academy Charter School. This information includes enrollment data for the percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners and students with disabilities as compared to the CSD and citywide averages, as well as targets recently finalized by the New York State Education Department.[16]

[16] 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 established by NYSED for students with disabilities, English Language Learner students, and students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch. Please note that the recently finalized targets are currently based on enrollment in the 2010-2011 school year and may be updated in the future.

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 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.[17]

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;
- 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

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

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

Is the school compliant with its charter and all applicable law and regulations?
As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with relevant laws and regulations as identified in the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework.

Staff Representatives

The following experts participated in the review of this school, including the renewal visit to the high school grades on December 18 and 19, 2014 and to the elementary and middle school grades on March 4 and 5, 2015, as well as meetings during the renewal process with members of the KIPP Academy Charter School Board and the KIPP NYC CMO leadership team:

- Yolanda Torres, Community Superintendent, Community School District 7, NYC DOE
- Julian Cohen, Senior Executive Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director, Charter Evaluation and Policy, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Gabrielle Mosquera, Senior Director, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Caitlin Robisch, Director of Analytics, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Paul Yen, Data Analyst, NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships
- Mariama Sandi, Chairperson, NYC DOE Committee on Special Education
- Arthur Sadoff, Independent Consultant

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

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

High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has four years of academic performance data and four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data at the time of this report. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments, aggregate high school performance data for all students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, and other academic indicators, please see Appendices A and B.

NOTE: The 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 ELA and math proficiency percentages should not be compared directly with prior-year results. Unlike prior years, proficiency on the NYS assessments for ELA and math in 2012-2013 and 2013-2014 were based on the Common Core Learning Standards – a more demanding set of knowledge and skills necessary for 21st century college and career readiness.

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP Academy Charter School	51.7%	63.3%	26.8%	20.8%
CSD 7	20.3%	23.5%	9.1%	9.2%
Difference from CSD 7 *	31.4	39.8	17.7	11.6
NYC	41.0%	45.0%	26.2%	28.4%
Difference from NYC *	10.7	18.3	0.6	-7.6
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-1.1	8.2	-4.3	-9.8
% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP Academy Charter School	86.9%	84.5%	43.4%	51.4%
CSD 7	36.0%	38.0%	8.9%	12.6%
Difference from CSD 7 *	50.9	46.5	34.5	38.8
NYC	56.7%	59.3%	28.5%	34.2%
Difference from NYC *	30.2	25.2	14.9	17.2
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	23.6	19.7	12.3	15.2

* 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[18]	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Overall Grade	A	A	A	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	B	A	B	
Student Performance	B	A	A	
School Environment	A	A	A	

HS Performance Compared to NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013***	**2013-2014**
KIPP Academy Charter School	-	-	87.9%	96.4%
NYC **	-	-	66.0%	68.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	21.9	28.0

* 2012-2013 was the first school year in which KIPP Academy Charter School served 12th grade students.
* The New York State graduation rate calculation method was first adopted in NYC for the Cohort of 2001 (Class of 2005). The cohort consists of all students who first entered ninth grade in a given school year (e.g., the Cohort of 2005 entered ninth grade in the 2005-2006 school year). Graduates are defined as those students earning either a Local or Regents diploma and exclude those earning either a special education (IEP) diploma or GED.

Mission and Academic Goals

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

- 11 of 16 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 9 of 16 in the second year,
- 16 of 24 in the third year, [19] and
- 12 of 24 in the fourth year.

[18] In school years 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 KIPP Academy Charter School was classified as a middle school for purposes of the NYC DOE Progress Report.
[19] It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core Learning Standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that refer to comparative academic performance of the school (e.g. to the Community School District) were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades or, due to a change in state regulation, goals that are related to standardized assessments for students in grades kindergarten through two in its analysis of progress towards goals.

Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals *

	Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1.	Each year, 75% of kindergarten through second grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above grade level in English Language Arts as measured by Fountas and Pinnell running records. For kindergarteners this equates in a level B by the end of the year, a level H for first grade students and a level L for second grade students. The Fountas and Pinnell running records will assess Students vocabulary, comprehension and phonics skills in order to appropriately determine a reading level.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**
2.	Each year, 75% of kindergarten through second grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above grade level by mastering at least 80% of the New York State Standards for Mathematics. Mastery is determined by beginning, middle and end of the year diagnostics for each grade level and interim assessments to determine mastery of each state standard. Mastery of a standard is defined by 70% or better on the math assessments which will be developed internally by teachers and adapted from the math curriculum.	**Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
3.	Each year, 75% of kindergarten through second grade students will perform at or above grade level in reading, as determined by teacher created interim reading assessments.	**Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
4.	Each year, 75% of kindergarten through second grade students will perform at or above grade level in mathematics, as determined by teacher created interim math assessments.	**Met**	**Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
5.	Each year, 75% of third through eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA examination.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
6.	Each year, 75% of third through eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State math examination.	**Met**	**Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
7.	Each year, 75% of fourth and eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Science examination.[20]	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**

[20] KIPP Academy Charter School did not administer the NYS Science examination to its eighth grade students in any year of the retrospective charter term. In lieu of the NYS Science Examination, eighth grade students at KIPP Academy Charter School took the NYS Earth Science Regents exam. Since this change was made without proper notification to the DOE, the progress for this goal is considered as Not Met.

	Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
8.	Each year, 75% of fifth and eighth grade students who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Social Studies examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9.	Each year, each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam (baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam.	**Not Met**	**Partially Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
10.	Each year, each grade-level cohort of the same students (i.e. students who are in the school for two years in a row) will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State math exam (baseline) and 75% at or above Level 3 on the current year's State math exam.	**Partially Met**	**Partially Met**	N/A	**Not Met**
11.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by the NYC DOE.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**
12.	Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State math exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by the NYC DOE.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**
13.	Each year, the school will earn a score sufficient to place it in the 75th percentile of all schools on the NYC DOE Progress Report.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	N/A
14.	Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing an English Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools as determined by the NYC DOE Progress Report peer schools.	N/A	N/A	**Met**	N/A
15.	Each year, the percent of students in the high school accountability cohort passing a Math Regents exam with a score of 65 or above by the end of their fourth year will exceed that of the students in the high school accountability cohort from a group of similar schools as determined by the NYC DOE Progress Report peer schools.	N/A	N/A	**Met**	N/A

	Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
16.	Each year, 80% of students enrolled in grades nine through twelve will accumulate 10 or more credits towards graduation.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**
17.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examination in ELA (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade nine on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**
18.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examination in math (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade nine on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**
19.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examination in Science - Living Environment, Chemistry, or other (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade nine on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**
20.	By the end of year four in the charter, 80% of the first cohort* will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examination in History - Global Studies or US History (*cohort is defined as the group of students entering grade nine on or before BEDS day in the same year at any school, regardless of when the student enters the charter school).	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**
21.	Each year, the average performance of students in the tenth grade will exceed the state average on the PSAT tests in Critical Reading and Mathematics. It is expected that the participation rate for this test will be 75% or greater.	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
22.	Each year, the average performance of students in the twelfth grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics. It is expected that the participation rate for this test will be 75% or greater.	N/A	N/A	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
23.	Each year, 90% of students in the Graduation Cohort will complete the school's college placement program that will consist of passing 3 of the following courses in grades nine through twelve, respectively: Speech and Composition, Math and Verbal Reasoning, College Readiness, and Senior Research Institute College Counseling. (The program changed from 4 to 3 courses.)	N/A	N/A	**Not Met**	**Not Met**

Academic Goals		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
24.	Each year, 70% of students in the Graduation Cohort will successfully pass a high school AP exam.	N/A	N/A	**Not Met**	**Not Met**
25.	Each year, 85% of students in the Graduation Cohort will gain admission into a two and/or four year college.	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**
26.	Each year, 70% of students in the Graduation Cohort will enroll in a two and/or four year college.	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**
27.	Each year, 80% of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fourth year in the cohort and, each year, 95 percent of students in the high school Graduation Cohort will graduate after the completion of their fifth year in the cohort.	N/A	N/A	**Met**	**Met**
28.	Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Report Card.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	N/A
29.	Each year, the school will have an average daily student attendance rate of at least 95%.	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**	**Met**

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

Responsive Education Program

- School leadership reports that the KIPP NYC network analyzes data on a quarterly or annual basis, as appropriate, from interim and standardized assessments taken by KIPP Academy students. The school administers the Northwest Measures of Academic Progress (NWEA MAP) exam, which is a nationally normed computer adaptive test used across the country by district and charter schools.
    - The school reported that the most recent eighth grade students made gains in math achievement on this measure, moving from 37% of students above the 50th percentile at the first administration in the fifth grade (when the students entered KIPP Academy), to 82% above the 50th percentile.
    - Additionally, 62% of students in grades kindergarten through two were identified as being at or above grade level as measured by NWEA MAP Reading results in 2013-2014.
- At the high school level, the school assesses its self-defined college readiness measures based on nationally standardized college entrance exams. KIPP Academy tracks students' scores on the PSAT and SAT to assess college readiness.
    - The first cohort of KIPP Academy students to attend KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School had an average combined score of 967 on the PSAT and SAT (Math and Critical Reading); the school's goal for that administration was an average combined score of 1000.
- As part of the KIPP Through College program, KIPP Academy also tracks student college matriculation and persistence.
    - For the 2009 KIPP Academy high school cohort (graduation from grade twelve in June 2013), all but one KIPP Academy graduate enrolled in college or university in the fall of 2013. For the 2010 KIPP Academy high school cohort (graduation from grade twelve in June 2014), 100% of graduating KIPP Academy students enrolled in college or university in the fall of 2014.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school's high school grades on December 18 and 19, 2014 and its elementary and middle school grades on March 4 and 5, 2015. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**
    - At the elementary level, school leadership reports that curriculum has shifted over the course of the charter term to materials that are research-based, aligned to the Common Core Learning Standards, and more responsive to students.
        - The elementary math curriculum shifted during the charter term from initially being teacher-created, to Everyday Math, then to Singapore Math, to eventually implementing (in 2013-2014) EngageNY Math. The school has also incorporated Cognitively Guided Instruction into the math blocks.
        - In literacy, the school has invested and focused intensely on improving Guided Reading. The school has contracted with an expert in Guided Reading to observe teachers and give feedback, along with the Dean of Teaching & Learning (DTL) at the school. This helps build the capacity of both the DTL and the classroom teachers.
    - At the middle school level, the school has historically used teacher-created curriculum. In the past three years, the school has joined with other middle schools supported by KIPP NYC to create a regional middle school curriculum platform. KIPP Academy has contributed to the regional math and ELA scope and sequence, lesson plans, unit plans, and interim assessments, with focus on aligning all resources to the Common Core Learning Standards.
        - In addition to this, the school has returned to a model with 90-120 minute math blocks and increased the length of its reading blocks.
            - The longer reading blocks now include Guided Reading for 30-45 minutes a day, which is a new focus for the middle school. This new implementation is being supported by the KIPP Foundation, which is providing support for training and development of school-based staff.
    - At the high school level, school leadership reports that, while still providing students with a path toward a Regents or Advanced Regents diploma, the school's sequence of core courses and curricular supports has evolved substantially over the course of the charter term.
        - The school now offers 10 Advanced Placement (AP) courses across all five core content areas. In 2013-2014, the school created a pre-AP program to help prepare students for its AP World History and AP English language courses and for school year 2014-2015, the school added an AP microeconomics course.
        - Prior to school year 2013-2014, a team of KIPP NYC's math curriculum planners rewrote the region's integrated algebra curriculum and applied it to algebra instruction for the school's 2010 student cohort, one year before the state would require students to take the Common Core Learning Standards-aligned Algebra Regents exam. Because this team believed that the algebra curriculum modules released by the state did not contain sufficient scaffolding of basic algebra skills or adequate differentiation supports at that time, its algebra team created materials that incorporated these elements. These included five lessons per week, including a workshop lesson, one individual quiz, one partner quiz, and one Review and Problem Solving assignment comprised of three to four open-ended problems aligned to Common Core Learning Standards assessments. These materials are differentiated for both the school's 15:1 and honors classes.
            - The school's geometry team is in the process of shifting to Common Core Learning Standards-aligned curriculum during school year 2014-2015 following a similar process to that of the algebra team in school year 2013-2014.

        - The school has adopted a similar approach with respect to aligning its English curriculum to Common Core Learning Standards.
            - Prior to school year 2014-2015, a team of KIPP NYC teachers revised the region's English curriculum after taking part in a year-long professional development course with Public Consulting Group. This course was intended to help the team increase teachers' capacity to implement rigorous instruction in close reading, vocabulary, argumentative writing, and inquiry-based research, and to help provide individualized just-in-time mentoring to faculty members around individually determined areas of need. The school is now implementing the aligned curriculum in grades nine through twelve.
            - The school's current tenth grade students will take the Common Core Learning Standards English Regents exam in June 2015.
    - The school has partnered with Microsoft to implement the company's Technology, Education and Literacy in Schools (TEALS) program as part of the school's first computer science program, piloting in school year 2014-2015. As part of this program, Microsoft recruits, trains, and places a technology professional into the school to serve as a volunteer part-time teacher in a co-teaching model with one of the school's computer science teachers for two years. At the end of this period, the school's computer science program will operate using only internal resources and will include the addition of an AP computer science course in school year 2015-2016 and an elective web design and robotics course in school year 2016-2017.

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

    - Across all grades of KIPP Academy Charter School, Child Study Teams (CSTs), alternately termed Student Response Teams (SRTs) at the high school level, are in place. The CST and SRTs focus on Response to Intervention (RtI) plans to meet the needs of students that are identified as potentially at risk of academic failure.
    - The elementary school level offers at least two sections of Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) per grade. In addition, the needs of students with disabilities are supported by a Director of Special Education and two Special Education Coordinators. The school employs a Director of School Social Work and three additional social workers.
    - The middle school is piloting one ICT classroom per grade in the current year, 2014-2015, with plans to add at least one additional ICT class in the next academic year.
    - The middle school began the current charter term offering reading interventions in only two grades. However, in 2011-2012, the middle school grades implemented Read 180 as a Tier II intervention and SYS 44 for Tier III intervention. The middle school now also has at least one Learning Specialist per grade to provide additional support.
        - The middle school also uses Math 180 as a math intervention.
    - The elementary and middle school grades share the services of a Speech Pathologist, and the high school employs a full-time speech and language therapist, who also provides Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS) in both pull-out and push-in methods.
    - KIPP NYC provides additional support and training for students that are English Language Learners (ELLs).
        - At the elementary school level, this support is provided directly by English as a Second Language instructors. At the middle school level, supports for ELLs are provided via interventions using Read 180 and/or SYS 44.
    - School leadership reports that at the high school level, the school offers several layers of academic support both inside and outside of general instruction.
        - The high school offers additional, supportive courses for students who are struggling, including courses with a 15:1 student to teacher ratio to provide more individualized instruction. These smaller classes include both students who do and do not have Individualized Education Programs (IEPs).

        - Ninth grade students who struggle with literacy are placed into targeted reading intervention courses.
        - Students across all grades read leveled texts during their independent reading periods.
        - The high school provides several supports for struggling students taking Regents exams. Three dual-certified English teachers in grades nine and ten work with the school's student support team to teach small, intensely scaffolded classes geared towards preparing students for the English Regents exam. Similarly, a dual-certified math teacher works to prepare grade nine students for the Algebra Regents exam.
        - The high school offers three pre-Regents self-contained courses of eight or fewer students. These focus on building foundational skills for students who may not be ready for Regents-level material and are offered in literacy, math, and nonfiction studies in grades nine and ten.
        - Classes not taught by a dual-certified teacher are offered as reduced-size general education classes that receive push-in support from resource room teachers.
        - As observed at the time of the high school renewal visit on December 18 and 19, 2014, the high school has built a variety of transitional supports into its model, including:
            - A Summer Bridge program for incoming freshmen during which students complete assessments and are introduced to the high school's culture;
            - Socio-emotional counselors at all grade levels;
            - Provision of case managers (SETSS teachers) for all students with IEPs;
            - Career counselors who help guide eleventh grade students toward opportunities for internships as well as weekend and summer programs;
            - College counseling for all twelfth grade students, including IEP review (when applicable) and self-advocacy instructions for testing accommodations; and
            - Use of the state's Adult Career and Continuing Education Services-Vocational Rehabilitation (ACCES-VR) program to help students obtain funding for college as well as provide vocational training for students who need it.

- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**

  During the renewal visit to the school's elementary and middle school campuses on March 4 and 5, 2015, 47 classrooms in grades kindergarten through eight were observed with the elementary school Principal, the elementary school Assistant Principal, the middle school Principal, the elementary school Deans of Teaching and Learning, the elementary school Director of Special Education Services, and the middle school Director of Special Education Services.
    - In all observed elementary classes, teachers were following an ICT instructional model, team teaching, parallel teaching, or the models of lead and assist or lead and monitor. In all observed middle school classes, teachers were following the school's model of instruction, featuring a lead teacher and, in some cases, additional adults pushing in to give additional support.
    - Class sizes observed in the elementary school ranged from 19 to 23 students, with one to three teachers in all classrooms. Class sizes observed in the middle school ranged from 18 to 24 students, with one teacher in all but one classroom, in which there were two teachers.
    - Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations, which were often used in combination with each other, included some basic fact recall, but mostly challenged students to demonstrate understanding or to analyze and apply.
        - In one elementary classroom observed, after a demonstration, the classwork required students to calculate the mechanical advantage of different levers.

        - In one Social Studies classroom in the middle school, students were engaged in a Socratic learning experience.
    - In most observed classrooms, checks for understanding included questioning, classwork, teacher observation, peer review of work, and polling.
        - In one elementary classroom observed, students shared out strategies to solve a math problem and other students indicated whether they agreed or disagreed.
    - In some observed elementary classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, modalities, products, and assessments was observed, primarily via small group instruction. The differentiation observed was consistent with the school's model. In most classes, small groups of students work with adults on different texts.
        - For example, in one elementary classroom, some students used worksheets alone while others used worksheets with manipulatives.
    - There were small, differentiated groups in many classrooms observed. In most middle school classrooms, checks for understanding that included questioning, classwork, teacher observation, performance-based activities, peer review of work, were observed. For example, during one Reading block, small groups worked together, shared out answers with the whole class and then work was peer reviewed.
    - In all observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction and demonstrated awareness of classroom rules and procedures.
    - In all observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were off task for a short duration.
    - Based on debriefs with the school's leadership team members after classroom visits, most classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

During the renewal visit to the school's high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014, 29 core subject (including those with SETSS) and elective classrooms in grades nine through twelve were observed with the high school Principal and the high school Dean of Special Education.

- In all observed classes, teachers were using either an ICT, lead and assist, or lead and monitor instructional approach.
- Class sizes observed ranged from 12 to 26 students with one teacher in most classrooms, but in some classrooms, such as the 15:1 and ICT settings, two teachers were present in the classroom.
- Forms of questioning identified during the classroom observations included some basic fact recall, but most forms of questioning challenged students to demonstrate understanding or to compare or illustrate concepts.
    - Examples include a ninth and tenth grade trigonometry/algebra II class where students were asked not only to solve quadratic equations graphically, but to compare and contrast the method they used to methods used for prior equations, and a ninth grade honors English class in which students who had just read a passage from Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye* were challenged to write two to three paragraphs on how symbolism helped develop the passage's central idea.
    - Some class activities challenged students to synthesize and evaluate their learning, such as a computer science class during which students designed coding rules in order to move characters within a "Space Invaders"-like computer program.
- In most classrooms, checks for understanding included questioning, classwork, teacher observation, peer review of work, and exit tickets. Examples include a global/history class that challenged students to debate the advantages and disadvantages of democracies and aristocracies.
- In some observed classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, and products was observed.
- In all observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
- In all observed classes, students were either fully on task or mostly on task. Off-task students were off task for a short duration.

- Based on debriefs with the school's 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

During the renewal visit to the school's elementary and middle school campuses on March 4 and 5, 2015, NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 17 instructional staff members including teachers, learning specialists, reading teachers, grade team leaders and one Assistant Principal. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received whole-school weekly professional development (PD) during the school year, monthly department meetings, and quarterly data days provided by KIPP NYC regional staff. PD focus areas described by most teachers included CGI, Guided Reading, and the school's love and logic disciplinary approach
- All interviewed teachers described observation and evaluation structures including frequent information observations by coaches and peers, weekly informal check-ins with their instructional coaches, and twice-yearly formal evaluations. Most teachers further described the use of the KIPP Framework for Excellent Teaching and its five-point rubric as the basis of formal evaluations.
- Most interviewed teachers reported that they use formal and informal data sources to inform classroom instruction. Informal sources cited included guided reading notes, weekly sight word assessments, and the results of math exit slips. Formal sources included NWEA MAP results, KIPP NYC quarterly benchmarks, Fountas and Pinnell assessments, and mid- and end-of-unit assessments.

During the renewal visit to the school's high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014, NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 15 general and special education classroom teachers. The following was noted:

- Most interviewed teachers reported that they receive school-based professional development four times per week, hold department meetings two times per month, and meet in professional learning communities nine times per school year. They also reported that they were provided KIPP NYC regional professional development on-site four times per school year.
- Most interviewed teachers discussed both formal collaborative structures such as weekly grade/subject meetings (including SETSS meetings) as well as frequent and regular informal collaboration in the form of lesson planning between co-teachers and peer classroom visitations.
- Most interviewed teachers mentioned the use of the KIPP Framework for Excellent Teaching (KFET) for formal teacher evaluations conducted by the school's department chairs every two weeks. These teachers reported that they receive both verbal and written feedback following the observation, and the written feedback is also logged into the school's TeachBoost instructional leadership platform for reference. Teachers reported that they are encouraged to set three professional development goals for the school year.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through several types of both formal and informal assessments. Formal assessments mentioned included unit exams, interim mock Regents exams, and midterm exams. Informal assessments mentioned included quizzes, observation of classroom activities, exit tickets, do nows, writing assignments, GPA growth analysis, and homework analysis.

During the renewal visit to the school's elementary and middle school campus on March 4 and 5, 2015, NYC DOE representatives conducted group interviews with 24 students in grades three, four, five, six, seven and eight. The following was noted:

- All interviewed students reported appreciating their teachers' efforts to support them and guide them on their paths to academic success and the importance of college.

- All interviewed students reported that their teachers had high academic expectations for them and were able to name staff members who they could easily approach when in need of academic and/or social-emotional support, both in person as well as via phone when not in school.

During the renewal visit to the school's high school campus on December 18 and 19, 2014, NYC DOE representatives conducted group interviews with 16 students in grades nine through twelve. The following was noted:

- All interviewed students reported that their teachers had high academic expectations for them but also felt supported by teachers in trying to reach those expectations.
- All interviewed students spoke positively regarding the school's behavioral incentives and recognition of positive character traits.
- All students stated that they had many opportunities both during and outside of school hours to receive academic help when they needed it.
- Many students spoke positively about the school's guidance and overall preparation efforts toward readying them for college and/or careers.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 97% of parents of elementary and middle school students at KIPP Academy Charter School agree or strongly agree "that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child" and 98% of parents who responded to the survey agree or strongly agree "that the school has high expectations for [their] child."[21]

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey 90% of elementary and middle school teachers at KIPP Academy Charter School agree or strongly agree that "order and discipline are maintained at the school" and 83% disagree or strongly disagree with the statement that "at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school."[22]

[21] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 64% of parent respondents strongly agree that KIPP Academy Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 33% agree with the statement. Similarly, 68% of parent respondents strongly agree that KIPP Academy Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 30% agree with the statement.

[22] According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 29% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at KIPP Academy Charter School; another 61% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 29% strongly disagree that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 54% of teacher respondents disagree with the statement; and 18% 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 December 19, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE met with a representation of the school's Board of Trustees independent of the school leadership team. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has seven active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of five members and maximum of 25 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, and Superintendent positions, as specified in the bylaws, are currently filled. However, the current bylaws also specify Principal positions, which appear to be vacant; these have been removed as officer positions in practice and, as of the writing of this report, the Board is revising its bylaws to reflect this change.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes that were reviewed for Board meetings held for school years 2011-2012 through 2014-2015 (12 meeting minutes reviewed).
- The Superintendent, an employee of the Board, or school principal(s) regularly updates the Board on academic progress at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes. Regular operational and financial updates are provided by the KIPP NYC operations and finance staff. Non-academic updates are from KIPP NYC network level personnel, not members of the KIPP Academy school leadership team or onsite school personnel.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and network and the network and school leadership team as evidenced by the school's organization chart and KIPP NYC LLC leadership's monthly updates on academic, financial, and operational performance to the Board and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes. As a result, accountability of the school leadership team to the Board is indirect, with the KIPP NYC Superintendent playing a key role in the school accountability structure.
- The Board's bylaws state that the Board may form any Board committee (other than the Hiring committee which may be formed by the Superintendent) but is not obligated to do so. The current Board roster for KIPP Academy indicates that Board members serve on the following Board committees: Audit and Finance, Talent and Compensation, and Search. The school reported that the Audit and Finance committee is the only currently active committee of the Board. Board leadership reported that members of the Board frequently have informal interactions between meetings to discuss Board business that could otherwise be conducted via Board committees.
- The school's Board is led by chair David Massey, who has been on the Board since January 1994. Mr. Massey is stepping down from his role on the individual KIPP NYC affiliated school boards effective at the end of March 2015. Rafael Mayer, the current KIPP Academy Board Treasurer and Secretary, has been nominated to assume the Board Chair role for KIPP Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees. The school leadership team includes: Carolyn Petruzziello, Elementary School Principal, who has held this position since 2009; Frank Corcoran, Middle School Principal, who has held this position since 2011; and Natalie Webb, High School Principal, who has held this position since July 2009. Ms. Petruzziello will end her tenure in June 2015; current Assistant Principal Tyritia Groves will take over the role of Elementary School Principal at that time. The school is also overseen by KIPP NYC Superintendent Josh Zoia, who joined KIPP NYC in 2011 and has held this position since July 2012. Mr. Zoia will end his tenure in this position in June 2015. Starting in July 2015, Jim Manly will assume the position of KIPP NYC Superintendent.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- The school met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% in all four years of the retrospective charter term. Average daily attendance for students over the course of the charter term is provided in the table below.[23]

Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP Academy Charter School*	**97.0%**	**96.9%**	**96.1%**	**95.1%**
NYC**	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	3.8	3.0	2.5	1.9
High School Attendance				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School*	**96.4%**	**96.0%**	**95.5%**	**95.3%**
NYC**	85.5%	86.2%	86.1%	86.5%
Difference from NYC	10.9	9.8	9.4	8.8

* 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 averaged 18% over the retrospective charter term. For KIPP Academy, instructional staff turnover has fluctuated between a low of 15% and a high of 24%. In 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014, the percentage of staff who did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year was 16%, 16%, 24%, and 15%, respectively.
- 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 yet finalized by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term at the time of the creation of this report. 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 in any year of the retrospective charter term.

[23] The table reflects average daily attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system for school years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014. For school years 2010-2011 through 2013-2014 the high school attendance information reflects attendance of all high school students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, not simply those enrolled at KIPP Academy Charter School. Please note that the school self-reported aggregate attendance rates in its Renewal Application which differ from the aggregate attendance recorded in ATS for all school years. The school self-reported attendance rates of 98.2%, 96.9%, 96.9%, 96.0% and 95.5% for school years 2010-2011, 2011-2012, 2012-2013 and 2013-2014.

Mobility

Student Mobility out of KIPP Academy Charter School *				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Number of Students who Left the School	31	34	35	127
Percent of Students who Left the School	5.8%	4.7%	4.3%	13.3%

- 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 elementary and middle school students, parents and teachers 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 two of the four selected questions. The percentage of parents agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for all of the three selected questions. The percentage of students agreeing or strongly agreeing was above citywide averages for two 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. The response rates for middle school KIPP Academy Charter School students have been above NYC averages in the last three years of the current charter term. The response rates for parents of elementary and middle school students at KIPP Academy Charter School have been above the citywide rates in the last three years of the current charter term. The response rates for elementary and middle school teachers at KIPP Academy Charter School were only above the citywide averages in the first year of the current charter term.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree						
Survey Question		KIPP Academy Charter School ****				Citywide Average
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students *	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning.**	80%	81%	72%	54%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	75%	82%	84%	67%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	89%	94%	93%	84%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	97%	100%	98%	98%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	93%	95%	96%	96%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	97%	97%	98%	98%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	100%	100%	89%	89%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	100%	100%	86%	83%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	100%	100%	98%	90%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents.***	-	100%	95%	97%	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.
**** Survey results are presented for students, parents, and teachers of only elementary and middle school grades of KIPP Academy Charter School. High school students enrolled at KIPP Academy Charter School, as well as parents of high school students enrolled at KIPP Academy Charter School and high school teachers, are not included in the above figures.

NYC School Survey Results

Response Rates					
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	KIPP Academy Charter School **	65%	97%	94%	96%
	NYC	83%	82%	83%	83%
Parents	KIPP Academy Charter School	43%	62%	62%	55%
	NYC	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	KIPP Academy Charter School	100%	55%	70%	51%
	NYC	82%	81%	83%	81%

* Students in grades kindergarten through five do not participate in the NYC School Survey.
** Survey response rates are presented for students, parents and teachers of only elementary and middle school grades of KIPP Academy Charter School. High school students enrolled at KIPP Academy Charter School, as well as parents of high school students enrolled at KIPP Academy Charter School and high school teachers are not included in the above figures.

- The school's charter goals include, "each year, parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more parents participate in the survey." The school partially met this goal in 2010-2011 but did meet this goal in all other applicable school years, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.[24] 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 NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more teachers participate in the survey." The school met this goal in all applicable school years, 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.
- The school's charter goals include, "each year, students will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect; the school will only have met this goal if 50% or more students participate in the survey." The school partially met this goal in the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years.[25] The school met this goal in 2012-2013. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.

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

- The elementary school has several structures in place to communicate with and engage parents. These include monthly "Coffee & Conversations" gatherings, active parent committees (that work as the parent association), and annual Carnival celebration that is open to the entire community.
- The elementary school recently worked with the International Rescue Committee (which uses the campus soccer field) to have a nearby abandoned building knocked down, and a community garden created in its place.
- The elementary school is part of a high-functioning campus council, and has partnered with other building Principals to do co-observations for classrooms and leadership meetings.
- The middle school has an active KIPP Parent Association and engages parents through student performances and celebrations.
- The middle school Principal maintains a strong working relationship with the Principals of other co-located schools in the building.
- The middle school uses a weekly "paycheck" to represent each student's social and academic performance. This logs each student's "KIPP dollars," which are awarded according to teacher comments across categories ranging from attendance and homework, to being a good teammate and displaying extra effort in the classroom. Students begin each week with 50 KIPP dollars and earn credits and/or deductions based on how they meet school-wide behavioral expectations.
- As a means of peer mentorship and support, the high school uses an Advisory system consisting of small groups of eight to 10 students that meet once a week throughout their high school careers to focus on character and academic skills. The faculty-created Advisory curriculum follows a scope and sequence covering the following themes: academic success; character development; college and career connection; grade unity; social responsibility; and team building.

[24] If the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, or if the response rate was less than 50% but the school received a score of at least 7.5 points in each category, the goal was considered 'partially met.' In the 2010-2011 school year, the elementary and middle school parent response rate for KIPP Academy Charter School was less than 50%.

[25] If the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, or if the response rate was less than 50%, the goal was considered 'partially met.' In the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years, KIPP Academy Charter School received fewer than 7.5 points in the Communication and Engagement categories.

The Advisory program also engages students' families via communications with each student's advisor.

- At all grade levels, teachers are trained to implement the "Love and Logic" philosophy of classroom and behavior management developed by Jim Fay and Foster W. Cline, M.D, which emphasizes a combination of empathy, choice, and reason to manage most classroom behaviors. In cases where this approach is not proving effective as a means of helping students regulate their own behavior, the school utilizes the Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) approach developed by Dr. Stuart Ablon of Massachusetts General Hospital. This approach stems from the idea that the most challenging student behaviors are often the byproducts of lagging thinking skills and are best addressed by teaching students the skills they lack, often through the use of conferencing at the time of an incident.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing on March 5, 2015 at the elementary school campus located at 730 Concourse Village West, the Bronx, for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 30 participants attended the hearing with nine speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition. In addition, four individuals submitted written comments in support of renewal for the charter school.
- 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 February 2015 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 95% 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 22.39 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities**.**
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash in the amount of $3,796,969, representing 74 days of operating expenses, 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 October 31, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue**.**
- As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had no debt obligations.

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

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY14, the school generated an aggregate surplus over these audited fiscal years, though in FY14 the school operated at a 6% deficit.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.31 indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities**.**
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY14, the school generated overall positive cash flow from FY11 to FY14, though the school's cash flow fluctuated from negative to positive each fiscal year.

There were no material weaknesses noted in the past three independent financial audits from FY12 to FY14; however, there was a significant deficiency noted for the FY11 financial audit.

A significant deficiency in the internal control over financial reporting with regard to untimely account reconciliations and adjustments was noted:

- Due to account reconciliations not being performed on a timely basis, the trial balance was not adjusted properly throughout the year and therefore any generated financial reports used by management and/or governance could not always be relied upon. As a result, adjustments were not made to adjust and reconcile account balances during and after the final audit fieldwork. These areas included accounts payable, expenses, accounts receivable, revenue, due to/from accounts, and deferred revenue.

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

- The KIPP NYC Finance Team hired a new Controller in 2012 and added two staff accountants to better manage the transaction volume. They instituted new procedures for reconciling high-activity general ledger accounts and were able to automate the payroll and 403(b) reconciliations to save time and improve accuracy. Bank and corporate credit card accounts are consistently reconciled on a monthly basis and reviewed by the Controller and the Managing Director of Finance. All non-standard journal entries are also reviewed on a monthly basis by the Controller or the Managing Director of Finance.

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

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

As of the review in March 2015, the Board of Trustees for KIPP Academy Charter School is in compliance with:

- **Membership size.** Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range of five to 25 members as outlined in both the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws. The Board currently has seven active members.
- **Required number of monthly meetings.** The Board's current bylaws specify one required annual meeting but do not specify a required number of regular meetings during the calendar or academic year. In the most recent four academic years including the current year, 2011-2012 through 2014-2015, evidence available to OSDCP indicates the Board held between three and four meetings per year. Minutes were received and reviewed for a total of 12 meetings during the current charter term. Quorum was met for all meetings held.
    - Beginning with the 2014-2015 academic year, the Board has not held the number of board meetings required by the Charter Schools Act. 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.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms to NYSED. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.[26]
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has not consistently made all Board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting on the school's website. However, it does consistently post its most recent Board minutes and agenda 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.
- **Submission of documents.** 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. The school has posted to its website its most recent annual audit, as required in charter law, as part of its posting of the 2013-2014 Annual Report.

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

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Immunization.** The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization.
- **Insurance.** The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2015-2016 school year, the school has an application deadline of April 1, 2015 and lottery date of April 6, 2015, 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.
- **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.

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

- **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.
- **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 on March 2015, the charter school is out of compliance with:

- **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 has 26 uncertified staff members.
    - According to KIPP NYC human resources (HR), during the hiring process KIPP Academy Charter School principals have emphasized finding Highly Qualified teachers with deep content experience who can build positive relationships with students and who are seeking a strong culture of high expectations. The school expects teachers, upon being hired, to become NYS-certified in their content area.
    - KIPP NYC HR leadership interviewed as part of the renewal process on January 8, 2015 reported that it offers the following support to help principals and teachers along the path to certification:
        - Holds regular one-on-one meetings between KIPP NYC HR staff and uncertified teachers to check in on progress towards certification.
        - Contracts with the NYC Charter School Center to provide additional support and guidance for uncertified teachers. In these meetings, KIPP NYC teachers identify gaps in coursework, test completion and other requirements and develop individualized plans to remedy each deficiency.
        - In the spring of 2013, KIPP NYC built a teacher certification database and tracking tool to monitor school and charter level teacher certification rates and progress toward completion, and to flag teachers who are not progressing towards certification.
        - In September 2014, KIPP NYC hired a consultant with expertise in teacher certification (formerly of the NYC Charter Center) to examine the status of teacher certification across KIPP NYC to make recommendations on how schools should proceed.

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 the creation of this report, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act were still in a proposed status; these targets have since been finalized. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, as well as the recently finalized current enrollment targets developed by NYSED. It should be noted that these targets were developed using a

different methodology than that used to develop the school-specific enrollment rates for each special population as presented below.[27]

- In all years of operation during the retrospective charter term, including the most recently completed school year 2013-2014, KIPP Academy Charter School:
  - served a lower percentage of students qualifying for Free or Reduced Price Lunch compared to the CSD 7 rate, but a higher percentage compared to the citywide and CSD 5 high school rate in 2012-2013; and
  - served a lower percentage of students with disabilities compared to the CSD 7 and citywide percentages, though the school served a higher percentage of students with disabilities compared to the CSD 5 high school rate in 2012-2013; and
  - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to the CSD 7 and citywide percentages, though the school served a higher percentage of English Language Learner students compared to the CSD 5 high school rate in 2012-2013.

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

Enrollment of Special Populations[28]

Special Population		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Current)[29]
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	**KIPP Academy Charter School**	**85.4%**	**87.7%**	**89.7%**	**93.1%**	**94.5%**
	CSD 7	91.4%	93.2%	96.3%	94.0%	
	CSD 5	-	-	78.3%	-	
	NYC	79.0%	81.1%	80.4%	80.4%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	**KIPP Academy Charter School**	**10.3%**	**11.4%**	**13.8%**	**16.3%**	**18.8%**
	CSD 7	21.7%	20.7%	22.8%	23.0%	
	CSD 5	-	-	13.1%	-	
	NYC	17.5%	17.2%	17.8%	19.2%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	**KIPP Academy Charter School**	**3.8%**	**5.6%**	**8.1%**	**7.9%**	**21.2%**
	CSD 7	19.7%	19.5%	21.4%	18.3%	
	CSD 5	-	-	6.6%	-	
	NYC	15.2%	14.8%	14.4%	14.0%	

Additional Enrollment Information				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Grades Served	K-1, 5-10	K-2, 5-11	K-3, 5-12	K-12
CSD(s)[30]	7	7	7 (Grades K-3, 5-8) and 5 (Grades 9-12)	7

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

[29] Targets were identified for KIPP Academy Charter School by using CSD 7 as the primary CSD and a grade range of grades kindergarten through twelve.

[30] In 2012-2013 KIPP Academy Charter School's high school grades were served in a DOE-owned building at 625 West 133rd Street in CSD 5 in Manhattan before moving to its permanent high school site at 201 East 144th Street in CSD 7 in the Bronx for the 2013-2014 school year. The school's permanent high school site is a Charter Partnership building, a building owned by the NYC DOE but leased out to the charter operator for an extended period of time.

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

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

- Although the school does not plan to serve any additional grades, it did request an increase in its maximum authorized enrollment from 855 to 1,229 by the end of the fifth year of the next charter term. Due to student attrition below projections and higher than anticipated demand for seats in KIPP NYC's shared high school, KIPP Academy projected that it would exceed its chartered enrollment by 106 students in the 2014-2015 school year. The request to increase authorized enrollment is a result of these more recently observed student attrition and retention trends.
- KIPP Academy is now serving students in grades kindergarten through twelve. In the current 2014-2015 school year, fourth graders from KIPP Academy's elementary campus began to feed in to the KIPP Academy middle school facility.
- To ensure future instructional success in the next charter term, KIPP Academy will focus on the teacher pipeline, and over the next three years work to implement the KIPP Instructional Visions and Instructional Blueprints.

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 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 their 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.[31]

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.[32] As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act's renewal standards:

[31] See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.
[32] See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;
- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction; and
- The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and 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.[33]

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.[34]

[33] § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.
[34] See § 2852(5).

Part 6: NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

The Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships 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[35]

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

[35] Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE replaced the DOE Progress Report with the DOE School Quality Report. The 2012-2013 school year is the last year NYC public schools will have a Progress Report score. The Progress Report and School Quality Report contain similar indicators of performance.

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

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

1c. Learning Environment

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

- Provide a safe, respectful, and stable academic environment conducive to student leaning (one with efficient transitions and safe hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.)
- Have a strong academic culture that creates high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to consistently give their best effort academically and to actively engage in their own learning and the life of the school
- Use a comprehensive approach to student management, including positive behavioral expectations and a clear discipline policy to build and sustain a safe, orderly, and supportive classroom environment
- Have classrooms where academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Have formal or informal structures or programs in place that provide students opportunities to develop as individuals and citizens (for example: a character education, citizenship, or community involvement or service program)

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

- Classroom observations
- NYC DOE School Survey results (students, parents and teachers)
- School mission and articulated values
- Student management plan (code of conduct, school values, discipline policy, positive incentive system, etc.)
- Student attendance and retention rates
- Student discipline data (referral, suspension, expulsion)
- Parent complaint/concern information
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Interviews with school leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, students
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)
- School calendar and class schedules

2. Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?
2a. Mission and Goals
Schools with a successful mission and goals have many of the characteristics below: • Have an animated mission statement and clearly articulated goals (both academic and non-academic) that staff, students and community embrace • Demonstrate an active self-evaluation process that involves regular monitoring, an examination of practices based on outcomes against goals, and reporting on progress towards school goals • Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data
Evidence for a successful mission and goals might include, but not be limited to, the following: • Mission Statement • School charter and external documents (student/family handbooks, school website, etc.) • Annual Reports, school improvement plans, leadership/Board reports • Board agendas and minutes • Parent, student, and teacher satisfaction surveys • Participation at parent-teacher conferences, school advocacy events, participation in academic goal related programs • Stakeholder interviews (board, parents, staff, students, etc.)

2b. Leadership and Governance Structure
Schools with successful leadership and governance structures have many of the characteristics below: • Have a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations, with clear lines of accountability for the Board, school leadership and all staff • Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate officers, committees, and a purposeful blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter • Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly, but not limited to, Open-Meeting Law and conflict of interest laws, and is fully compliant with its Board approved by-laws (number of meetings, quorum, posting of calendar, agenda and minutes) • Have a defined process for Board reflection on effectiveness, assessing developing needs, and plan for professional growth • Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time • Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals and, if and when necessary, makes timely adjustments to that structure with proper notice to and approval by its authorizer • Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel • Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provides regular feedback on instruction to teachers, including both formal and informal observations
Evidence for school governance and organizational design may include, but are not limited to, the following: • School charter • Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, calendar of meetings, meeting agenda and minutes • Annual conflict of interest forms • Board resources for evaluating school leadership and staff, including rubric/performance metrics • Board resources for self-reflection and professional growth • Board development plan • Board interviews • Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook and core operational policies • School calendar • Professional development plans • Stakeholder interviews (board, school leadership and staff)

2c. School Climate and Community Engagement
Schools with a sustaining school climate and engaged parent and community support have many of the characteristics below: • A healthy professional school climate that is collaborative, student-centered, and open to parents and community support • Employ an effective means of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including, but not limited to, the NYC DOE School Survey • Have effective home-school communication practices and engagement strategies to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children • Strong community-based partnerships that support and advocate for the school • Engage families actively in the life of the school, including advocacy, community engagement, and feedback on school policies and initiatives • Have a clear procedure for parents and staff to express concerns to school leadership and the Board, as appropriate, including a clearly articulated escalation path to authorizer • Share instructional and operational practices with the larger NYC school community and actively seek opportunities for partnering and collaboration • Encourage professional conversations about effective performance and quality instruction among staff, through, for example, such means as regular and periodic teaming (grade level teams, data days, etc.) and peer observations • Have systems in place to evaluate professional development effectiveness and provide ongoing support for school-wide and individual initiatives
Evidence for school climate and community engagement may include, but not be limited to, the following: • NYC DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results • Student retention and wait list data • Staff retention data • Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews • Student and staff attendance rates • Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences • Parent association meeting calendar and minutes • Community partnerships and sponsored programs • Participation in NYC DOE initiatives and efforts to collaborate/partner with other NYC schools • Parent and community feedback via public hearings, renewal calls to parents, etc. • Community outreach documents (newsletters, announcements, invitations, etc.) • School Professional Development Plan and staff feedback on professional development events • Resources for evaluations and observations, scheduled opportunities for professional collaboration, staff feedback on professional development events • Student/Family and Staff Handbooks

2d. Operational Health

Schools that are effective, sustainable organizations have many of the characteristics below:

- A safe, clean and appropriately resourced educational facility with all appropriate services specified in charter and mandated by appropriate law and regulations
- Demonstrate efficient and orderly daily operations
- Have appropriate insurance coverage and insurance and facility documents
- An effective process for recruiting, hiring, compensating, monitoring, supporting, and evaluating school leadership and staff
- A flexible, data-driven approach to professional development for all staff
- Consistently meet student enrollment and retention targets as established by SED (applicable to schools renewed after 2010)
- Communications with NYC DOE are timely, comprehensive, and appropriate
- If applicable, school relationship with a charter management organization identified in charter and supported by a management agreement that spells out services, responsibilities, accountability reporting, performance expectations, and fees

Evidence of an operationally viable organization may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Required facility documents (lease, certificate of occupancy, fire and safety inspections, etc.)
- Appropriate insurance documents
- Operational policies and procedures
- Operational organizational chart
- Secure storage areas for student and staff records
- Policies/protocols for maintaining secure records
- School safety plan
- Immunization completion rate information
- Appropriate AED/CPR certifications

2e. Financial Sustainability

Schools that are responsible stewards of public funds and are effective, sustainable organizations have many of the characteristics below:

- Maintain annual budgets that meet all short- and long-term financial responsibilities with available revenues
- Provide rigorous oversight of financial and operational responsibilities, at school leadership and Board levels, in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to short- and long-term decision-making
- Consistently clean financial audits and compliant escrow accounts
- If applicable, strong, accountable partnerships with management organizations and other partners and significant vendors to support delivery of charter school's design and academic program
- School leadership and Board maintain effective internal controls of finances to ensure integrity of financial management and a proactive approach to mitigating risk
- School leadership and Board oversee financial and operational responsibilities in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to decision-making
- Demonstrate financial planning for future school years, including per-pupil and space-related cost projections

Evidence for a financially sound, viable organization may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- School budget, P&Ls, and monthly/quarterly cash-flow reports
- Financial audits, escrow accounts and other fiscal reporting documents
- Financial leader(s) resume and accountability documents
- Financial and operational organizational chart
- Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) for significant partnerships and vendor relationships

3. Is the School in Compliance with its Charter and All Applicable Laws and Regulations?

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with the school's charter and charter agreement have the characteristics below:

- Implement the key features of their charter as described in the original charter and, if appropriate, as modified in approved revisions to their charter, including but not limited to mission, academic program, school organization, grade configuration, enrollment, goals, etc.
- Ensure that up-to-date charter is available on request to staff, parents, and school community
- Implement comprehensive academic, behavioral, oversight, management, and operational policies and procedures that are substantially aligned with the charter and the school's stated mission and vision

Evidence for a school's compliance with the terms of its charter and charter agreement may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Authorized charter and signed agreement
- Charter revision request approval and documentation
- School mission
- School policies and procedures
- Annual Comprehensive Review reports
- Board meetings, agendas and minutes
- Leadership/Board and staff interviews
- Public hearings (renewal or material revision hearings)

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have the characteristics below:

- Meet all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, ELL and Special Education students to those of their community school district of location[36] *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

[36] School-specific targets for enrollment and retention were developed by the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

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

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

3c. Applicable Regulations

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

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

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

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

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

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

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

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

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

4b. Organizational Sustainability

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

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

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

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

4c. School or Model Improvements
Successful schools are thoughtful about the continued appropriateness of school design features and elements of their models. They: • Review performance carefully and even without major changes through expansion or replication, are careful to adjust elements to ensure continued and improved success • Develop plans to improve the school learning environment, including improving their facilities to expand program offerings and/or developing new partnerships to further the school's mission
Evidence for successful improvements to a school's program or model may include, but not be limited to, the following: • Renewal application narrative, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term • Renewal application revised charter including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term • Leadership and Board interviews • Contracts or Memos of Understanding (MOUs) with partners or important vendors

Appendix A: School Performance Data

Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP Academy Charter School				
Grade 3	-	-	22.9%	25.6%
Grade 4	-	-	-	19.2%
Grade 5	41.4%	55.6%	16.4%	9.5%
Grade 6	57.6%	66.7%	26.5%	16.7%
Grade 7	51.6%	70.3%	36.5%	30.9%
Grade 8	57.6%	61.3%	33.9%	23.0%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 7 *				
Grade 3	-	-	12.6	16.1
Grade 4	-	-	-	7.8
Grade 5	12.8	23.2	6.8	-0.6
Grade 6	35.5	46.0	18.3	8.6
Grade 7	35.6	47.2	28.4	22.9
Grade 8	42.3	43.5	24.5	14.5
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 3	-	-	-5.2	-4.4
Grade 4	-	-	-	-11.9
Grade 5	-7.6	3.4	-12.2	-18.9
Grade 6	14.0	21.4	3.2	-8.6
Grade 7	15.1	27.0	11.0	4.1
Grade 8	22.6	22.3	8.4	-5.9

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
KIPP Academy Charter School				
Grade 3	-	-	36.1%	61.1%
Grade 4	-	-	-	54.8%
Grade 5	70.0%	65.3%	32.8%	28.4%
Grade 6	100.0%	86.4%	48.5%	53.0%
Grade 7	84.4%	93.8%	46.0%	52.9%
Grade 8	94.9%	95.2%	56.5%	57.4%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 7 *				
Grade 3	-	-	24.3	45.3
Grade 4	-	-	-	38.7
Grade 5	29.8	19.5	23.1	11.6
Grade 6	64.8	50.4	39.8	43.2
Grade 7	48.5	58.9	39.8	44.2
Grade 8	61.8	59.7	48.5	49.4
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 3	-	-	3.0	22.5
Grade 4	-	-	-	14.8
Grade 5	7.1	0.1	3.3	-10.4
Grade 6	44.0	27.1	19.7	19.3
Grade 7	28.9	36.5	21.0	23.3
Grade 8	42.4	40.0	30.7	34.6

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

Regents Pass Rates

KIPP Academy Charter School			
	2011-2012	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Integrated Algebra	90%	96%	92.9%
Algebra 2 / Trigonometry	80%	88%	83.3%
Comprehensive English	96%	91%	96.1%
U.S. History	100%	92%	98.4%
Chemistry	58%	73%	32.3%
Physics	75%	43%	47.5%
Living Environment	92%	92%	94.7%
Language Other Than English (Spanish)	-	-	98.4%

Appendix B: High School Performance Data

The high school performance data presented below reflects high school students from all four KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up "KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School".[37] The percentage of students that attended KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School that were KIPP Academy Charter School students is as follows:

- In 2010-2011, 26% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP Academy Charter School students.
- In 2011-2012, 30% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP Academy Charter School students.
- In 2012-2013, 29% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP Academy Charter School students.
- In 2013-2014, 33% of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School students were KIPP Academy Charter School students.

HS Performance Compared to Peer and NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	-	-	91.5%	95.1%
NYC *	-	-	66.0%	68.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	25.5	26.7
College and Career Preparatory Course Index **				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	-	-	80.9%	74.7%
Peer Percent of Range	-	-	79.0%	71.0%
City Percent of Range	-	-	100.0%	99.3%

* The New York State graduation rate calculation method was first adopted in NYC for the Cohort of 2001 (Class of 2005). The cohort consists of all students who first entered ninth grade in a given school year (e.g., the Cohort of 2005 entered ninth grade in the 2005-2006 school year). Graduates are defined as those students earning either a Local or Regents diploma and exclude those earning either a special education (IEP) diploma or GED.

** The College and Career Preparatory Course Index score was not introduced until the 2010-2011 school year and peer and city percent of range scores were not available until the 2011-2012 school year. 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.

[37] The four KIPP NYC CMO schools whose high school grades together make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School are KIPP Infinity Charter School, KIPP AMP Charter School, KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School and KIPP Academy Charter School. The NYC DOE Chancellor does not authorize KIPP STAR College Prep Charter School.

Weighted Regents Pass Rates

2014					
	English	**Math**	**Science**	**Global History**	**U.S History**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.13	1.57	2.00	1.23	1.26
Peer Percent of Range	60.9%	89.3%	100.0%	95.2%	76.3%
City Percent of Range	73.9%	95.2%	96.8%	92.2%	84.6%
2013					
	English	**Math**	**Science**	**Global History**	**U.S History**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.06	1.58	1.80	1.16	1.10
Peer Percent of Range	50.0%	97.5%	100.0%	83.3%	59.5%
City Percent of Range	65.0%	100.0%	85.1%	84.0%	68.0%
2012					
	English	**Math**	**Science**	**Global History**	**U.S History**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.36	2.05	2.16	1.54	1.24
Peer Percent of Range	59.7%	92.4%	100.0%	58.2%	50.0%
City Percent of Range	60.7%	93.8%	94.8%	60.9%	53.0%
2011					
	English	**Math**	**Science**	**Global History**	**U.S History**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	1.17	1.69	2.01	1.34	-
Peer Percent of Range	40.9%	67.5%	100.0%	40.5%	-
City Percent of Range	51.9%	74.1%	91.7%	54.7%	-

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				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	76.4%	84.9%	88.3%	90.4%
Peer Percent of Range	16.6%	48.5%	54.5%	62.9%
City Percent of Range	56.7%	69.7%	74.2%	78.5%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	86.6%	84.7%	87.9%	88.6%
Peer Percent of Range	56.8%	52.2%	61.9%	62.9%
City Percent of Range	77.1%	71.8%	76.7%	78.6%
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School	-	90.3%	89.8%	87.2%
Peer Percent of Range	-	71.6%	69.6%	61.7%
City Percent of Range	-	83.5%	81.7%	77.3%

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.

Closing the Achievement Gap

4-year Weighted Diploma Rate*				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students with Disabilities **	-	-	253.8%	359.1%
English Language Learner Students	-	-	-	325.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	-	-	217.9%
College and Career Preparatory Course Index * **				
	2010-2011	**2011-2012**	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	-	-	-	14.3%

* The weighted diploma rate assigns a weight to each type of diploma based on the relative level of proficiency and college and career readiness indicated by the diploma type and based on certain student demographic characteristics.

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

*** The College and Career Preparatory Course Index score for Students in the Lowest Third Citywide was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

Performance on the NYC Progress Report – KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School

High School Progress Report Grades	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Overall Grade	-	-	A	Progress Reports were discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year.
Student Progress	-	-	A	
Student Performance	-	-	B	
School Environment	-	-	A	
College and Career Readiness *	-	-	A	

* The College and Career Readiness grade was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

Regents Pass Rates

KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School			
	2011-2012	**2012-2013**	**2013-2014**
Integrated Algebra	83.0%	91.0%	93.0%
Algebra 2 / Trigonometry	78.8%	78.9%	70.6%
Comprehensive English	96.0%	92.9%	93.3%
U.S. History	98.5%	95.0%	92.2%
Chemistry	58.7%	62.4%	28.5%
Physics	72.2%	45.6%	43.9%
Living Environment	93.3%	91.9%	95.7%
Language Other Than English	-	99.2%	99.3%

Academic Performance of KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School

The high school performance data presented here in Appendix B reflects high school students from all four KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School, a created but not legally chartered separate entity.

For the 2013-2014 school year, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's four-year graduation rate was 95.1%. This rate was higher than the citywide average by 26.7 percentage points. KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's four-year graduation rate was in the 89th percentile of high schools citywide. When compared to high schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools) KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School outperformed 84% of similar schools.

Credit accumulation is self-reported by charter schools to the NYC DOE. In general, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's overall credit accumulation rates have been higher than both the average credit accumulation rates of its peer group schools and the average credit accumulation rates of all high schools citywide over the charter term. The Peer and City Percent of Ranges for first, second, and third year students were above 50% in all years (with the exception of first-year credit accumulation in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012), meaning that the school outperformed its peer group and the citywide average along

each metric. The exceptions occurred in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, when the Peer Percent of Range for first-year students was below 50% in each of the two years.[38]

In the most recent school year, 2013-2014, 90.4% of first year students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School earned 10+ credits, placing the school in the 56th percentile of its peer group schools and the 75th percentile of all high schools citywide.[39] Additionally, 88.6% of second year students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School earned 10+ credits, again placing the school in the 56th percentile of its peer group schools and the 75th percentile of all high schools citywide. Finally, 87.2% of third year students at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School earned 10+ credits; placing the school in the 62nd percentile of its peer group schools and the 79th percentile of all high schools citywide.

Weighted Regents pass rates in English, Math, Science, Global History and U.S. History were at or above both the citywide averages and the averages for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's peer group in the most recent school year, 2013-2014. In general, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School compares favorably against its peer group schools and all high schools citywide when analyzing weighted Regents pass rates over the course of the current charter term, though peer and citywide comparisons show that KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School has historically performed less favorably in English and History.

A Progress Report was produced for KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School for the 2012-2013 school year based on the high school performance data of students enrolled at all four KIPP NYC CMO charter schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School. KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School received an Overall grade of A on its 2012-2013 NYC DOE High School Progress Report, as well as A grades in all other sections with the exception of Student Performance, for which it received a B grade. This ranked KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School in the 85th percentile of all high schools citywide.

NYC DOE Progress Reports graded each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and were based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores were based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of 40 schools with similar student populations and to all schools citywide. The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report was the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constituted 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section was primarily based on median adjusted growth percentiles,[40] 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

The high school closing the achievement gap data reflects high school students from all KIPP NYC CMO schools that collectively make up KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School.

Students in the lowest third citywide at KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School had a four-year weighted diploma rate of 217.9% in 2013-2014. However, only 14.3% of this same group of students met the requirements for the College and Career Preparatory Course Index (CCPCI). The school did not serve

[38] A comparison range consists of all possible results within two standard deviations of the average. A Percent of Range of 50.0% represents the average and indicates that the school's credit accumulation rate was equal to the average score for the relevant comparison group.

[39] A percentile rank provides the percentage of schools that score the same or lower than the school under consideration. A citywide percentile of 75%, for example, indicates that the school's credit accumulation rate was equal to or above 75% of high schools citywide.

[40] 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 minimum percentage of students designated as in the lowest third to receive peer or city percent of range data for either the weighted diploma rate or the CCPCI.[41]

In 2013-2014, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's students with disabilities had a four-year weighted diploma rate of 359.1%. This rate was associated with a City Percent of Range of 85.5% indicating it was above the citywide average.

In 2013-2014, KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School's English Language Learner students had a four-year weighted diploma rate of 325.0%. However, the school did not serve the minimum percentage of students designated as English Language Learners to receive peer or city percent of range data.[42]

[41] For a school to be included in the NYC DOE's calculation of peer and city averages for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics and, thus, for the school to receive peer and city percent of range data for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, the school's population percentage for the relevant special population must be at least 25% of the City percent of range. Students in the lowest third citywide made up only 8.6% of the KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School student population in 2013-2014, which corresponded to a City Percent of Range of only 13.2%.

[42] For a school to be included in the NYC DOE's calculation of peer and city averages for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics and, thus, for the school to receive peer and city percent of range data for Closing the Achievement Gap metrics, the school's population percentage for the relevant special population must be at least 25% of the City percent of range. English Language Learner students made up only 3.7% of the KIPP NYC College Prep Charter School student population in 2013-2014, which corresponded to a City Percent of Range of only 6.7%.

Appendix C: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-2013