



**INWOOD ACADEMY FOR LEADERSHIP CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2014 – 2015 SCHOOL YEAR
DECEMBER 2014**

Table of Contents

PART 1: SUMMARY OF RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION	2
I. CHARTER SCHOOL OVERVIEW:	2
<i>Background Information</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Overview of School-Specific Data</i>	<i>3</i>
II. RENEWAL RECOMMENDATION AND RATIONALE	6
PART 2: SCHOOL OVERVIEW AND HISTORY.....	12
PART 3: RENEWAL REPORT OVERVIEW	14
PART 4: FINDINGS	16
<i>Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally and Operationally Sound, Viable Organization?.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? ...</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?.....</i>	<i>33</i>
PART 5: BACKGROUND ON THE CHARTER RENEWAL PROCESS	34
PART 6: NYC DOE OSDCP ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK.....	37
APPENDIX A: SCHOOL PERFORMANCE DATA	49
APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY DATA	49

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Background Information

Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	
Board Chair(s)	Rahsaan Graham
School Leader(s)	Christina Reyes (Executive Director), Ryan McCabe (MS)
Charter Management Organization (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	N/A
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 6
Physical Address(es)	433 West 204th Street, Manhattan (Grades 5-8)
	108 Cooper Street, Manhattan (Grade 9)
Facility Owner(s)	Private
School Opened For Instruction	2010-2011
Current Charter Term Expiration Date	12/14/2014
Current Authorized Grade Span	5-9
Current Authorized Enrollment	500
Proposed New Charter Term	3.5 years [December 15, 2014 - June 30, 2018]
Proposed Authorized Grade Span for New Charter Term	5-12
Proposed Authorized Enrollment for New Charter Term	1,020
Proposed Sections per Grade for New Charter Term	4-5 (four sections per grade in grades 5, 9-12; five sections per grade in grades 6-8)

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	13	13	13	13	52
# Met	2	3	2	1	8
# Partially Met	0	1	0	0	1
# Not Met	2	1	2	6	11
# Not Applicable *	9	8	9	6	32
% Met	15%	23%	15%	8%	15%
% Partially Met	0%	8%	0%	0%	2%
% Not Met	15%	8%	15%	46%	21%
% Not Applicable *	69%	62%	69%	46%	62%
% Met of All Applicable Goals	50%	60%	50%	14%	40%

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

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	25.7%	40.8%	15.2%	11.8%
CSD 6	38.4%	34.5%	13.7%	15.6%
Difference from CSD 6*	-12.7	6.3	1.5	-3.8
NYC	49.0%	48.7%	25.8%	27.4%
Difference from NYC *	-23.3	-7.9	-10.6	-15.6
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-27.1	-14.3	-15.9	-18.8

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	55.5%	61.3%	15.7%	18.1%
CSD 6	51.0%	52.2%	15.0%	20.4%
Difference from CSD 6*	4.5	9.1	0.7	-2.3
NYC	62.9%	62.2%	27.8%	31.5%
Difference from NYC *	-7.4	-0.9	-12.1	-13.4
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-7.8	-3.5	-15.4	-18.1

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

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

Student improvement on the state tests compared to other students

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School - All Students	45.0%	72.0%	56.0%	59.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	0.0%	100.0%	23.4%	41.7%
City Percent of Range- All Students	0.0%	82.7%	20.9%	34.3%
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School - School's Lowest Third	49.0%	77.5%	73.0%	73.5%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	81.2%	20.1%	39.0%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	0.0%	68.0%	25.2%	38.6%

Median Adjusted Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School - All Students	59.5%	67.5%	58.5%	62.0%
Peer Percent of Range - All Students	35.9%	71.2%	34.5%	46.9%
City Percent of Range- All Students	41.4%	70.3%	41.3%	51.8%
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School - School's Lowest Third	71.0%	71.0%	79.0%	76.0%
Peer Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	54.7%	63.6%	56.6%	51.4%
City Percent of Range - School's Lowest Third	56.2%	63.5%	63.7%	58.9%

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

Closing the Achievement Gap

Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	63.6%	61.3%	54.4%
English Language Learner Students	18.2%	50.0%	38.8%	35.0%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	23.1%	50.6%	46.2%	43.4%
Percent in the 75th Growth Percentile - Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students with Disabilities *	-	33.3%	58.1%	63.3%
English Language Learner Students	20.0%	32.4%	43.7%	35.2%
Students in the Lowest Third Citywide	38.7%	36.5%	51.4%	56.9%

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

Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School enrolled its first class of ninth grade students in the 2014-2015 school year. As a result, high school performance data, including graduation rates, credit accumulation and Regents pass rates, are not available for the current charter term.

II. Renewal Recommendation and Rationale

Based on the evidence presented herein and detailed below in Part II, the NYC DOE recommends a 3.5 year short-term renewal with academic performance conditions.

The academic performance conditions are as follows:

1. As part of its oversight of Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School in its next term, the NYC DOE will require the school to submit an academic improvement/corrective action plan to address its English Language Arts performance and growth on the NYS assessments. This plan should include timelines, interim progress goals, details on data-driven instructional program design, professional development and assigned responsibilities. A draft of the plan should be submitted to the NYC DOE no later than March 14, 2015.
2. If by the start of school year 2017-2018, the school's high school academic performance in each year to date of the charter term does not meet or exceed the following, the NYC DOE reserves the right to provide the school's students and parents with information and counseling regarding the citywide high school choice process:
 - NYS Regents exam pass rates (weighted and standard) at or above 50 percent of city range for both the English and math exams; and
 - Credit accumulation, as measured by the percent of high school students in their first and second years earning 10+ credits in each respective year, is at or above 50 percent of city range for both grade levels.

As part of the renewal application, Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School submitted two material revisions. The NYC DOE determination is as follows: regarding the material revisions to expand authorized grades from grades five through nine to grades five through twelve and to increase the authorized maximum enrollment to 1,020 students during the next charter term, the NYC DOE approves these material revisions.

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School (Inwood Academy for Leadership) has partially 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 Inwood Academy for Leadership indicates that the school has made progress towards meeting these objectives.

Mission and Vision

Inwood Academy for Leadership's mission is to empower students in Inwood and Washington Heights to become agents for change through community-focused leadership, character development and college preparedness. The school executes against this mission by embedding character development curriculum into the school day, providing student leadership opportunities within both the school and its surrounding community, and fostering partnerships with local organizations in the Inwood and Washington Heights sections of Manhattan.

School-Specific Academic Performance

The school entered its fifth year of operation with the 2014-2015 academic year. The New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) 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 Inwood Academy for Leadership.

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 are not directly comparable.

English Language Arts (ELA) and math proficiency rates for Inwood Academy for Leadership have not consistently exceeded or fallen below those of CSD 6 during the current charter term. In 2012-2013, ELA and math proficiency rates for Inwood Academy for Leadership met or exceeded those of CSD 6.¹ However, in the most recent year, 2013-2014, Inwood Academy of Leadership proficiency rates were below those of CSD 6 for both ELA and math.

In 2012-2013, 15.7% of Inwood Academy for Leadership's students were proficient in math. Inwood Academy for Leadership's math proficiency was higher than 55% of middle schools citywide and, when compared to middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools), Inwood Academy for Leadership outperformed 67% of similar schools. In 2012-2013, 15.2% of Inwood Academy for Leadership's students demonstrated proficiency in state tests in ELA. At this level of proficiency, Inwood Academy for Leadership outperformed 57% of middle schools citywide. Additionally, Inwood Academy for Leadership outperformed 85% of its peer schools.

The following year, in 2013-2014, 18.1% of Inwood Academy for Leadership's students were proficient in math. Inwood Academy for Leadership's math proficiency was again higher than 55% of middle schools citywide. When compared to peer schools, Inwood Academy for Leadership outperformed 63% of similar schools. In 2013-2014, 11.8% of Inwood Academy for Leadership's students demonstrated proficiency in NYS assessments in ELA. At this level of proficiency, Inwood Academy for Leadership outperformed only 43% of middle schools citywide but outperformed 63% of its peer schools.

Over the four years that data is available for the retrospective charter term, Inwood Academy for Leadership has met 40% of its applicable academic charter goals.^{2,3} Inwood Academy for Leadership met one of seven applicable academic performance goals in its most recent year.

¹ This refers to overall proficiency within the school. Individual grade-level proficiency was below the CSD 6 rates for grades five and six in both ELA and math.

² This calculation does not include goals which have not been evaluated (not applicable) either as a result of the goal no longer being measurable (e.g. NYC DOE Progress Report grades for 2013-2014 school year and beyond) or the goal not yet measurable for the school at the time of the annual reporting (e.g. high school graduation rate for an academic year in which the school was not serving grade 12 students).

³ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades in its analysis of progress towards goals.

Because of the move to Common Core 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, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report grades. The school has demonstrated a trend of decreased achievement of its stated charter goals over the most recent years of the charter term under review.

In 2012-2013, Inwood Academy for Leadership's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was 56% with a City Percent of Range of 20.9%, placing the school in the 11th percentile of middle schools citywide.⁴ Similarly, the school's peer and Community School District (CSD) percentiles were 21% and 0%, respectively. This means that only 21% of other middle schools in Inwood Academy for Leadership's peer group and no other middle schools in CSD 6 had ELA median adjusted growth percentiles lower than Inwood Academy for Leadership's ELA median adjusted growth percentile.

In 2012-2013, Inwood Academy for Leadership's math median adjusted growth percentile was 58.5% with a City Percent of Range of 41.3%, which placed it in the 32nd percentile of middle schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer and CSD percentiles were 31% and 29%, respectively. The school's math median adjusted growth percentile was below the average of both its peer group and CSD 6.

The following year, in 2013-2014, Inwood Academy for Leadership's median adjusted growth percentile increased in each ELA and math. In 2013-2014, Inwood Academy for Leadership's ELA median adjusted growth percentile increased to 59% with a City Percent of Range of 34.3%, placing the school in the 21st percentile of middle schools citywide. Similarly, the school's peer and CSD percentiles both increased to 35% and 12%, respectively.

In 2013-2014, Inwood Academy for Leadership's math median adjusted growth percentile increased to 62% with a City Percent of Range of 51.8%, placing the school in the 50th percentile of middle schools citywide. The school's peer and CSD percentiles rose to 43% and 41%, respectively.

The school has consistently provided a supportive learning environment for students as well as a responsive education program, but has shown mixed evidence of academic achievement and progress. Reports from the past three NYC DOE visits to the school indicate that in the first three years of its charter the school provided a safe environment that was conducive to learning. These reports consistently describe safe, positive, productive classrooms and a reflective professional culture focused on individual improvement and student achievement.⁵ However, the school has struggled to maintain these achievement and progress levels on state assessments aligned to the CCLS, which began in school year 2012-2013. The school's current leadership team has been responsive to this during the past two school years by expanding the school's academic intervention team to increase support to at-risk students; expanding its use of reading intervention tools and its overall Response to Intervention (RtI) program; delving deeper into analysis of internal and external assessment data; and increasing support for teachers in the forms of additional coaching, planning time, and professional development (PD).⁶

On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, Inwood Academy for Leadership received an overall grade of C with a grade of C for Student Progress and grades of B and A for Student Performance

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 the same or lower than the school under consideration. A City Percent of Range of 20.9% indicates that the school's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was greater than one standard deviation below the average (that only 20.9% of the range around the average represented scores lower than that of Inwood Academy for Leadership), while a citywide percentile of 11% indicates that Inwood Academy for Leadership's ELA median adjusted growth percentile was higher than only 11% of all middle schools citywide.

⁵ Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School's Annual Site Visit Reports, 2010-2011 and 2011-2012

⁶ Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School's renewal application materials submitted on March 31, 2014

and School Environment, respectively. Inwood Academy for Leadership ranked in the 30th percentile of all middle schools citywide on the 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report. On the prior year's NYC DOE Progress Report (2011-2012), the school received an overall grade of A and received A grades in all other report categories, placing it in the 93rd percentile of all middle schools citywide. The school's year-over-year performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report, as represented by percentile rank, declined. (Schools receive an ungraded progress report in their first year serving students.)

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,⁷ which measure students' growth on state tests relative to other students with the same prior-year score. Although the NYC DOE Progress Report was discontinued beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, individual academic performance metrics from the former NYC DOE Progress Report are included in this renewal report for all years for which data was available in the current charter term.

Closing the Achievement Gap

NYC DOE-authorized charter schools are also assessed based on their ability to close the achievement gap for specific student populations. In school years prior to the 2013-2014 school year, schools received additional credit on the NYC DOE Progress Report for progress and performance of students with disabilities, English Language Learners (ELLs), and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, charter schools will be assessed on the actual performance as well as the academic growth of students in these populations compared with public school students in the CSD and throughout New York City.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 57% of Inwood Academy for Leadership's students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places Inwood Academy for Leadership in the 72nd percentile of middle schools citywide. However, only 43% of 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 Inwood Academy for Leadership in the 25th percentile of all middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 63% of Inwood Academy for Leadership's students with disabilities experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math scores. This level places Inwood Academy for Leadership in the 91st percentile of middle schools citywide. However 54% of students with disabilities 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 Inwood Academy for Leadership in the 54th percentile of all middle schools citywide.

On the 2013-2014 NYS assessments, 35% of Inwood Academy for Leadership's English Language Learner students experienced growth in math that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting math

⁷ 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.

scores. This level places Inwood Academy for Leadership in the 39th percentile of middle schools citywide. Similarly, 35% of English Language Learner students 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 Inwood Academy for Leadership in the 36th percentile of all middle schools citywide.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Inwood Academy for Leadership 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:

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

Over the course of the school's charter term, the Board of Trustees has maintained a developed governance structure and organizational design. It has maintained a steady membership and consistently achieved quorum for its required number of yearly meetings. The Board Chair, Rahsaan Graham, is a founding Board member. The Board's officer positions have been consistently filled and its committees have been consistently active. The Board posts its meeting minutes and agenda publicly via the school's website. The Board receives standing academic and operational reports from the school's leadership team during meetings.

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has developed a stable school culture. The school's Executive Director, Christina Reyes, has been with the school since its inception, as has the majority of the school's leadership team. Additionally, Inwood Academy for Leadership has maintained an instructional staff turnover rate of 14% or less throughout the course of the charter term even as it expanded grade levels. The school has retained 93% or more of its students throughout the course of the charter term. Although the school met its student attendance goal for only two of the four years of the charter term under review, its average daily student attendance for this period does meet the school's attendance goal threshold of 95%.

Based on NYC School Survey results, 100% of teachers at Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School agree or strongly agree that school leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching, which has been constant for three of the four years of survey data in the charter term. This level of agreement is eight percentage points above the citywide average of 92% in 2013-2014. Responses on key questions from students, parents and teachers were generally above citywide averages with only one teacher response and one student response below the citywide average. Response rates for students, parents and teachers have consistently been above citywide averages for the past three years.

Overall, the school is in a neutral position to meet near-term financial obligations. The school has 28 days of unrestricted cash on hand to meet current liabilities totaling \$1,709,731.

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

There was no material weakness noted in the three independent financial audits.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the charter term, Inwood Academy for Leadership has been compliant with most applicable laws and regulations and was briefly out of compliance with one portion of its charter monitoring plan.

The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is not in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization; according to school records, only 96.2% of the school's students have met immunization requirements.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

The school has submitted a request to make the following material revisions to its charter as part of its next charter term:

- Continue phase-in of high school with expansion of grades served from five through nine to five through 12; and
- Expand maximum authorized enrollment from 500 to 1,020 students.

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

- The school plans to expand its summer programming to include more weeks of enrichment programming in addition to its existing Summer School, Leadership Week, and Boot Camp enrichment offerings.
- The school plans to embed its Leadership Week during an added week at the beginning of the school year to ensure that students who travel to the Dominican Republic during the summer can return in time to participate. Additionally, going forward, Leadership Week will include day-long retreats for each grade level.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School is a middle/high school serving 586 students⁸ in grades five through nine during the 2014-2015 school-year. It opened in the 2010-2011 school-year with grade five and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's authorized grade span through the fifth year of its charter is 5-9, with the original application authorizing the school to serve grades 5-12.⁹ The school does not currently offer a public universal Pre-Kindergarten program in New York City. The school is located in two different privately operated facilities in Community School District 6, in Manhattan.

Inwood Academy for Leadership is a middle/high school located in the Inwood neighborhood of Manhattan. The school's mission is to empower students in Inwood and Washington Heights to become agents for change through community-focused leadership, character development and college preparedness. Since its inception the school has made particular efforts to serve the students of its surrounding community, many of whom are recent immigrants and English Language Learners.

Inwood Academy for Leadership manages student information via the DOE's Automate the Schools (ATS) system and invoices through the NYC DOE vendor portal. The annual budget is created by the Board of Trustees of the school. Inwood Academy for Leadership's Board of Trustees is solely responsible for complying with all requirements of grants for the school, the school's governing charter, and all applicable laws.

Inwood Academy for Leadership's Board of Trustees is led by chair Rahsaan Graham, a founding Board member. The school is led by Executive Director Christina Reyes, who is also the interim high school principal. She has been with the school since its inception. The middle school is led by principal Ryan McCabe, who has been with the school since 2012.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades five through eight and backfills students during the school year in only these grades from the waitlist. There were 226 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2014 lottery.¹⁰

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
Grade 5	109	107	107	110
Grade 6	-	113	115	106
Grade 7	-	-	110	117
Grade 8	-	-	-	114
Grade 9	-	-	-	-
Total Enrollment	109	220	332	447

* 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.

⁸ ATS data as of October 31, 2014

⁹ NYC DOE internal data

¹⁰ 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
Grade 5	4	28
Grade 6	4	27
Grade 7	4	29
Grade 8	4	29
Grade 9	-	-
Students Admitted Through The Lottery	125	

* Lottery and section count information are based on self-reported data from the 2013-2014 DOE Annual Charter School Survey. Average Class Sizes were determined by dividing ATS enrollment as of October 31, 2013 by the appropriate grade-level section count.

Please see additional demographic data in Section 4 of this report for information regarding the enrollment of special populations at Inwood Academy for Leadership. This information includes enrollment data for the percentage of students eligible for Free or Reduced Price Lunch, English Language Learners and students with disabilities as compared to the CSD and citywide averages, as well as targets proposed by the New York State Education Department (NYSED).¹¹

¹¹ Beginning with the 2014-2015 school year, Board of Regents authorized charter schools, including those authorized by NYC DOE, will be held accountable to enrollment targets once established by NYSED for students with disabilities, English Language Learner students, and students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch.

Part 3: Renewal Report Overview

Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding the charter school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during the current charter term, including but not limited to oversight visits, annual reports, and formal correspondence between the school and its authorizer, the NYC DOE, all of which are conducted in order to evaluate and monitor the charter school's academic, fiscal, and operational performance. Additionally, the NYC DOE incorporates into this report its findings from the renewal application process, which includes a written application, a report on student achievement data and a school visit by the Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) and other staff from the NYC DOE.

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

Is the school an academic success?

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

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

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

Is the school a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally and operationally sound, viable organization, OSDCP focuses on three areas: Governance Structure & Organizational Design, School Climate & Community Engagement, and Financial Health. This includes an analysis of the school's audited financial statements, based on the National Association of Charter School Authorizer's Core Performance Framework.¹²

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

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

A school's Governance Structure & Organizational Design and Climate & Community Engagement are rated as **Developed, Partially Developed, or Not Yet Developed.** A school's Financial Health is rated to

¹² 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 two renewal visits to the school on May 14-15, 2014 and September 30, 2014:

- DawnLynne Kacer, Executive Director of 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
- Lynnette Aqueron, Education Administrator and Senior School Improvement Specialist, NYC DOE Office of Special Education

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal Inwood Academy for Leadership has partially demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

High Academic Attainment and Improvement

- The school has four years of academic performance data and four years of NYS assessment data at the time of this report. For detailed information on grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A.

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

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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	25.7%	40.8%	15.2%	11.8%
CSD 6	38.4%	34.5%	13.7%	15.6%
Difference from CSD 6 *	-12.7	6.3	1.5	-3.8
NYC	49.0%	48.7%	25.8%	27.4%
Difference from NYC *	-23.3	-7.9	-10.6	-15.6
New York State **	52.8%	55.1%	31.1%	30.6%
Difference from New York State	-27.1	-14.3	-15.9	-18.8

% Proficient in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	55.5%	61.3%	15.7%	18.1%
CSD 6	51.0%	52.2%	15.0%	20.4%
Difference from CSD 6 *	4.5	9.1	0.7	-2.3
NYC	62.9%	62.2%	27.8%	31.5%
Difference from NYC *	-7.4	-1.0	-12.1	-13.4
New York State **	63.3%	64.8%	31.1%	36.2%
Difference from New York State	-7.8	-3.5	-15.4	-18.1

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

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

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

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

Mission and Academic Goals

According to annual reports submitted to the NYSED as well as information submitted to the NYC DOE as part of the school's Renewal Application, over each of the four years in the charter term during which the school was open, the school achieved/met academic goals as follows:

- 2 of 4 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter,
- 3 of 5 in the second year,
- 2 of 4 in the third year,¹³ and
- 1 of 7 in the fourth year.

Progress Towards Academic Charter Goals *

Academic Goals	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
1. 75% of seventh and eighth graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Exams - Math	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met
2. 75% of seventh and eighth graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Exams - English	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met
3. 75% of eighth graders will receive a 3 or 4 on the NYS Science examination	N/A	N/A	N/A	Not Met
4. 75% of fifth and eighth graders will receive a 3 or 4 on the NYS Social Studies examination.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
5. 90% of ninth grade students will pass both the Living Environment and Algebra NYS Regents examinations with at least a 65.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹³ It should be noted that because of the move to Common Core standards in 2012-2013, the NYC DOE did not include goals that measure a school's actual performance relative to 75% or greater absolute proficiency on the NYS ELA and math exams or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals for the 2012-2013 school year. Goals that refer to comparative academic performance of the school (e.g. to the Community School District) were included in the analysis. In addition, beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE will not include goals that are related to NYC DOE Progress Report Grades in its analysis of progress towards goals.

Academic Goals		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
6.	The school will meet or exceed the requirements and annual goals of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, and will be in good standing concerning Adequate Yearly Progress.	Met	Met	Met	N/A
7.	Grade-level cohorts of the same students will reduce by one-half the gap between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State exams (baseline) and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State exam.	N/A	Partially Met	N/A	Not Met
8.	Each cohort of students will reduce by one-half the gap between percent passing on Regents exams.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
9.	The percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will place the school in the top quartile of peer schools.	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met	Not Met
10.	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 peer schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
11.	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 peer schools.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
12.	75% of fifth through ninth graders will perform at or beyond grade level on the curricular unit assessments.	Met	Met	Not Met	Met
13.	The school will have an average daily student attendance rate of at least 95%. ¹⁴	Not Met	Met	Met	Not 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

As part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE visited the school on May 14-15, 2014 and September 30, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- **Alignment with Common Core:**

- At the middle school level, the school currently uses the EngageNY curriculum for math instruction and the Core Knowledge curriculum for ELA. The high school uses the EngageNY modules in both ELA and math as its core curriculum.
- The school has used a standards-based grading system since its first year in anticipation of the shift to Common Core. Teachers use one-on-one conferencing with students to help break down the CCLS into objectives they can understand and to provide goals leading toward mastery of these standards over time.
- The school uses i-Ready and Achieve3000 software to reinforce Common Core questioning methods during independent practice.

¹⁴ Progress towards this goal was determined by attendance data from the NYC DOE ATS system.

- School leadership team reported that by conducting an item analysis of state assessment results from 2012-2013, the school was able to discover that it needed to concentrate more on mastering core CCLS early in the school year.
- **Addressing the Needs of All Learners:**
 - During the September 30, 2014 visit, the school reported having 80 students with Individual Education Programs (IEPs). Annual reviews for all students with IEPs were up to date. Some three-year mandated reviews were overdue; however, the school and the Committee on Special Education (CSE) had arranged to schedule their completion.¹⁵
 - The school's Special Education Coordinator provides a central access for teachers to view IEPs. In addition, she provides teachers with an "IEP at a Glance" document which contains basic information, goals, and any alerts. All special education teachers have access to SESIS except for new teachers.
 - The school has 10 fully certified special education teachers, three teachers working toward certification, and two ELL specialists.
 - The school provides the following services for students with IEPs: Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS); Integrated Co-Teaching (ICT) in four fifth and sixth grade classrooms; and ICT in seventh and eighth grade math, social studies and science classrooms. Related services for occupational therapy (OT), physical therapy (PT) and paraprofessionals are provided by outside agencies and/or related service authorizations. The school provides speech and counseling services.
 - At the time of the most recent school visit on September 30, 2014, most students' program recommendations were being implemented as per the IEP for SETSS and ICT. However, there were some students who had Day Treatment or Special Class in a Community School (D75) recommendations that should be amended to better reflect the school's offerings. At the time of the visit, transition services were not being implemented, although students had access to a guidance counselor to discuss college paths.¹⁶
 - Parents of students with disabilities are provided information regarding students' progress towards goals three times a year.
 - As part of the school's Response to Intervention process, middle school and high school teams have been set up to meet every week and discuss specific students. The special education coordinator reported that different levels of interventions are discussed depending on each student's needs. Tier 1, 2 and 3 interventions are implemented.
 - The school's ELL supports include: small grouping (6:1 or 12:1) for phonics instruction, Read 180, and New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT) prep and support.
 - The school has a preference for ELL students in its admissions lottery and reports that many of its ELL students enroll within months of immigrating to the United States.
 - The school has shown consistent success in declassifying ELL students. In school year 2010-2011, 18% of the school's ELLs tested proficient on the New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test (NYSESLAT); in 2011-2012, 22% of the school's ELLs tested proficient; in 2012-2013, 19% of the school's ELLs tested proficient; and in 2013-14, 17% of the school's ELLs tested proficient (with an additional 60% scoring at the Advanced level).¹⁷ Taking these students from proficiency on the NYSESLAT to proficiency on the ELA portion of state assessments has been, and will continue to be, one of the school's main focus areas.

¹⁵ Information regarding students with disabilities and IEPs is from renewal visit documentation review and observations conducted by a member of the NYC DOE charter CSE.

¹⁶ Information regarding students with disabilities and IEPs is from renewal visit documentation review and observations conducted by a member of the NYC DOE charter CSE.

¹⁷ Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School's renewal application, submitted March 31, 2014 and updated September 20, 2014

- The school is a member of the NYC Charter School Center’s Special Education Collaborative. The Collaborative provides the school with program analysis, training, and recruitment and resource materials.
- The school uses literacy intervention tools including Read180, System44, Wilson Reading, and the American Reading Company. The school has a Reading Specialist on staff.
- The school focuses its support on students in fifth and sixth grade by utilizing a “House” model. Each grade, or “House” is assigned two core teachers; one is responsible for ELA/social studies instruction and the other for math/science. These teachers loop with their students for a maximum of two years, with the intention of enabling them to build content expertise, deepen their understanding of students’ learning needs, and strengthen their relationships with students’ families.
- The school offers summer programming, enrichment programming after school, and Saturday School twice a month. The school reports that on average, 75% of its students stay for enrichment programming each day.¹⁸
- Teachers receive ongoing support through weekly PD sessions, coaching, retreats, and through collaboration time in their Professional Learning Communities (PLCs).
- The school utilizes the Danielson Framework for teacher evaluations and observations. Teachers are observed by their principals monthly in 15-minute periods and receive verbal feedback within 24 hours. A written feedback summary is provided via email.
- The school partners with New Visions for Public Schools to provide additional support to its fifth grade teachers around student inquiry methods. Twice a month these teachers meet with a New Visions coach who takes them through the inquiry process, engaging them in the collaborative planning of tasks, error analysis of student work, identification of focus standards, and creation of implementation plans.
- The school works with the Center for Educational Innovation - Public Education Association’s (CEI-PEA) Partnership for Innovation in Compensation for Charter Schools (PICCS) program to develop a leveled career and compensation plan for instructional staff members, implemented in spring 2014. Through this professional growth model teachers can begin as an Apprentice and then progress through the levels of Aspiring Teacher, Novice Teacher, Associate Teacher, and finally Master Teacher. Each level includes a proportional base salary and potential increase and/or stipend opportunity. The school hopes this career ladder will help retain strong teachers looking to increase their leadership responsibilities.

- **Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction:**

During the renewal visit, 20 classrooms across grades five through nine were observed with the school’s Executive Director, middle school principal, and former high school principal.

- In most observed classes, teachers were either utilizing the school’s “bucketizing” approach to student grouping and instructional differentiation or following its ICT model.
- Class sizes observed ranged from 16 to 26 students in size, with one to two teachers in each classroom.
- Forms of questioning identified during classroom observations mostly challenged students to either demonstrate understanding of the material covered or to analyze and apply it. Examples included: a science lab in which students compared the time needed for whole versus crushed tablets to dissolve in order analyze the effect of an object’s surface on reaction time; an ELA class in which students were composing mock Twitter “tweets” as a character from the novel *Stargirl*; and a differentiated activity that required students to draw conclusions about triangles based on information given and to prove their answers in peer stations.

¹⁸ Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School’s renewal application, submitted March 31, 2014 and updated September 20, 2014

- In most observed classrooms, checks for understanding consisted of a combination of teacher questioning, classwork, and teacher observation.
 - In most observed classrooms, differentiation of materials, tasks, and products, through small group instruction or independent practice, was observed. These were consistent with the school model. Examples included: a math class in which one group was completing a geometry worksheet tasking them with demonstrating the Pythagorean Theorem while another group completed an Algebra worksheet; and an ELA class in which student groups discussed the significance of character names from differentiated texts (novels varied by student proficiency level) and how they contributed to the story's allegorical elements.
 - 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.
- The school's current interim assessment system for all grades includes administration and analysis of: NWEA MAP assessments three times per school year; school-created interim assessments twice per school year; and unit tests taken from EngageNY modules. Additionally, the school relies extensively on formative data, such as that from daily exit slips, to help assess standard and sub-standard mastery and identify student groupings (what the school calls "bucketizing") for the following day's instruction. Following each interim assessment, the school's Director of Technology aids the school's Instructional Leadership Team in guiding teachers through a "deep dive" of the data gathered.
 - The school's current schedules include various staff and student supports that serve its instructional model. School leadership reports that teachers receive two hours of time per week to collaboratively plan across grade levels, and an average teacher schedule has two to three hours per day devoted to data analysis and/or collaboration as well. Middle school student schedules include intervention periods as well as an Advisory period that utilizes a character-focused curriculum to bolster leadership development aspect of the school's mission. The high school schedule maintains the middle school teacher schedule elements of shared planning time, weekly team meetings, and teacher-led professional development. The school also plans to integrate front-loaded credit-bearing classes in grades nine and 10 to enable students in grades 11 and 12 to participate in out-of-school internships.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 16 general and special education teachers. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received weekly and biweekly school-based professional development during the school year as well as during the summer, with the administration providing resources. They also reported being encouraged by administration to get further professional development outside of the school.
- All interviewed special education teachers and ELL specialists spoke of frequent collaboration with the general education teaching staff, stating they provide help with lesson planning and differentiation as well as information on behavior modifications.
- Most of the interviewed teachers mentioned the use of the Danielson Framework for formal evaluations and informal teacher observations conducted by the school's principals. All of the teachers interviewed stated that helpful, supportive feedback was consistently provided in a timely fashion after each observation.
- All interviewed teachers reported that they use data in the classrooms through both formal assessments (e.g., NWEA MAP results and interim assessments) and informal assessments (e.g., observational notes and exit slips). All interviewed teachers spoke about using exit slip assessments to inform the next day's instructional groupings, a main focus of the school's instructional model. Many interviewed teachers characterized the school as "data-driven."

NYC DOE representatives conducted group interviews with 16 students across grades five through nine. The following was noted:

- Most interviewed students reported feeling academically challenged at the school, but at a level that was not intimidating to them.
- Many interviewed students spoke of the school's leadership and character-related initiatives in their interviews.
- All interviewed students reported that their teachers had high academic expectations for them and also felt supported by teachers in trying to reach those expectations.

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, most parents strongly agree “that the school has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss [their] child” and most parents who responded to the survey strongly agree “that the school has high expectations for [their] child.”¹⁹

According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 71% of teachers agree that “order and discipline are maintained at the school” and 86% disagree with the statement that “at my school students are often harassed or bullied in school.”²⁰

¹⁹ According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 77% of parent respondents strongly agree that Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School has teachers who are interested and attentive when they discuss their child; another 21% agree with the statement. Similarly, 76% of parent respondents strongly agree that Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School has high expectations for their child; another 22% agree with the statement.

²⁰ According to the 2013-2014 NYC School Survey, 11% of teacher respondents strongly agree that order and discipline are maintained at Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School; another 60% agree with the statement. Of teacher respondents, 69% disagree with the statement that students are often harassed or bullied in the school; 17% strongly disagree 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 October 1, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives for the NYC DOE conducted an interview with representatives from the school's Board. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has eight active members. This level of membership is consistent within the minimum of seven and maximum of 11 members established in the Board's bylaws.
- The Board's Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary and Treasurer positions, as specified in the bylaws, are currently filled with no vacancies.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in the minutes that were reviewed for Board meetings held for school years 2011-2012 through the current school year, 2014-2015 (27 meetings total through November 2014).
- The Executive Director updates the Board on academic progress and school operations, as recorded in meeting minutes, on a standing basis. Periodic financial updates are provided by the Board's Treasurer in conjunction with the school's operations staff.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership as evidenced by the school's organizational chart and school leadership team's monthly updates on academic, financial and operational performance to the Board and its committees, as recorded in Board meeting minutes.
- The Board has active and functioning committees, as required by its bylaws and as recorded in meeting minutes. These standing committees are: the Executive Committee, the Educational Accountability Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Audit Committee. The Board also has additional Facilities and Fundraising Task Forces to aid in the school's transition to private space and its consequent financial demands.
- The school's Executive Director is Christina Reyes, who has been at the school for five years, since its inception.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- To date, the school has met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% in two of the four years of the retrospective charter term. Average daily attendance for students over the four year charter period is 95.1% as reflected in the table below.²¹

²¹ The table reflects attendance data taken from the NYC DOE's ATS system. Please note that the school self-reported different attendance rates than those recorded in ATS in its Renewal Application to the NYC DOE for school years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. The school self-reported attendance rates of 96.6% and 96.7% for school years 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, respectively.

Average Attendance

Elementary and Middle School Attendance				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School *	94.8%	96.1%	95.1%	94.4%
NYC **	93.2%	93.9%	93.6%	93.2%
Difference from NYC	1.6	2.2	1.5	1.2

* Attendance figures reflect average attendance as recorded in ATS.

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

- The school has generally experienced low instructional turnover during the course of the charter term. In year one, year two, and year three of the charter term (2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013), the percentage of staff who did not return, either by choice or request, at the start of the following school year was 9%, 14%, and 9%, respectively. For the most recent period, instructional staff turnover was again 14%, or 5 instructional staff members, not returning, either by choice or request, in the 2013-2014 school year.²² There is no evidence that instructional turnover has negatively affected student performance.
- Student mobility is presented below for the charter term without comparison to other schools, the CSD or NYC as final student retention goals were not established by the New York State Education Department for the retrospective charter term. Based on the NYC DOE's evaluation and not in comparison to any other school, the CSD or NYC averages, the school has not had challenges with retaining students.

Mobility

Student Mobility out of Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School*				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Number of Students who Left the School	5	14	15	31
Percent of Students who Left the School	4.6%	6.4%	4.5%	7.0%

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

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

²² Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form in November 2014

citywide averages for all of the three selected questions; and 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 parents, teachers and students (if participating) are presented below for each year of the charter term. In general, the response rates for Inwood Academy for Leadership students, parents and teachers have been above NYC averages with the only exceptions being the parent and teacher response rates in the first year of operation.

NYC School Survey Results

Percent of Respondents that Agree or Strongly Agree						
Survey Question		Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School				Citywide Average
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014
Students*	Most of my teachers make me excited about learning. **	-	90%	62%	65%	62%
	Most students at my school treat each other with respect.	-	71%	49%	54%	60%
	I feel safe in the hallways, bathrooms, locker room, cafeteria, etc.	-	95%	86%	84%	79%
Parents	I feel satisfied with the education my child has received this year.	100%	99%	99%	99%	95%
	My child's school makes it easy for parents to attend meetings.	100%	96%	100%	99%	94%
	I feel satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school.	97%	98%	99%	99%	95%
Teachers	Order and discipline are maintained at my school.	100%	89%	82%	71%	80%
	The principal at my school communicates a clear vision for our school.	100%	100%	100%	89%	88%
	School leaders place a high priority on the quality of teaching.	100%	95%	100%	100%	92%
	I would recommend my school to parents. ***	-	84%	87%	89%	81%

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

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

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

NYC School Survey Results

		Response Rates			
		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Students*	Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	-	98%	98%	96%
	NYC	-	82%	83%	83%
Parents	Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	32%	88%	81%	82%
	NYC	52%	53%	54%	53%
Teachers	Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	75%	100%	100%	92%
	NYC	82%	81%	83%	81%

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

- The school's charter goals include: "Each year, 80% of parents (at a participation rate of 60%) will express satisfaction with Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School, based on the School's Parent Survey." The school fully met this goal in two of the three applicable years of its charter and partially met this goal in one of the applicable years of its charter. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.²³
- The school's charter goals include: "Each year, 90% of teachers (at a participation rate of 95%) will express satisfaction with Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School, based on the School's Staff and Faculty Survey." The school fully met this goal in one of the three applicable years of its charter and partially met this goal in two of the applicable three years of its charter. This goal was not applicable for the 2013-2014 school year.²⁴
- The school's charter goals include: "Each year, 80% of students (at a participation rate of 95%) will express satisfaction with Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School, based on the School's Student Survey." The school fully met this goal in one of the two applicable years of its charter and partially met this goal in the other applicable year of its charter. This goal was not applicable for the 2010-2011 or 2013-2014 school years.²⁵

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 school reports having an active Parent Leadership Council that has bylaws and has moved from meeting monthly in the first three years of its charter to meeting every other month in the fourth charter year.
- The school disseminates a weekly communication bulletin called *The 411* to parents. In its fourth year, the school also launched a quarterly newsletter targeting an external audience of potential staffers, funders, and community partners.

²³ The school fully met the goal if the parent response rate was greater than or equal to 60% and the school received at least 7.5 points based on parent responses in each of the four NYC School Survey categories (Safety and Respect, Communication, Engagement, and Academic Expectations). If either the response rate did not meet the benchmark and/or the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, the goal was considered 'partially met.'

²⁴ The school fully met the goal if the teacher response rate was greater than or equal to 95% and the school received at least 7.5 points based on teacher responses in each of the four NYC School Survey categories (Safety and Respect, Communication, Engagement, and Academic Expectations). If either the response rate did not meet the benchmark and/or the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, the goal was considered 'partially met.'

²⁵ The school fully met the goal if the student response rate was greater than or equal to 95% and the school received at least 7.5 points based on student responses in each of the four NYC School Survey categories (Safety and Respect, Communication, Engagement, and Academic Expectations). If either the response rate did not meet the benchmark and/or the school received less than 7.5 points in one or more of the Survey categories, the goal was considered 'partially met.'

- The school has partnered with Eklund Consulting, a national firm focused on workplace culture and job satisfaction, throughout its charter term to help gauge its organizational wellness and drive improvement. A 2013 School Workplace Satisfaction Survey administered by Eklund found that more than 90% of surveyed staff responded favorably to the following statements about the school:²⁶
 - Our administration encourages and supports teachers working together.
 - I have the freedom to choose how to best meet the needs of the students in my classroom.
 - I believe I am improving as a teacher.
 - My school is a positive place to work.
 - Our school has a positive reputation in the community.
 - The work environment and culture at this school are what I wanted when I became an educator.
 - I would suggest this school as a great place to work to a teacher seeking employment.
- A Panorama Education internal survey performed by the school during the spring of 2013 indicated that 98% or more of parents either agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements about the school:²⁷
 - My child is learning a lot in school this year.
 - My child is safe at this school.
 - I talk with my child's teacher(s) about my child's schoolwork, challenges, and academic progress.
 - This school offers me many ways to be involved in my child's education.
 - My child is challenged to meet high expectations at this school.
 - I am satisfied with the response I get when I contact my child's school with questions or concerns.
- A Panorama Education internal survey performed by the school during the spring of 2013 indicated that 87% or more of students either agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements about the school:²⁸
 - I look forward to going to school each day.
 - I feel safe when I am at school.
 - There is an adult at school I can go to who will listen if I have a problem or concern.
 - My teacher knows this subject well.
 - My teacher is willing to give us extra help on our schoolwork if we need it.
- The school's charter goals include: "Each Year the suspension rate will be below 4% (average NYC DOE rate)." According to self-reported data by the school, Inwood Academy for Leadership met this goal during three of the four years in its charter term.
- The school's charter goals include: "Each year 95% of students in grade five through nine will complete at least two community service projects. This will be monitored and recorded by the Director of School Culture." According to self-reported data by the school, Inwood Academy for Leadership met this goal during three of the four years in its charter term.
- The school's charter goals include: "Each Year Inwood Academy for Leadership will host three events in conjunction with a community based partner." According to self-reported data by the school, Inwood Academy for Leadership met this goal during each year of its charter term. Events included Hike the Heights held with community partner Community Research Project and various in-school and after-school collaborations with the YM-YWHA of Inwood & Washington Heights.
- School staffers have participated in the Washington Heights Inwood Youth Service Providers Collective, a monthly meeting of organizations that work with Inwood youth. Staffers were able to secure connections to community soccer and orchestra resources for their students through this Collective.

²⁶ Submitted with school's renewal application on March 31, 2014. It was unclear from the report summary submitted what percentage of the school's staff members participated in the survey.

²⁷ Submitted with school's renewal application on March 31, 2014. It was unclear from the report summary submitted what percentage of the school's families participated in the survey.

²⁸ Submitted with school's renewal application on March 31, 2014. It was unclear from the report summary submitted what percentage of the school's students participated in the survey.

- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school on September 30, 2014 at 433 W. 204th St, New York, NY 10034 in an effort to elicit public comments. Approximately 230 participants attended the hearing with 18 people speaking in support of the school's renewal and none speaking in opposition.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to school parents/guardians were made from September through November 2014 until 20 phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the fiscal year 2014 (FY14) financial audit, the school's current ratio of 1.53 indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit and follow up, the school's unrestricted cash availability of 28 days cash on hand indicated a risk that the school will be able to cover at least one month of its operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2014-2015 budget to the actual enrollment as of September 30, 2014 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY14 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

Financial Sustainability

Overall, 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, and in FY14 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY14 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio of 0.28 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, however the school had negative cash flow from FY13 to FY14.

There was no material weakness noted in the four independent financial audits for FY11 through FY14.

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

- The school saw a significant decline in its cash position due to investing \$300,000 in leasehold improvements in their newly leased space during FY14.

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

Over the charter term, Inwood Academy of Leadership has been compliant with most applicable laws and regulations.

As of the review in November 2014, the Board of Trustees for Inwood Academy for Leadership is in compliance with:

- **Membership size.** Over the charter term, the Board has consistently had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws, a minimum of seven and maximum of 11 members.
- **Required number of monthly meetings.** The school's bylaws indicate that the Board is to hold 11 meetings a year in addition to an Annual meeting in June, for a total of 12 meetings per calendar year. From school year 2011-2012 through November 2014,²⁹ the Board, as per its bylaws, held 12 Board meetings per year during the current charter term as evidenced by the Board Yearly Meeting Schedule and the posted meeting minutes. Required meetings are those which met quorum.
- **Submission of all required documents.** All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms. The documents submitted do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.³⁰
- **Posting of minutes and agendas.** The Board has consistently made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings by posting them on the school's website.
- **Notification of Board Member Resignations/Submission of New Board Members for Approval.** With one exception, the Board has consistently submitted resignation notices or new Board member credentials within the required five days of change to OSDCP for review and if necessary, approval.
 - Conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms for four Board members who were approved by the Board during 2011-2012 and had been serving since that time were not sent to or approved by OSCDP within the timeframe above. However, OSCDP received these materials in the spring of 2013 and has since approved all current Board members.
- **Timely submission of documents.** The Board consistently submitted the Annual Report to the NYSED by the deadline of August 1 (or by the NYSED granted extension date) for each year of the current charter term. The school has posted to its website its annual audit for each year of the charter term, as required in charter law.

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

- **Fingerprint clearance.** All staff members have appropriate fingerprint clearance.
- **Teacher certification.** The school has submitted required documentation for teacher certification and is compliant with state requirements for teacher certification. The Charter Schools Act prohibits more than five staff members or more than 30 percent of the teaching staff from not being certified in accordance with requirements applicable to other public schools.
- **Safety Documents.** The school has submitted the required safety plan. The school has the required number of staff with AED/CPR certification.
- **Insurance.** The school has submitted appropriate insurance documents to the NYC DOE.
- **Fire Emergency.** At least one of the school leaders was trained in General Response Protocols/Fire Emergency Drill Conductor for NYC, as mandated by the NYC Fire Department.
- **Application and Lottery.** For the 2014-2015 school year, the school had an application deadline of April 4, 2014 and lottery date of April 10, 2014, adhering to charter law's requirement of

²⁹ OSDCP did not ask for submission of Board minutes during school year 2010-2011 and is consequently unable to review minutes for that school year.

³⁰ Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

accepting applications up to at least April 1. Over the course of the charter term, the school consistently adhered to this requirement.

- **Student Discipline Plan.** The school has provided the NYC DOE with a current and complete copy of their 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 May 2014, the charter school is out of compliance with:

- **Immunization.** The school has submitted its required immunization documentation and is not in compliance with Department of Health standards of 99% for immunization; according to school records, only 96.2% of the school's students have met immunization requirements.

Enrollment and Retention Targets

- Amendments to Article 56 of the New York State Consolidated Laws: Education, which relates to Charter Schools, call for charter schools, as a consideration of renewal, "to meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets" for students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who are eligible for the free and reduced price lunch program. The amendments further indicate "Repeated failure to comply with the requirement" as a cause for revocation or termination of the charter.
 - The law directs schools to demonstrate "that it has made extensive efforts to recruit and retain such students" in the event it has not yet met its targets.
 - The NYC DOE, as authorizer, will annually monitor the school's performance against these targets and the efforts it makes to meet this state requirement.
 - As of November 1, 2014, charter school enrollment and retention targets as required by the NYS Charter Schools Act are still in a *proposed* status. The information presented below for enrollment is compared to NYC CSD and NYC averages, however, these averages should not be assumed to be similar to the final enrollment targets to be released by NYSED.³¹
- In all years of operation, including the most recently completed school year 2013-2014, Inwood Academy for Leadership:
 - served a lower percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to the CSD 6 rate, but served a higher percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced price lunch compared to the citywide percentage (with the exception of the most recent school year, 2013-2014, in which it served a lower percentage than the citywide rate);
 - served a higher percentage of students with disabilities compared to the CSD 6 percentage, but served a lower percentage compared to the citywide rate (with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, in which it served a higher percentage than the citywide rate); and
 - served a lower percentage of English Language Learner students compared to the CSD 6 percentage but a higher percentage of English Language Learner students compared to the citywide percentage.

³¹ Please see the following website for more information: <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/enrollment-retention-targets.html>

Enrollment of Special Populations³²

Special Population		2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2013-2014 State Enrollment Target (Proposed)
Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRPL)	Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	85.3%	87.7%	91.0%	80.8%	94.3%
	CSD 6	90.8%	94.2%	93.4%	92.5%	
	NYC	82.3%	84.7%	83.3%	82.3%	
Students with Disabilities (SWD)	Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	15.6%	19.5%	20.5%	19.2%	14.2%
	CSD 6	15.4%	16.0%	16.5%	18.5%	
	NYC	19.7%	19.8%	20.2%	21.0%	
English Language Learners (ELL)	Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School	24.8%	17.7%	17.2%	15.9%	46.8%
	CSD 6	40.2%	37.5%	33.5%	33.0%	
	NYC	14.3%	13.0%	12.4%	12.0%	

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

³² Comparisons of a charter school's special populations to the CSD and City are made relative only to the grades served by the school. For example, if a charter school serves grades kindergarten through five, comparisons of that school's special populations will only be made relative to grades kindergarten through five in the CSD and citywide. CSD comparisons are particular to the grades served in each CSD each year. Enrollment rates reflect demographic characteristics as of June 1 and enrollment as of October 31 for each given school year, with the exception of enrollment in the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.

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

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

The school has submitted a request to make the following material revisions to its charter as part of its next charter term:

- The school applied to expand its grades served from five through nine to five through 12 in the next charter term.
- The school applied to expand its maximum authorized enrollment from 500 to 1,020 in the next charter term.

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

- The school plans to expand its summer programming to include more weeks of enrichment programming in addition to its existing Summer School, Leadership Week, and Boot Camp enrichment offerings.
- The school plans to embed its Leadership Week during an added week at the beginning of the school year to ensure that students who travel to the Dominican Republic during the summer can return in time to participate. Additionally, going forward, Leadership Week will include day-long retreats for each grade level.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Renewal Process

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

The NYC DOE does not automatically grant charter renewal, and no charter operator is entitled to renewal. Rather, a school must prove that it has earned renewal and is worthy of continuing the privilege of educating New York City public school students. To make such determinations, the NYC DOE Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) renewal team performs a comprehensive review of the school's academic, operational and fiscal performance over the course of the charter which includes an analysis of the school's renewal application. This application is built around the four essential questions of the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework and includes a retrospective analysis of the school's prior track record as well as a prospective plan for the school. In reviewing this information, a school must be able to demonstrate that it can satisfy the four essential questions of the NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework:

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

The school presents evidence to support 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.³³

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.³⁴ As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education ("NYC DOE") institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act's renewal standards:

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;

³³ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

³⁴ See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction; and
- The means by which the charter school will meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets as prescribed by the board of regents of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced price lunch program which shall be considered by the charter entity prior to approving such charter school's application for renewal.³⁵

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.³⁶

³⁵ § 2851(4)(e) added with the 2010 amendments to the Act.

³⁶ See § 2852(5).

Part 6: NYC DOE OSDCP Accountability Framework

The Office of School Design and Charter Partnerships (OSDCP) team may recommend to the Chancellor three potential outcomes for charter schools applying for renewal: full-term renewal (with or without conditions), short-term renewal with 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 our 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 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 2014-15.

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 Reports³⁷

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

³⁷ Beginning with the 2013-2014 school year, the NYC DOE replaced the DOE Progress Report with the DOE School Quality Report. The 2012-2013 school year is the last year NYC public schools will have a Progress Report score. The Progress Report and School Quality Report contain similar indicators of performance.

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

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

1c. Learning Environment

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

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

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

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

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

2a. Mission and Goals

Schools with a successful mission and goals have many of the characteristics below:

- Have an animated mission statement and clearly articulated goals (both academic and non-academic) that staff, students and community embrace
- Demonstrate an active self-evaluation process that involves regular monitoring, an examination of practices based on outcomes against goals, and reporting on progress towards school goals
- Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data

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

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

2b. Leadership and Governance Structure

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

- Have a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations, with clear lines of accountability for the Board, school leadership and all staff
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate officers, committees, and a purposeful blend of skills and experiences to provide oversight and strategic direction to fulfill the mission and goals of its charter
- Have a Board that is fully compliant with all applicable laws and regulations, particularly, but not limited to, Open-Meeting Law and conflict of interest laws, and is fully compliant with its Board approved by-laws (number of meetings, quorum, posting of calendar, agenda and minutes)
- Have a defined process for Board reflection on effectiveness, assessing developing needs, and plan for professional growth
- Have developed a succession plan for board and school leadership, consistent with the charter and Board by-laws, to ensure continuity of direction and leadership over time
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals and, if and when necessary, makes timely adjustments to that structure with proper notice to and approval by its authorizer
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provides regular feedback on instruction to teachers, including both formal and informal observations

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

- School charter
- Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, calendar of meetings, meeting agenda and minutes
- Annual conflict of interest forms
- Board resources for evaluating school leadership and staff, including rubric/performance metrics
- Board resources for self-reflection and professional growth
- Board development plan
- Board interviews
- Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook and core operational policies
- School calendar
- Professional development plans
- Stakeholder interviews (board, school leadership and staff)

2c. School Climate and Community Engagement

Schools with a sustaining school climate and engaged parent and community support have many of the characteristics below:

- A healthy professional school climate that is collaborative, student-centered, and open to parents and community support
- Employ an effective means of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including, but not limited to, the NYC DOE School Survey
- Have effective home-school communication practices and engagement strategies to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children
- Strong community-based partnerships that support and advocate for the school
- Engage families actively in the life of the school, including advocacy, community engagement, and feedback on school policies and initiatives
- Have a clear procedure for parents and staff to express concerns to school leadership and the Board, as appropriate, including a clearly articulated escalation path to authorizer
- Share instructional and operational practices with the larger NYC school community and actively seek opportunities for partnering and collaboration
- Encourage professional conversations about effective performance and quality instruction among staff, through, for example, such means as regular and periodic teaming (grade level teams, data days, etc.) and peer observations
- Have systems in place to evaluate professional development effectiveness and provide ongoing support for school-wide and individual initiatives

Evidence for school climate and community engagement may include, but not be limited to, the following:

- NYC DOE School Survey satisfaction parent, teacher, and, if appropriate student results
- Student retention and wait list data
- Staff retention data
- Leadership, staff, parent, student interviews
- Student and staff attendance rates
- Parent attendance at parent-teacher conferences
- Parent association meeting calendar and minutes
- Community partnerships and sponsored programs
- Participation in NYC DOE initiatives and efforts to collaborate/partner with other NYC schools
- Parent and community feedback via public hearings, renewal calls to parents, etc.
- Community outreach documents (newsletters, announcements, invitations, etc.)
- School Professional Development Plan and staff feedback on professional development events
- Resources for evaluations and observations, scheduled opportunities for professional collaboration, staff feedback on professional development events
- Student/Family and Staff Handbooks

2d. Operational Health

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

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

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

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

2e. Financial Sustainability

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

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

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

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

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

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

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

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

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

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

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

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

- Meet all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Meet or exceed enrollment and retention targets for Free and Reduced Price Lunch, ELL and Special Education students to those of their community school district of location³⁸ 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

³⁸ School-specific targets for enrollment and retention are to come from the NY State Education Department. This requirement of the New York State Charter Schools Act applies to schools renewed after 2010.

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

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

3c. Applicable Regulations

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

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

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

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

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

4a. School Expansion or Model Replication

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

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

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

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

4b. Organizational Sustainability

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

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

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

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

4c. School or Model Improvements

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

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

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

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

Appendix A: School Performance Data

Students scoring at or above Level 3

Grade-Level Proficiency in English Language Arts				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School				
Grade 5	25.7%	37.0%	16.3%	6.5%
Grade 6	-	44.5%	9.6%	12.4%
Grade 7	-	-	19.8%	12.8%
Grade 8	-	-	-	15.2%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 6 *				
Grade 5	-12.7	-0.6	-0.7	-9.5
Grade 6	-	13.1	-1.3	-1.1
Grade 7	-	-	6.6	-2.4
Grade 8	-	-	-	-2.5
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 5	-23.3	-15.2	-12.3	-21.9
Grade 6	-	-0.8	-13.7	-12.9
Grade 7	-	-	-5.7	-13.9
Grade 8	-	-	-	-13.7

Grade-Level Proficiency in Mathematics				
	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014
Inwood Academy for Leadership Charter School				
Grade 5	55.5%	53.7%	7.7%	14.8%
Grade 6	-	68.8%	10.3%	19.0%
Grade 7	-	-	28.8%	20.5%
Grade 8	-	-	-	18.0%
DIFFERENCE FROM CSD 6 *				
Grade 5	4.5	-0.4	-9.6	-10.6
Grade 6	-	18.6	-5.2	-0.9
Grade 7	-	-	16.3	2.5
Grade 8	-	-	-	-0.5
DIFFERENCE FROM NYC				
Grade 5	-7.4	-11.5	-21.9	-23.9
Grade 6	-	9.5	-18.5	-14.7
Grade 7	-	-	3.8	-9.1
Grade 8	-	-	-	-4.7

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

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Comprehensive Report 2012-2013](#)

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

[Annual Site Visit Report 2010-2011](#)