



**FAHARI ACADEMY CHARTER SCHOOL
RENEWAL REPORT**

**2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
NOVEMBER 2013**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Summary of Renewal Recommendation | 2 |
| I. Charter School Overview | 2 |
| II. Overview of School-Specific Data | 2 |
| III. Rationale for Recommendation | 4 |
| | |
| School Overview and History | 8 |
| | |
| Renewal Process Overview | 10 |
| | |
| Findings | 12 |
| Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success | 12 |
| Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization..... | 16 |
| Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations? | 20 |
| Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term? | 22 |
| | |
| Background on the Charter Renewal Process Overview | 23 |
| | |
| Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework | 24 |
| | |
| Appendix A: School Performance Data..... | 33 |
| | |
| Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data | 35 |

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

| | |
|--|--|
| Name of Charter School | Fahari Academy Charter School |
| Current Board Chair(s) | Jason Starr |
| School Leader | Stephanie Clagnaz, Principal |
| Management Company (if applicable) | N/A |
| Other Partner(s) | N/A |
| District(s) of Location | NYC Community School District 17 |
| Physical Address | 72 Veronica Place, 4th Floor, Brooklyn, NY 11226 |
| Facility | Public |
| School Opened For Instruction | 2009-2010 School-Year (Planning year in 2008-2009) |
| Current Charter Term Expiry Date | 12/15/2013 |
| Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at Expiry Date | 5-8 / 409 (school was chartered for 5-9) |
| Proposed Charter Term | Non-renewal |
| Proposed Maximum Grade / Enrollment at New Expiry Date | N/A |

II. Overview of School-Specific Data:

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report

| Progress Report Grade | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Overall Grade | - | D | C | F |
| Student Progress | - | F | D | F |
| Student Performance | - | D | C | F |
| School Environment | - | B | B | C |
| College and Career Readiness | | | - | - |
| Closing the Achievement Gap Points | - | 1.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 |

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

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC and State averages

| % Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 36.4% | 34.1% | 41.1% | 7.5% |
| CSD 17 | 38.7% | 39.5% | 38.9% | 16.7% |
| Difference from CSD 17 | -2.3 | -5.4 | 2.2 | -9.2 |
| NYC | 46.2% | 46.3% | 46.9% | 25.7% |
| Difference from NYC | -9.8 | -12.2 | -5.8 | -18.2 |
| New York State | 52.5% | 54.8% | 55.2% | 31.2% |
| Difference from New York State | -16.1 | -20.7 | -14.1 | -23.7 |

| % Proficient in Math | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 48.9% | 45.7% | 61.7% | 10.6% |
| CSD 17 | 47.9% | 48.6% | 50.8% | 14.7% |
| Difference from CSD 17 | 1.0 | -2.9 | 10.9 | -4.1 |
| NYC | 59.7% | 59.5% | 60.6% | 27.3% |
| Difference from NYC | -10.8 | -13.8 | 1.1 | -16.7 |
| New York State | 64.6% | 64.6% | 65.7% | 28.9% |
| Difference from New York State | -15.7 | -18.9 | -4.0 | -18.3 |

All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

| Academic Goal Analysis | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | 1st Year 2009-2010 | 2nd Year 2010-2011 | 3rd year 2011-2012 | 4th Year 2012-2013 | Cumulative 4 Year Total |
| Total Achievable Academic Goals | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 23 |
| # Met | 1 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 8 |
| # Partially Met | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| # Not Met | 2 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 15 |
| % Met | 33% | 0% | 67% | 25% | 35% |
| % Partially Met | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| % Not Met | 67% | 100% | 33% | 75% | 65% |

III. Rationale for Recommendation

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Fahari Academy Charter School (Fahari) has not demonstrated academic achievement or progress.

The New York Charter Schools Act of 1998 establishes a system of charter schools throughout New York State, with objectives that include, "(a) Improve student learning and achievement;" and "(b) Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure." Data available for Fahari indicate that the school has not made progress towards meeting this objective.

Fahari's mission is to educate, support, challenge and train scholars in Brooklyn's Flatbush neighborhood for success in college. The school was founded with the goal of providing the Flatbush neighborhood with a quality college preparatory option. Fahari is a Swahili word which means pride and helps define the school's core values: Perseverance, Respect, Independence, Discipline and Excellence. All scholars are expected to exemplify these values daily.

The school entered its fifth year of operation with the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. Therefore, the New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data to evaluate the academic achievement and progress of the students at Fahari. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an A, B, C, D, or F and are based on student progress, student performance, and school environment. Scores are based on comparing results from one school to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to all schools citywide.

Fahari has consistently struggled with poor performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report. On its 2012-2013 NYC DOE Progress Report, Fahari received an F grade in all sections except School Environment, for which they received a C grade. This ranks Fahari in the bottom 1% of all middle schools citywide. On its prior two NYC DOE Progress Reports, as its Overall Grade, the school earned a D, and C, in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012, respectively. (Schools receive an ungraded progress report in their first year serving students.)

The Student Progress section of the NYC DOE Progress Report is the most heavily weighted of all sections; it constitutes 60% of a school's grade. The grade in this section is based on median adjusted growth percentiles¹, which are a measure of how much a school's students perform on state tests relative to other students with the same prior score. Over the course of the charter term, the school did not fare well in this section; earning an F, a D, and an F in 2010-2011, 2011-2012, and 2012-2013, respectively.

In 2012-2013, Fahari's English Median Adjusted Growth Percentile was 49%, placing the school in the bottom 2% of middle schools citywide. Fahari's Math Median Adjusted Growth Percentile of 37% placed it in the bottom 1% of middle schools citywide. Additionally, all other middle schools in Community School District (CSD) 17 and in Fahari's peer group had a median adjusted growth percentile greater than Fahari's.

The Student Performance grade is based on results on the state tests in English and math, and core course pass rates, representing 25% of a school's total Progress Report score. Over the charter term, Fahari's Performance section grades were a D, a C, and an F for the years 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, respectively. In 2012-2013, only 10.6% of Fahari's students were proficient in math. Fahari's math proficiency was higher than 45% of middle schools citywide. However, when compared to middle schools with student populations most like its own (i.e. peer schools); Fahari outperformed only 18% of similar schools. In 2012-2013, only 7.5% of Fahari's students demonstrated proficiency in state tests in English. With this level of proficiency, Fahari outperformed just 25% of middle schools citywide. Additionally, Fahari only outperformed 3% of its peer schools.

Schools receive additional credit on the NYC DOE Progress Report for progress and performance of students with disabilities, English Language Learners, and students who start in the lowest third of proficiency citywide. On the 2012-2013 state assessments, 35% of Fahari'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 Fahari in the bottom 4% of middle schools citywide. Similarly, only 35% of students in the lowest third citywide experienced growth in English that, with adjustments, matched or exceeded the growth of 75% or more of other students citywide with the same starting English scores; this result places Fahari in the bottom 2% of all middle schools citywide.

Over the four years that data is available for the charter term, Fahari has met only 35% of its academic charter goals. Fahari met none of its performance goals in its most recent year.² 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% absolute

¹ 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 Progress Report 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 Progress Report 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.

² 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% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

proficiency³. This should have theoretically improved a school's percentage of goals met because 5 of 10 charter goals for the current year were not applicable. However, Fahari's percentage of goals met actually dropped to 25%.

The school has shown only mixed evidence of a developed responsive education program and supportive learning environment. Reports from past NYC DOE visits to the school indicate that in the first two years of the charter, the school provided a safe environment, conducive to learning. In a visit to the school in May 2011, reviewers noted that the school, "has high academic expectations and employs strategies for the full range of students" and in March 2012, that the "school dedicates significant resources to teaching and learning". The school also uses a co-teaching model for classrooms with at-risk learners. However, the staff turnover at the school made it difficult to establish a culture to meet students' needs. For example, as noted in the May 2011 site visit report, "the loss of the Science teacher midyear made it necessary to replace Science with Science Fiction."⁴ The school made improvements and 85% percent of eighth-grade students passed the Living Environment Regents examination at the end of the 2012-2013 school year.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Fahari Academy Charter School is a fiscally sound, but only partially viable organization.

At many points during the charter term, the Board of Trustees has had only a partially developed governance structure and organizational design. Fahari's governance has suffered from high turnover of its Board of Trustees members, as well as its school leadership team.

The Board has experienced complete turnover over the course of the charter term. None of the founding Board members remain. Jason Starr, the Board's third Chair during the charter term, assumed this position in July 2012. He was preceded by Dirk Tillotson, who resigned to take on the role of Executive Director of the school. The Board has not provided effective oversight of school management as demonstrated by the school's failure to show evidence of academic success, stable school culture, and stable school leadership.

School leadership has also experienced complete turnover in the last two years, with the founding school Executive Director, Catina Venning, leaving during the school's third year of operation. An interim leadership team was brought in, which included Dirk Tillotson, former Board Chair as Interim Acting Executive Director, and Glenn Liebeck and Joanne Falinski as interim acting academic leaders. They remained with the school until the end of the fourth year of operation (June 2013). The Board of Trustees then hired current principal, Stephanie Clagnaz, in May 2013, who fully transitioned into the role over the summer of 2013. As reported by the school, the title of Executive Director was discontinued in May 2012 in favor of Principal, however, the school did not request a revision to its charter to reflect this and NYC DOE was not informed of this change for the current charter term.

Fahari has also struggled with several operational problems. Over the course of the school's charter term, the school has not developed a stable school culture. The school received a Notice of Deficiency in August 2011, after a NYC DOE site visit conducted on May 16, 2011 raised concerns about the school's ability to hire and retain quality staff, maintain student enrollment, maintain an appropriate behavior management system, and effectively serve its students. In August 2012, the school received a Notice of Probation, which is described in more detail in Section C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations, below.

Although in its first year, the school's results on the NYC School Survey were Above Average; for academic years 2010-2011, 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, the results have been consistently low,

³ For more information on Fahari's student achievement, please see Appendix A

⁴ Fahari Academy Charter School Annual Site Visit Report 2011-2012, March 2012

with most categories falling in the Below Average range. For the last three years, the school has received two Bs and one C in the Learning Environment section of the NYC DOE Progress Report.

The school has also experienced high teacher rates over the course of its charter. As indicated by information submitted by the school, instructional turnover rates for the last 4 years have been at 40% and above (2009-2010: 43%; 2010-2011: 73%; 2011-2012: 40%; 2012-2013: 44%.⁵ The school retained 87.5% of staff from October 1, 2013 through the start of the 2013-2014 school year. The school's teaching staff voted to unionize in October 2011, and was recognized as a bargaining unit by the school's Board in November 2011.

While the school met its attendance goal of having an average daily attendance rate of at least 92%, Fahari failed to meet its goal of maintaining at least 85% of its authorized enrollment number from November 2010 through March 2011. Over the course of the year, the average enrollment was 83%.

Financially, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations and is financially sustainable based on its current practices. There was no material weakness noted in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011 or 2011-2012 independent annual financial audits.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Laws and Regulations

Over the course of the charter term, Fahari did not comply with all applicable laws and regulations; in particular, with teacher certification and chartered student enrollment requirements.

After a site visit to the school in the 2011-2012 school year, the NYC DOE issued the Fahari Board of Trustees a Notice of Probation on August 27, 2012. The visit revealed that the school was not in full compliance with the NYS Charter Schools Act, which requires that charter schools employ "at least 70% certified teaching staff and establish procedures for conducting criminal history checks of individuals who have regular access to the students." At the site visit in March 2012, NYC DOE discovered that many instructional staff had joined Fahari midway through the year, yet Fahari had not provided NYC DOE with an updated roster with certification and fingerprint clearance.⁶ By August of 2012, the NYC DOE had still not received updated rosters to indicate that the school was in compliance.

Further, over the 2011-2012 academic year, the school's enrollment averaged just 83% of its authorized student enrollment. This meant that Fahari, was out of compliance with Section 2.2 of its Charter Agreement with the NYC DOE, which requires that the school maintain at least 85% of its authorized enrollment. Fahari was therefore also out of compliance with its charter application, which established a 90% student retention goal for that academic year. (Additionally, according to information submitted by the school, the school did not meet the 90% student retention goal for the 2009-2010 or 2010-2011 academic years)

Additionally, the Notice of Probation expressed concerns about the school's suspension rate, as well as concerns about its ability to reach its approved academic goals. According to a document submitted by the school in March 2012, between September 2011⁷ and March 2012, the school had 91 out-of-school suspensions and 8 in-school suspensions, out of a total student body of only 225 students. Lastly, the school was out of compliance with Fahari's bylaws, which requires that the school have at least five voting members on the Board of Trustees. At the start of the 2012-2013 school year, the board had only four voting members.

The Board and school leadership responded and implemented a corrective action plan. Upon monitoring and document reviews by the NYC DOE, the Notice of Probation was allowed to expire

⁵ Self-reported by school in May 2012; 2012-13 CSAS Renewal Template, Staff Sheet V; Row 12, Columns D-G

⁶ Fahari Academy Charter School Annual Site Visit Report 2011-2012, March 2012

⁷ Self-reported by the school, FACS ASV School Visit Data Collection 3.22.12

on August 31, 2013. However as part of the renewal review process the NYC DOE is continuing to monitor Fahari in the areas cited in the Notice.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

The original terms of Fahari's current charter included high school grades. Fahari delayed expansion until both programmatic capacity and operational capacity were increased. The school proposes to begin serving 9th grade in the 2017-2018 school year.

For the aforementioned reasons, the NYC DOE is denying Fahari's renewal application.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Fahari Academy Charter School (Fahari) is a middle school serving approximately 409 students⁸ in fifth through eighth during the 2013-2014 school year. It opened in the 2009-2010 school year, with fifth grade and is under the terms of its first charter. The school's previously authorized full grade span is five through nine; however, the charter was revised to only serve grades five through eight during its current charter term, which expires December 15, 2013.⁹ The school is located in a NYC DOE facility¹⁰ in District 17, in Brooklyn. Fahari is co-located with Walt Whitman Middle School, a district middle school serving students in grades six through eight.¹¹

Fahari's mission is to educate, support, challenge and train scholars in Brooklyn's Flatbush neighborhood for success in college. Fahari is from the Swahili word meaning pride and helps define its core values: Perseverance, Respect, Independence, Discipline and Excellence.

The school typically enrolls new students in grades five and six. There were 321 students on the waitlist after the Spring 2013 lottery.¹²

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students:¹³

Special Populations

| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) | 91.2% | 77.8% | 69.0% | 88.7% |
| Students with Disabilities (SwD) | 13.2% | 12.0% | 15.5% | 14.7% |
| English Language Learners (ELL) | 0.0% | 5.4% | 3.6% | 5.2% |

Findings from the site visit during the 2010-2011 school year raised concerns about the school's ability to hire and retain quality staff, maintain student enrollment, maintain an appropriate behavior management system, and effectively serve students. As a result, the NYC DOE issued a Notice of Deficiency on August 26, 2011 to Fahari's Board of Trustees.

The following year, the Notice of Deficiency was upgraded to a Notice of Probation on August 27, 2012. A visit to the school during the 2011-2012 academic year revealed that the school was not in full compliance with NY State Charter Schools Act which requires that charter schools employ "at least 70% certified teaching staff and establish procedures for conducting criminal history checks of individuals who have regular access to the students."

Additionally, for the 2011-2012 academic year, the school's average enrollment was just 83% of its authorized student enrollment. Fahari was therefore out of compliance with Section 2.2 of its Charter Agreement with the NYC DOE, which requires that the school maintain at least 85% of its authorized enrollment. Fahari was also out of compliance with its charter application which includes a goal of retaining 90% of its students.

The Notice of Probation also included concerns about the school's suspension rate and its ability to reach the academic goals set in the charter application.

⁸ ATS data from 10/10/2013.

⁹ NYC DOE internal data.

¹⁰ NYC DOE internal data.

¹¹ NYC DOE Location Code Generating System database.

¹² Self-reported on Data Sheet Submitted with Renewal Application dated 5/1/2013

¹³ Free and Reduced Lunch, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learner figures are pulled as of Oct. 31st of each year.

Lastly, the school was out of compliance with Fahari's bylaws, which requires that the school have at least five voting members on the Board of Trustees. At the start of the 2012-2013 school year, the board had only four voting members.

In response to and compliance with the Notice of Probation, the Board of Trustees submitted a Corrective Action Plan to cure the noncompliance and address the other areas of concern. The plan included added professional development for teachers, modifications to the school schedule, and the addition of content consultants to coach teachers and modify the curriculum to align with the Common Core Learning Standards. The Notice of Probation ended on August 31, 2013.

During the 2012-2013 school year, Fahari met the enrollment, staffing, and Board of Trustees requirements; however, the NYC DOE is continuing to monitor Fahari in these areas as part of the renewal review process.

Fahari Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees is currently led by Jason Starr. Jason Starr, the Board's third Chair during the charter term, assumed this position in July 2012. He was preceded by Dirk Tillotson. Dirk Tillotson originally took this position in September 2011 along with a Co-Chair, Anna Graham Hunter, although it is not clear when she resigned from the Board. Ayanna Brooks served as the Board Chair since the school's founding in 2008 until her resignation in September 2011.

Currently, the school's principal is Stephanie Clagnaz, who joined the school in May 2013. Ms. Clagnaz was appointed to replace the school's interim acting leaders Dirk Tillotson, Glenn Liebeck, and Joanne Falinski. Dirk Tillotson resigned from the Board in June 2012 to assume the role of Interim Acting Executive Director from July 2012 through June 2013. Glenn Liebeck and Joanne Falinski were the school's Interim Acting Academic Leaders from March 2012 through June 2013. Catina Venning, the school's founder, was the school's Executive Director from the school's inception through June 2012.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

Renewal Process

In the final year of its charter, a 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 first 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.

As the school is approaching the end of its charter term, the NYC DOE performs a comprehensive review of the school's performance over the course of the charter. This renewal process is conducted through analyzing student performance data and collecting and evaluating school-submitted documents during the charter term. Evidence of a school's success is organized around the four essential questions that comprise the NYC DOE's Accountability Framework:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally 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?

A school will answer these overarching questions by demonstrating that its students have made significant academic progress and that the school has met the goals and objectives pledged in its initial 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.

Renewal Report

This report contains the findings and recommendations of the NYC DOE regarding a school's application for charter renewal. This report is based on a cumulative record of the school's progress during its 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 identify areas of weakness and to help the school to address them. 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 staff from the Charter Schools Accountability and Support (CSAS) team and other staff from the NYC DOE.

Upon review of all the relevant materials, a recommendation is made to the 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:

- Overall NYC DOE Progress Report score,
- New York State ELA and Math results and/or New York State Regents exams,
- ELA and Math proficiency compared to the district for elementary and middle schools, and graduation rates compared to the city for high 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 sound, viable organization?

To assess whether a school is a fiscally sound, viable organization, CSAS 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 NACSA (National Association of Charter School Authorizers) Financial Framework¹⁴.

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

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

A school's Governance Structure & Organizational Design and Climate & Community Engagement are rated as **Developed, Partially Developed, or Not Yet Developed**. A school's Financial Health is rated to indicate whether there are concerns about the near-term financial obligations and the financial sustainability of the school.

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

As it pertains to compliance, the NYC DOE identifies areas of compliance and noncompliance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Staff Representatives

The following NYC DOE representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on June 4, 2013 and September 30, 2013:

- Sonia Park, Executive Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Daree Lewis, Senior Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Jorge Cruz, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Maria Campo, Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Taniel Chan, Analyst, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Louise Kanian, Executive Director, NYC DOE Division of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners
- Elaine Gorman, Senior Superintendent, NYC DOE Division of Portfolio Planning
- Jose Castro, National Association of Charter School Authorizers (NACSA) Fellow
- Simeon Stolzberg, Independent Consultant

¹⁴http://www.qualitycharters.org/assets/files/images/stories/pdfs/publications/Performance_Framework_Fall_2012_Draft.pdf, page 38-59

Part 4: Findings

Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?

At the time of this school's renewal Fahari Academy Charter School has not demonstrated academic achievement or progress.

Academic Attainment and Improvement

The school has received three NYC DOE Progress Reports and has four years of NYS assessment data at the time of this report. (For detailed information on the progress reports and grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A.)

Performance on the NYC Progress Report

| Progress Report Grade | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Overall Grade | - | D | C | F |
| Student Progress | - | F | D | F |
| Student Performance | - | D | C | F |
| School Environment | - | B | B | C |
| College and Career Readiness** | | | - | - |
| Closing the Achievement Gap Points | - | 1.0 | 2.5 | 2.7 |

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

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC and State averages

| % Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 36.4% | 34.1% | 41.1% | 7.5% |
| CSD 17 | 38.7% | 39.5% | 39.1% | 16.8% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | -2.3 | -5.4 | 2.0 | -9.2 |
| NYC | 46.2% | 46.3% | 46.9% | 25.7% |
| Difference from NYC* | -9.8 | -12.2 | -5.8 | -18.2 |
| New York State | 52.5% | 54.8% | 55.2% | 31.2% |
| Difference from New York State | -16.1 | -20.7 | -14.1 | -23.7 |

| % Proficient in Math | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 48.9% | 45.7% | 61.7% | 10.6% |
| CSD 17 | 47.9% | 48.6% | 51.8% | 14.7% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | 1.0 | -2.9 | 10.9 | -4.1 |
| NYC | 59.7% | 59.5% | 60.6% | 27.3% |
| Difference from NYC* | -10.8 | -13.8 | 1.1 | -16.7 |
| New York State | 64.6% | 64.6% | 65.7% | 28.9% |
| Difference from New York State | -15.7 | -18.9 | -4.0 | -18.3 |

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Mission and Academic Goals

Over the charter term, Fahari achieved: 1 of 3 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter, 0 of 7 in the second year, 6 of 9 in the third year, and 1 of 4 in the fourth year.¹⁵

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

| | Met in 2009-10? | Met in 2010-11? | Met in 2011-12? | Met in 2012-13? |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Goal: Each year, 75 percent of 5th graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Examinations for ELA, Social Studies and Mathematics. | No | No | No | N/A |
| Goal: Each year, 75 percent of 6th graders will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Examinations for ELA and Mathematics. | N/A | No | No | N/A |
| Goal: Each year, 75 percent of 7th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State ELA and Mathematics examination. | N/A | N/A | Yes | N/A |
| Goal: Each year, 75 percent of 8th graders who have been enrolled at the school for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the New York State Examinations for Mathematics, Social Studies, ELA and Science. | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Goal: (NCLB): Each Year the school will be "In Good Standing" ¹⁶ | N/A | N/A | Yes | Yes |
| Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in Community School District 17. | No | No | Yes | No |
| Each year, the percent of students performing at or above Level 3 on the State math exam in each tested grade will, in the majority of grades, exceed the average performance of students tested in Community School District 17. | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| For years 2 through 4 reduce the difference between a grade's performance in year 1 and 75% by one half in year 2 and each subsequent year on the NYS ELA exam | N/A | No | Yes | N/A |
| For years 2 through 4 reduce the difference between a grade's performance in year 1 and 75% by one half in year 2 and each subsequent year on the NYS Math exam | N/A | No | Yes | N/A |
| From years 2-4, the school will receive a 'B' or higher on the Student Progress section of the NYCDOE Progress Report. | N/A | No | No | No |

¹⁵ 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% absolute proficiency or goals that measure reducing the performance gap of a cohort in ELA and Math assessments in its analysis of progress towards goals. Goals that compared the school to the Community School District performance were included in the analysis.

¹⁶ In 2009-2010 and 2010-2011, the school received the designation: "Subject to Charter Law". This was not included in the overall analysis of charter goals.

Responsive Education Program

The school administers the Stanford-10 assessment, which is a nationally normed, standardized, achievement test. The test is administered each June. The school self-reported the following data:

- In reading, 33.3% of students performed at or above the 50th percentile in June 2010. The same group of students also took the test in June 2012 and 70.3% performed at or above 50th percentile.
- In math, 36.3% of Fahari students performed at or above 50th percentile in June 2010. In June 2012, the same group of students took the exam and 60.6% of students performed at or above 50th percentile.
- On average this group of students grew 15.4 normal curve equivalents (NCEs) in reading and 5 NCEs in math between their fifth and seventh grade years at the school. (A change of zero NCE from year to year is considered one year of growth.)

On August 27, 2012, Fahari Academy Charter School was presented with a Notice of Probation due to noncompliance with statutory regulations and its own bylaws. In addition, the notice included concerns about Fahari's academic achievement and ability to meet some of its key charter academic goals, including the percent of students proficient in ELA and math. According to the Notice of Probation, "[i]n the 2010-2011 school year, only 34.1% of students scored above a level three in ELA, and only 45.7% of students scored above a level three in math, which fell well below the 75% goals stated in the charter." Despite some areas of improvement, the school did not meet its goal. In the 2011-2012 school year, the level of students proficient in each grade was:

- Grade 5: 33.3% in ELA and 53.6% in math;
- Grade 6: 41.4% in ELA and 86.1% math; and,
- Grade 7: 75% in ELA and 66% in math.

The Board of Trustees responded to the Notice by submitting a corrective action plan to address the issues concerning compliance, academics, pedagogy and curriculum, including additional professional development for teachers, modifications to the school schedule, and the addition of content consultants who coached teachers and modified the curriculum to align with the Common Core Learning Standards. The Board of Trustees also hired a permanent school leader to provide stable leadership.

During the 2012-2013 schools year, the Board of Trustees implemented its corrective action plan. Upon monitoring and document reviews by the NYC DOE, the Notice of Probation was allowed to expire on August 31, 2013.

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited the school on June 4, 2013 and September 30, 2013. Based on discussion, document review, and observation, the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
 - Over the last two years, Fahari has been working to revise the curriculum to better align with the Common Core Learning Standards.
 - During the summer before the 2012-2013 school year, the school hired content specialists in ELA, math, science and social studies as consultants to align the curriculum to the Common Core Learning Standards. The consultants created the scope and sequence documents, curriculum maps, and curriculum crosswalks.
 - During the 2012-2013 school year department chairs for core subjects were created and assumed this work when the school year started.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
 - To respond to the increase in the number of students with disabilities, the school has 11 homerooms that employ co-teaching in core subjects.
 - To support these students, the school leadership reported that the school has more than doubled its special education staff, added a reading specialist and two special education coordinators.

- Additionally, the school has seen an increase in the number of students who receive speech therapy and have a service provider dedicated to working with these students.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
 - Over the two days of the visit, along with members of the school's leadership, NYC DOE staff observed 29 classrooms, grades 5-8.
 - Class-sizes ranged from 21 to 30 students, with two teachers in all core subjects.
 - Forms of questioning during the observations included some basic fact recall, but for the most part challenged students to demonstrate understanding through explanation or restating.
 - In most rooms observed, checks for understanding included questioning, teacher observation, and exit tickets.
 - On the days of the renewal visit, there was no evidence of differentiation of materials, modality, tasks, products, or assessments. However, this is not a part of the Fahari classroom model.
 - In all observed classes, students were responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
 - In all observed classes, most students were on task. Off-task students were effectively redirected returning to the tasks.
 - Based on debriefs with the school leadership after classroom visits, all classrooms had instruction that aligned with the instructional model and current academic goals of the school.

Learning Environment

NYC DOE representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with twelve teachers and eleven members of the instructional staff. The following was noted:

- All interviewed teachers reported that they received school-based professional development both in the summer and weekly during the school year, with the administration providing resources.
- Some teachers mentioned participating in the school's mentoring program, where new teachers are paired with more experienced teachers.
- Most of the interviewed teachers mentioned the use of Charlotte Danielson's Framework for Teaching for teacher observations and evaluations conducted by the school's leadership. Many of the interviewed teachers discussed receiving feedback from the co-interim acting directors or the principal. During the 2012-2013 school year, a few teachers mentioned that they were not sure if they would be receiving an evaluation.
- Teachers reported using Fountas and Pinnell to group students and assign reading goals. Other forms of data collected include Stanford-10 assessment data and subject-based exams/quizzes.
- Teachers noted that they have common planning time. Observations of planning meetings revealed that teachers use this time for "kid-talk" and to discuss lesson plans and objectives.

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

Governance Structure & Organizational Design

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

- Fahari's bylaws require that the school have a minimum of five members. In the first year of the charter the Board lost six members. That attrition caused the board to be out of compliance with its bylaws during the start of the 2012-2013 school year, when the Board had only four members.
- The Board added one new member in December 2012, and has kept membership within the minimum of 5 members and maximum of 13 members established in the Board's bylaws. The Board currently has five active members.

On October 10, 2013 as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE interviewed the school's Board of Trustees. Based on document review and the interview, the following was noted:

- Outside of the period when the Board did not have the required number of members, the Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The school leaders update the Board on academic progress and operations at the school, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- There are clear lines of accountability between the Board and school leadership, as evidenced by the school's organization chart and school leadership's monthly 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, including a Finance Committee, Academic Committee, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- Fahari Academy Charter School's Board of Trustees is currently led by Jason Starr. Jason Starr, the Board's third Chair during the charter term, assumed this position in July 2012. He was preceded by Dirk Tillotson. Dirk Tillotson originally took this position in September 2011 along with a Co-Chair, Anna Graham Hunter, although it is not clear when she resigned from the Board. Ayanna Brooks served as the Board Chair since the school's founding in 2008 until her resignation in September 2011.
- Currently, the school's principal is Stephanie Clagnaz, who joined the school in May 2013. Ms. Clagnaz was appointed to replace the school's interim acting leaders: Dirk Tillotson, Glenn Liebeck and Joanne Falinski. Dirk Tillotson, resigned from the Board in June 2012 to assume leadership of Fahari, served as the school's Interim Acting Executive Director from July 2012 through June 2013. Glenn Liebeck and Joanne Falinski were the school's Interim Acting Academic Leaders from March 2012 through June 2013. Prior to this time, Catina Venning, the school's founder, was the school's Executive Director from the school's inception through June 2012.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- To date, the school has met its charter goal of having an average daily student attendance rate of at least 92%.

| Average Daily Attendance¹⁷ | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | 96% | 94% | 97% | 93% |

¹⁷ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 9/2013

- Fahari faced high staff turnover. At the start of the 2012-2013 school year, 44% of instructional staff did not return, either by choice or request.¹⁸ This percentage is similar to previous years, with the exception of 2010-2011 school year when the level was 73%.
- The school has had challenges with retaining students. The levels of student attrition were: 19.8% in 2009-2010, 37.6% in 2010-2011, 27% in 2011-2012 and 4.4% in 2012-2013.
- In August 2011, the school was issued a Notice of Deficiency citing its difficulty to maintain consistent enrollment.
- In August 2012, the school was issued a Notice of Probation indicating that the school's inability to retain students led to Fahari's non-compliance with its charter.
- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey results and response rates were:

Fahari Academy Charter School NYC School Survey Results

| | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
|------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Academic Expectations | Above Average | Well Below Average | Well Below Average | Well Below Average |
| Communication | Well Above Average | Well Below Average | Below Average | Well Below Average |
| Engagement | Well Above Average | Well Below Average | Well Below Average | Well Below Average |
| Safety & Respect | Well Above Average | Well Below Average | Average | Below Average |

Fahari Academy Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

| | Parents | Citywide | Teachers | Citywide | Students ¹⁹ | Citywide |
|----------------|------------|----------|-------------|----------|------------------------|----------|
| 2009-10 | 60% | 49% | 80% | 76% | - | - |
| 2010-11 | 54% | 52% | 29% | 82% | 81% | 83% |
| 2011-12 | 79% | 53% | 92% | 82% | 79% | 82% |
| 2012-13 | 75% | 54% | 100% | 83% | 94% | 83% |

The school has mixed results in meeting the following:

- The school's charter goals include, "parents will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect."²⁰
- The school's charter goals include, "staff will express satisfaction with school leadership and professional development opportunities as determined by the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect."²¹
- The school's charter goals include, "students will express satisfaction with the school's program, based on the NYC School Survey in which the school receives scores of 7.5 or higher in each of the four survey domains: Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement and Safety and Respect."²²

As part of the renewal process, representatives of 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:

¹⁸ Self-reported information from school-submitted data collection form on 9/2013

¹⁹ Student Response Rates on the NYC School Survey have not been applicable over the entire course of the current charter term

²⁰ Fahari Academy Charter School Statistics: <http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/17/K726/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm>

²¹ Fahari Academy Charter School Statistics: <http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/17/K726/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm>

²² Fahari Academy Charter School Statistics: <http://schools.nyc.gov/SchoolPortals/17/K726/AboutUs/Statistics/default.htm>

- An internal survey performed by the school during the 2012-2013 school year indicated that 95% of parents were either satisfied or very satisfied with their child's education. (Less than 50% of the schools families participated in the survey.)
- Over the course of the charter, the school has increased its support of parents by adding a Director of Family Engagement to the staff. Since joining the staff, the Director of Family Engagement has established two additional parent organizations, Mothers of Fahari and Fathers of Fahari.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments. About three hundred sixty participants attended the hearing, forty-five speaking in support of the school' 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 until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.

Representatives of the NYC DOE held focus groups with students from Fahari. A group of fifteen 5th and 6th grade students were interviewed. Eight 7th graders were interviewed, and nine 8th graders were interviewed. Based on student interviews conducted on the September 30th visit to the school, the following was noted:

- Across the grade levels, students noted the behavior system, which includes demerits, but also the incentive system of the PRIDE values, where students can receive points to get prizes.
- Across the grades, students reported the use of exit tickets, progress reports, weekly quizzes, and unit tests, as ways in which the school provided them with information about their academic progress.

Financial Health

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

- Based on Fiscal Year (FY) 2013 financial statements, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on FY13 financial statements, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover between one and two months of operating expenses without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-14 budget to the actual enrollment as of September of 2013 revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of FY13 financial statements, the school had met its debt obligations.

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

- Based on financial statements from FY11 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus over the three fiscal years, though in FY13 the school operated at a deficit.
- Based on the FY13 financial statements, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on financial statements from FY11 through FY13, the school had overall negative cash flow from FY11 to FY13, despite a single-year increase in cash flow from FY12 to FY13.

There was no material weakness noted in the 2009-2010, 2010-2011, and 2011-2012 independent annual financial audits.

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

- The school explained that the cash flow from FY11 to FY13 was affected by staff expenses to support the addition of its 8th grade students.
- In addition, the school incurred additional expenses from contractual obligations with the school's unionized staff and its representation by the United Federation of Teachers

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

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

The school was issued a Notice of Deficiency on August 26, 2011, after a site visit to the school raised concerns about the school's ability to hire and retain quality staff, maintain an appropriate management system, and effectively serve its students.

The next year the school was moved from Notice of Deficiency to Notice of Probation.

The school was issued a Notice of Probation on August 27, 2012 due to violations of the schools charter and applicable law and concerns about the school's ability to provide an environment conducive to academic success.

- Violations included:
 - Personnel Policies and Criminal History Checks: During the 2011-2012 school-year, a visit to the school revealed that the school was not in full compliance with NY Education Law §2854 which requires that charter schools employ “at least 70% certified teaching staff and establish procedures for conducting criminal history checks of individuals who have regular access to the students.” The school is currently in compliance.
 - Student Attrition: During the 2011-2012 school year, the school had unusually high student attrition which lead to the school being out of compliance with its Charter Agreement from November through March with the NYC DOE and charter application. Section 2.2 of its Charter Agreement requires that the school maintain at least 85% of its authorized enrollment, and the charter application includes a goal of retaining 90% of its students. Over the 2011-2012 school year, the school enrolled just 83% of its authorized enrollment.
- Concerns included:
 - Suspension Rate: According to data reported by the school, of March 22, 2012, the school had 8 in-school suspensions and 91 out-of-school suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year, when 226 students were enrolled. These statistics indicated that there were issues with student behavior and management.
 - Ability to Reach Academic Charter Goals: After two years of state assessments, the school had not met some of its key charter academic goals. In 2010-2011, only 34.1% of students scored about a level three in ELA, and only 45.7% of students scored above a level three in math, well below the 75% goal stated in the charter.

The school responded on October 2, 2012 with a corrective action plan that included the following items:

- Modifying school's hiring processes and professional development programming.
- Creating a dashboard for the board to monitor student and staff attrition.
- Establishing additional support structures for families of Fahari, to address and resolve behavioral concerns.
- Engaging Ramapo for Children to support instructional staff in creating a positive school-wide culture and behavior modification strategies.
- Increasing professional development for teachers and adding capacity to the instructional staff, including hiring content specialists to consult on the curriculum and pedagogy.

The Board and school leadership successfully implemented the items listed in the corrective action plan. Upon monitoring and document reviews by the NYC DOE, the Notice of Probation was allowed to expire on August 31, 2013. However, as part of the renewal review process, the NYC DOE is continuing to monitor Fahari in the areas cited in the Notice.

The Board is in compliance with:

- Membership size. Currently, the Board has had a membership size that falls within the range outlined in the school's charter and in the Board's bylaws. However, as noted above, the Board did not have the required number of members at the start of the 2012-2013 school year.
- The required number of monthly meetings. The school's bylaws state that the Board is to hold 6 meetings a year. The Board held the required number of monthly meetings for four out of the five years of the charter term, as evidenced by the posted meeting minutes. However, in the school year 2011-2012, when the Board membership was below the required size, five meetings were held without quorum.
- The required number of board meetings. The Board has held the number of board meetings, at least six per year, as outlined in its charter.
- Submission of all required documents. All current Board members have submitted conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms and do not demonstrate conflicts of interest.²³
- Submission of minutes and agendas. The Board has made all board minutes and agendas available upon request to the public prior to or at Board meetings.

The Board has been out of compliance with:

- Timely submission of documents. Over the course of the charter, the Board has not consistently provided timely submissions of accountability documents to the NYC DOE.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of all required documents. For the 2013-2014 school year, the school has submitted the required safety plan and is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Certification of staff. As of the 2013-2014 year, staff is either certified or high qualified, and those that are not are in the acceptable range required by the NY State Charter Schools Act. A school can have no more than 5 teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower.
- Insurance requirements. The school has all appropriate insurance documents.

The school was out of compliance with:

- Fingerprint clearance. During the 2011-2012 school year, all staff did not have the required fingerprint clearance.

²³ Source: New York State Education Department Annual Report

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

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

- The original terms of Fahari's current charter included high school grades, however, the school sought to delay expansion until both programmatic capacity and operational capacity were increased.
- Fahari proposes to expand to serve students in grades six through twelve. Starting in the 2017-2018 school year, Fahari would begin enrolling ninth grade students in 2017-2018, and would reach full scale in 2020-2021.
- Fahari proposes to extend the school day to allow more time for core instruction.
- Fahari would like to change number of instructional days with students from 190 to at least 185.
- Fahari also proposes additional student supports that are delineated in the full charter application, including a summer intensive program for students entering ninth grade.
- In response to the 2010 amendments to NYS Charter Schools Act requiring schools to attract and retain percentages of students who are designated as free and reduced lunch learners, students with disabilities, and English language learners, the school is making demonstrated efforts to attract and retain these students.
 - The school has increased the number of Collaborative Team Teaching (CTT) classrooms to support students with disabilities.
 - The school has an outreach plan to target community-based organizations that specifically serve immigrant populations, such as CAMBA, the Caribbean Women's Health Association, Ifetayo Cultural Arts Center, and the Haitian Center's Council, in an effort to recruit more ELL students.

Part 5: Background on the Charter Renewal Process

Statutory Basis for Renewal

The Charter Schools Act of 1998 (“the Act”) authorizes the creation 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:

- Improve student learning and achievement;
- Increase learning opportunities for all students, with special emphasis on expanded learning experiences for students who are at-risk of academic failure;
- Provide parents and students with expanded choices in the types of educational opportunities that are available within the public school system;
- Create new professional opportunities for teachers, school administrators and other school personnel;
- Encourage the use of different and innovative teaching methods;
- Provide schools with a method to change from rule-based to performance based accountability systems by holding the schools accountable for meeting measurable student achievement results.²⁴

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.²⁵

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.²⁶ As one such charter entity, the New York City Department of Education institutes a renewal application process that adheres to the Act’s renewal standards:

- A report of the progress of the charter school in achieving the educational objectives set forth in its charter;
- A detailed financial statement that discloses the cost of administration, instruction and other spending categories for the charter school that will allow a comparison of such costs to other schools, both public and private;
- Copies of each of the annual reports of the charter school including the charter school report cards and certified financial statements;
- Indications of parent and student satisfaction.

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.²⁷

²⁴ See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.

²⁵ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

²⁶ See §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

²⁷ See § 2852(5)

Part 6: Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework

The New York State Charter Schools Act (“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. 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.
- (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.

The NYC DOE may recommend four potential outcomes for charter schools applying for renewal: full-term renewal, renewal with conditions, short-term renewal, or non-renewal.

Full-Term Renewal

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 yielded strong student performance and progress, has met the majority of its charter goals, has demonstrated financial stability, has attained sufficient board capacity, and has an educationally sound learning environment in order to gain this type of renewal.

Renewal with Conditions

In cases where a school has demonstrated mixed academic results or concerns about organizational viability, renewal is contingent upon changes to the prospective application or new charter, new performance measures, or both. These may include changes to curriculum, leadership, or board governance structure that are intended to yield improved academic outcomes during the next chartering period.

Short-Term Renewal

In cases where a school is up for renewal of its initial charter and has fewer than two years of state-assessment results, a renewal of three-years or fewer may be considered. In limited circumstances, a

school not in its initial charter or in its initial charter with more than three years of state assessment data, may be considered for a short-term renewal.

Non-Renewal

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.

The CSAS Accountability Framework

To help NYC DOE authorized charter schools better understand what we mean by success for charter schools, the NYC DOE's Charter Schools Accountability & Support (CSAS) has developed an Accountability Framework build around four essential questions for charter school renewal:

1. Is the school an academic success?
2. Is the school a fiscally 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?

| |
|---|
| 1. Is the School an Academic Success? |
| 1a. High Academic Attainment and Improvement |
| <p>Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meet absolute performance goals • Meet student progress goals • Are closing the achievement gap for at risk students, including special needs and ELL students • Are surpassing performance of DOE identified peer-schools • Are surpassing performance district and city proficiency or better averages • Are meeting other rigorous academic and non-academic goals as stated in school's charter |
| <p>Evidence for success might include, but not be limited to, the following depending on school configurations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 3-8 NYS ELA Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations) • Grades 3-8 NYS Math Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations) • Grades 4 and 8 NYS Science Results (absolute performance, individual student progress, comparative performance to similar schools, home district or city averages, progress for at-risk populations) • Grades 8-12 NYS Regent Exam Results • When applicable, NYSAA or other approved alternate assessments results • HS 4- and 6-Year Graduation Rates (absolute and progress, overall, for at-risk student populations) • 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 • Results on state accountability measures • Charter School Academic and Non-Academic Goals • NYC Progress Reports |
| 1b. Mission and Academic Goals |
| <p>Schools with successful missions and goals have many of the characteristics below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have an animating mission statement that staff, students and community embrace • Set ambitious academic and non-academic goals that entire school community knows and embraces • Have processes for regular monitoring and reporting on progress toward school goals • Have processes for adjusting strategies in support of goals as appropriate in response to monitoring data |

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

- Mission statement, charter, external documents (parent and 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

1c. 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 standards and the new Common Core Curriculum.
- Use instructional models and resources consistent with school mission and that are 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
- Implement 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 curricular tasks, programs and resources for effectiveness and fit with school mission and goals

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

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

1d. Learning Environment

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

- Have a strong culture that connects high academic and behavioral expectations in a way that motivates students to give their best effort academically and socially
- 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
- Provide for safe, respectful, efficient transitions, hallways, cafeteria, yard, etc.
- Have classrooms where academic risk-taking and student participation is encouraged and supported
- Provide opportunities for students to actively engage in their own learning and in the life of the school

- Have a formal or informal character education, social development, or citizenship program that provides opportunities to develop as individuals and citizens

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

- 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
- DOE School Survey student results
- DOE School Survey parent and teacher safety and respect results
- Self-administered satisfaction survey results
- Leadership, staff, and, if appropriate, student interviews
- Classroom observations
- Scheduled student engagement opportunities (e.g., student advisory, internships, student government, student led conferences, peer tutoring, peer mediation, etc.)

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

2a. Governance Structure and Organizational Design

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

- Operate with a clearly articulated governance structure, compliant with its charter and all applicable laws and regulations
- Have a capable Board of Trustees with appropriate 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 laws and conflict of interest regulations
- 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 and despite circumstance
- Implements a school leadership structure that is aligned with charter and that is sufficient to fulfill school's mission and achieve its accountability goals; it also has clear lines of accountability for leadership roles, accountability to Board, and, if applicable, relationship with a charter management organization
- Have timely and appropriate access to legal counsel
- Implemented a process for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the school's organization and leadership structure
- Have instructional leadership staffing and support structures that holds staff accountable for student learning outcomes and provide regular feedback on instruction to teachers

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

- School charter
- Board by-laws, roster, trustee resumes, meeting agenda and minutes
- Annual conflict of interest forms
- Staff roster, job descriptions, staff handbook, operations manual
- School calendar, professional development plan

2b. 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
- An effective process for recruiting, hiring, supporting, and evaluating leadership and staff
- A flexible, data-driven approach to professional development for all staff
- An effective way of measuring and monitoring core constituency satisfaction (parent, staff, and, when age appropriate, student), including the DOE School Survey
- Effective home-school communication practices to ensure meaningful parent involvement in the learning of their children
- Strong community-based partnerships and advocacy for the school

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

- 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

2c. Financial and Operational Health

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

- Consistently meet its student enrollment and retention targets
- Annual budgets that meets all short- and long-term financial responsibilities with available revenues
- School leadership and Board that oversee financial and operational responsibilities in a manner that keeps the school's mission and academic goals central to decision-making
- Boards and school leadership that maintain effective internal controls of finances to ensure integrity of financial management and a proactive approach to mitigating risk
- Consistently clean financial audits
- If applicable, strong, accountable partnerships with management organizations and other partners and significant vendors to support delivery of chartered school design and academic program
- A safe, clean and appropriately resourced educational facility with all appropriate services specified in charter and mandated by appropriate law and regulations

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
- Appropriate insurance documents
- Required facility documents (lease, certificate of occupancy, fire and safety inspections, etc.)
- Financial audits
- Financial leader(s) resume and accountability documents
- Operational policies and procedures
- Operational org chart
- Secure storage areas for student and staff records
- Policies/protocols for maintaining secure records
- School safety plan

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

3a. Approved Charter and Agreement

Schools in substantial compliance with their charter and agreement have:

- Implemented the key features of their charter as described in the original charter and 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 update-to-date charter is publicly available to staff, parents, and school community
- Implemented 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
- Site visits
- Board meetings, agendas and minutes
- Leadership/board interviews

3b. Applicable Federal and State Law

Schools in substantial compliance with federal and state law have:

- Met all legal requirements for Title I and IDEA regulations and reporting
- Comparable enrollment of FRL, ELL and Special Education students to those of their district of location or are making documented good faith efforts to reach comparable percentages
- Implemented 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
- Conducted independently verified fair and open lottery and manage with integrity enrollment process and annual waiting lists
- Employed instructional staff with appropriate security clearances and certification requirements

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

- School reporting documents
- School's Annual Report
- Student recruitment plan and resources
- Student management policies and promotion and retention policies
- Student discipline records
- Lottery policy, resources, and records; enrollment procedures and records
- Staff roster, fingerprint clearance for all staff, certification status of all instructional staff

3c. Applicable Regulations

| |
|--|
| <p>Schools in substantial compliance with applicable regulations have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe and secure facilities with no significant compliance concerns with applicable regulations • Consistently clean annual audits, up-to-date escrow accounts, and have completed 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 complying with NYC DOE CSAS’s requirements for reporting changes in board membership and securing approval for new board members. • Informed NYCDOE CSAS, and where required, received CSAS approval for changes in significant partnerships, such as dropping/replacing a management organization • Effectively engaged parent associations |
| <p>Evidence for compliance with applicable regulations may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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 schools may be considering various growth options: replication, expansion to new grades or increased enrollment or altering their 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 address the 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:

- Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- 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 (human resource policies for growing your own talent, for example, 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)

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

- Board roster and resumes
- Board committees and minutes
- School organization 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 if they don't make major changes through expansion or replication, they 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:

- Application Part I: Retroactive Analysis, including performance results and analyses of the current charter term
- Application Part II: Prospective Analysis, including mission, program description, governance, organization, budget, etc. for new term
- Leadership and board interviews
- MOUs or contracts with partners

Appendix A: School Performance Data

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD and NYC averages

| % Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 36.4% | 34.1% | 41.1% | 7.5% |
| CSD 17 | 38.7% | 39.5% | 38.9% | 16.7% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | -2.3 | -5.4 | 2.2 | -9.2 |
| NYC | 46.2% | 46.3% | 46.9% | 25.7% |
| Difference from NYC* | -9.8 | -12.2 | -5.8 | -18.2 |

| % Proficient in Math | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 48.9% | 45.7% | 61.7% | 10.6% |
| CSD 17 | 47.9% | 48.6% | 50.8% | 14.7% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | 1.0 | -2.9 | 10.9 | -4.1 |
| NYC | 59.7% | 59.5% | 60.6% | 27.3% |
| Difference from NYC* | -10.8 | -13.8 | 1.1 | -16.7 |

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

| % of Fifth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|--|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 36.4% | 23.0% | 25.5% | 2.1% |
| CSD 17 | 38.7% | 39.8% | 42.1% | 19.6% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | -2.3 | -16.8 | -16.6 | -17.5 |
| NYC | 46.2% | 49.0% | 52.2% | 28.7% |
| Difference from NYC* | -9.8 | -26.0 | -26.7 | -26.6 |

| % of Fifth Graders Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | 48.9% | 32.2% | 50.0% | 1.1% |
| CSD 17 | 47.9% | 51.0% | 55.1% | 16.5% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | 1.0 | -18.8 | -5.1 | -15.4 |
| NYC | 59.7% | 62.9% | 65.2% | 29.6% |
| Difference from NYC* | -10.8 | -30.7 | -15.2 | -28.5 |

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

| % of Sixth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | - | 43.7% | 40.9% | 5.3% |
| CSD 17 | 31.1% | 39.2% | 37.0% | 13.7% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | - | 4.5 | 3.9 | -8.5 |
| NYC | 40.1% | 43.6% | 45.3% | 23.3% |
| Difference from NYC* | - | 0.1 | -4.4 | -18.0 |

| % of Sixth Graders Proficient in Math | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | - | 57.4% | 62.5% | 8.2% |
| CSD 17 | 40.0% | 46.5% | 48.7% | 17.4% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | - | 10.9 | 13.8 | -9.2 |
| NYC | 53.0% | 56.0% | 59.3% | 28.8% |
| Difference from NYC* | - | 1.4 | 3.2 | -20.6 |

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

| % of Seventh Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | - | - | 87.5% | 11.3% |
| CSD 17 | 31.1% | 30.1% | 38.1% | 16.5% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | - | - | 49.4 | -5.2 |
| NYC | 38.2% | 36.5% | 43.3% | 25.5% |
| Difference from NYC* | - | - | 44.2 | -14.2 |

| % of Seventh Graders Proficient in Math | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | - | - | 93.8% | 15.2% |
| CSD 17 | 41.7% | 45.8% | 49.1% | 11.1% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | - | - | 44.7 | 4.1 |
| NYC | 52.6% | 55.5% | 57.3% | 25.0% |
| Difference from NYC* | - | - | 36.5 | -9.8 |

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

| % of Eighth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | - | - | - | 19.6% |
| CSD 17 | 25.0% | 27.4% | 30.9% | 17.4% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | - | - | - | 2.2 |
| NYC | 37.5% | 35.0% | 39.0% | 25.4% |
| Difference from NYC* | - | - | - | -5.8 |

| % of Eighth Graders Proficient in Math | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | 2009-2010 | 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 |
| Fahari Academy Charter School | - | - | - | 33.3% |
| CSD 17 | 33.3% | 41.8% | 49.2% | 14.3% |
| Difference from CSD 17* | - | - | - | 19.0 |
| NYC | 46.3% | 52.5% | 55.2% | 25.7% |
| Difference from NYC* | - | - | - | 7.6 |

* All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Progress Reports

2012 – 2013 Academic Year

[2011 – 2012 Academic Year](#)

[2010 – 2011 Academic Year](#)

[2009 – 2010 Academic Year](#)

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

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

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

[Annual Site Visit Report 2009-2010](#)