



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

**2013 – 2014 SCHOOL YEAR
MAY 2014**

Table of Contents

Summary of Renewal Recommendation	2
I. Charter School Overview	2
II. Overview of School-Specific Data	2
III. Rationale for Recommendation	5
School Overview and History	9
Renewal Process Overview	11
Findings	13
Essential Question 1: Is the School an Academic Success?	13
Essential Question 2: Is the School a Fiscally Sound, Viable Organization?.....	20
Essential Question 3: Is the School Compliant with its Charter and All Applicable Law and Regulations?	23
Essential Question 4: What are the School’s Plans for the Next Charter Term?	24
Background on the Charter Renewal Process	25
Authorizer Responsibility Under the NY State Charter Schools Act and the DOE Accountability Framework	26
Appendix A: School Performance Data.....	35
Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data	38

Part 1: Summary of Renewal Recommendation

I. Charter School Overview:

Name of Charter School	Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy Charter School
Current Board Chair(s)	Kenneth Langone
School Leader	Geoffrey Canada, School Superintendent; Marquitta Speller, High School Principal; Shakira Petit, Middle School Principal; Achil Petit, Upper Elementary Principal; Tonya White, Lower Elementary Principal
Management Company (if applicable)	N/A
Other Partner(s)	Harlem Children's Zone
District(s) of Location	NYC Community School District 5
Physical Address	245 West 129th Street, New York, NY 10027
Facility	Non-DOE Operated (as of 2013-2014)
School Opened For Instruction	2004
Current Charter Term Expiry Date	8/10/2014
Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at Expiry Date	K-10/ 938
Proposed Charter Term	Full term
Proposed Maximum Grade Levels / Enrollment at New Expiry Date	K-12 / 1,100

II. Overview of School-Specific Data:

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report: High School

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade			A	A
Student Progress			A	A
Student Performance			A	A
School Environment			B	B
College and Career Readiness**			A	A
Closing the Achievement Gap Points			3.1	4.0

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

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report: Elementary / Middle School

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	B	C	B	C
Student Progress	C	C	C	C
Student Performance	C	B	B	B
School Environment	A	A	B	C
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	2.0	3.5	1.7	2.0

HS Performance¹ Compared to Peer and NYC Averages

4-year Graduation Rate				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	-	98.4%	98.5%
NYC	65.1%	65.5%	64.7%	
Difference from NYC	-	-	33.7%	
6-year Graduation Rate				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	-	-	-
NYC	69.2%	70.9%	73.2%	
Difference from NYC	-	-	-73.2%	
College Readiness Index** - 4 years				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School			46.0%	60.0%
Peer Percent of Range			85.8%	100.0%
City Percent of Range			100.0%	100.0%

* 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 or city.

** The College Readiness Index score was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

The graduation rate for NYC as of the 2012-2013 school year was not available during this report's publication.

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	78.7%	-	-	87.7%
Peer Percent of Range	53.4%	-	-	61.0%
City Percent of Range	62.4%	-	-	72.8%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	89.6%	88.6%	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	78.4%	76.2%	-	-
City Percent of Range	82.5%	80.5%	-	-
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	96.9%	97.0%	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	100.0%	93.8%	-
City Percent of Range	-	96.7%	95.7%	-

* 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 or city.

¹ HCZ Promise I CS originally accepted new students in kindergarten and middle school but revised its charter to have kindergarten to be their primary intake grade, discontinuing recruitment of new classes of the middle schoolers in 2009. The 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 graduating classes entered as middle schoolers. As a result there will be a two-year gap before the school's next graduating cohort in 2015-2016.

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
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	38.4%	39.8%	42.8%	21.7%
CSD 5	29.8%	29.6%	29.1%	13.4%
Difference from CSD 5	8.6	10.2	13.7	8.3
NYC	44.6%	45.7%	46.9%	26.4%
Difference from NYC	-6.2	-5.9	-4.1	-4.7
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-14.1	-15.0	-12.4	-9.5

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	60.2%	69.3%	67.6%	28.1%
CSD 5	38.5%	39.6%	39.0%	13.1%
Difference from CSD 5	21.8	29.7	28.6	15.0
NYC	56.3%	58.3%	60.0%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	3.9	11.0	7.6	-1.5
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-4.4	4.7	1.9	-0.8

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

Academic Goal Analysis by Category (based on School's submission)					
	1st Year 2009-2010	2nd Year 2010-2011	3rd Year 2011-2012	4th Year 2012-2013	Cumulative 4 Year Total
Total Achievable Academic Goals	13	14	15	12	54
# Met	8	9	8	10	35
# Partially Met	0	0	1	0	0
# Not Met	5	5	6	2	19
% Met	62%	64%	53%	83%	65%
% Partially Met	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%
% Not Met	38%	36%	40%	17%	35%

III. Rationale for Recommendation

A. Academic Performance

At the time of this school's renewal, Harlem's Children Zone Promise Academy I Charter School (HCZ Promise I) has demonstrated academic achievement and progress. After a successful first charter term, HCZ Promise I has continued its success through its second charter term with graduation rates above 98% in its first two graduating cohorts. The school earned overall grades of A on both of its graded New York City Department of Education (NYC DOE) High School Progress Reports. In its elementary and middle school grades, HCZ Promise I has consistently surpassed its Community School District (CSD) proficiency levels in both ELA and math in each year of the current charter term.

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." School graduation rates, state assessment data and NYC Progress Report results show that HCZ Promise I has demonstrated success through its second charter term in fulfilling its primary objectives.

The mission of the HCZ Promise Academy is to provide high quality, standards-based academic programs for students, grades K-12, from underserved communities and underperforming school districts, and to provide students with the skills they need to be accepted by and succeed in college. HCZ Promise I promotes high achievement in all subjects through a demanding curriculum, the use of data-driven teaching methods, and, uniquely, extensive support services through its institutional partner, the Harlem Children's Zone.

HCZ Promise I entered the fifth year of its second charter term with the start of the 2013-2014 academic year. For the current charter term, the NYC DOE has four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data to evaluate the academic performance of the school. In addition, the school has received four graded NYC DOE Elementary-Middle School Progress Reports and two graded High School Progress Reports during this term. NYC DOE Progress Reports grade each school with an overall grade of A, B, C, D, or F and are based on the school's performance in each of these categories: Student Progress, Student Performance, and School Environment, with additional points for Closing the Achievement Gap contributing to the overall grade. High School Progress Reports also include a College and Career Readiness section. Grades are based on comparing school results in each category to a peer group of up to 40 schools with the most similar student population and to school results citywide.

Over the course of its second charter term, HCZ Promise I earned an overall grade of A on the NYC DOE High School Progress Report in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. The school earned alternating overall grades of B, C, B and C on the NYC DOE Elementary-Middle School Progress Reports during the term.

As it had done in its first charter term, HCZ Promise I levels of proficiency (percent of students scoring Level 3 or 4) on NYS ELA and math assessments have surpassed those of its district of location, CSD 5, in both subjects and all years overall proficiency. While its percent proficient has not surpassed the city or state in ELA, in math the school's results surpassed the city in three of the four years of the term and the state in two of the four years. Its high school four-year graduation rates have exceeded the performance of over 96% high schools within its peer group and the city.

HCZ Promise I has consistently scored positive grades on the Student Performance section of its Progress Report. The High School Progress Report uses two metrics to measure Student Performance, Graduation Rates and the type of diploma students receive (greater value is allotted to diplomas that indicate higher levels of proficiency and college readiness—so a Regents diploma

is weighted more than a local diploma and an Advanced Regents diploma more than Regents and so on.) On both years it has received graded HS Progress Reports, HCZ Promise I has earned a grade of A for Student Performance.

For Elementary-Middle School Progress Reports, Student Performance looks at two types of metrics: proficiency in ELA and math and the percent of students passing core courses. After a Student Performance grade of C in 2009-2010 for its Elementary-Middle School Progress Report, HCZ Promise I has earned three consecutive Bs for Student Performance.

The Student Progress grade of the HS Progress Report looks at two metrics, the percent of students earning 10 or more credits in each of the first, second and third year of their enrollment and how students are progressing in passing Regent exams required for a Regents diploma. HCZ Promise I has received an A for Student Progress on each of its graded Progress Reports.

For Elementary-Middle School Progress Reports, the primary growth metrics for Student Progress are Median Adjusted Growth Percentiles (MAGP)² for ELA and math. During the current charter term, HCZ Promise I has earned Cs for Student Progress each year of the term.

Based on an analysis of applicable academic charter goals, over the course of its second charter term HCZ Promise I has cumulatively met 65% of its applicable goals. In 2009-2010, the school met 62% of its academic goals, in 2010-2011 it met 64%, in 2011-2012 it met 53%, and in its most recently completed year it met 83% of its academic charter goals³. In addition to goals related to ELA and math proficiency compared to the district and to high school graduation rates, the school has achieved its goals related to 75% of its students reaching proficiency on 4th and 8th grade NYS science exams every year of the term, with the exception of 8th grade science in 2011-2012.

Over the course of the charter term, the NYC DOE has conducted four site visits: a one-day Annual Visit in the Spring of 2011, a one-day Annual Visit in the Spring of 2012, a partial day Board observation and financial compliance focused visit in the spring of 2013, and, as part of the renewal process, a two-day visit in the March of 2014, with additional visits in March to meet with HCZ staff. As evidenced by site visit reports, HCZ Promise I has developed a responsive educational program and supportive learning environment.

HCZ Promise I utilizes a Response to Intervention (RTI) approach to support academic intervention and progress monitoring for all students at risk of academic failure. The primary means for delivery of special education academic services is Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS). The school's Student Support Team manages the RTI program and student referral process, and also provides direct support to students according to their IEPs. The school also provides counseling and works with the NYC DOE to provide additional related services such as physical and occupational therapy. HCZ Promise I offers a structured English language immersion program for English Language Learner (ELL) students that includes push-in and pullout support during the instructional day. All teachers receive professional development training on strategies for teaching ELL students.

² This measure calculates the median (middle) adjusted growth percentile of a school's eligible students. 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. A student's growth percentile is a number between 0 and 100, which represents the percentage of students with the same score on last year's test who scored the same or lower than the student on this year's test. 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 averages 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.

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% 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.

HCZ Promise I serves a comparable percentage of students receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch (FRL), a slightly smaller but increasing percentage of Students with Disabilities 11.6% in 2009-2010 to 14.9% in 2012-2013, less than two percent below the CSD average, and a much smaller percentage of ELL students compared to CSD 5. As it pertains to increasing the percentage of ELL students, please see page 25.

B. Governance, Operations & Finances

Over the course of the school's charter term, the school and its Board of Trustees have demonstrated a developed governance structure and organizational design. The Board's membership has been stable over the course of the term. It currently has nine members, which is more than the minimum number of seven members and fewer than the maximum number of seventeen established in its bylaws. Five of the nine have been on the Board since 2004; eight of nine have been on the Board throughout the current term with one member joining in 2012. Current Board Chair Kenneth Langone has been serving in this position throughout the current charter term.

The school has had stable leadership not only at the Board level but also at the institutional partner level with Geoffrey Canada serving as the President and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of HCZ Promise I and II. While there has been turnover at the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) level, HCZ's comptroller, Director of Student Support Services, and Director of Educational Research, and other school support leadership have been in place for all or most of the current term.

Over the course of the school's current charter term, HCZ Promise I has established a stable school culture, despite turnover among teaching staff over the course of the term. The school has consistently met its charter goals for parent participation and satisfaction on the NYC DOE School Survey, though struggled with its goals for student and teacher satisfaction. It has met its goals for student enrollment and retention each year. NYC DOE survey results have consistently been Average to Above Average across all four categories (Academic Expectations, Communication, Engagement, and Safety & Respect) over the course of the term, with the exception of Academic Expectations in 2012-2013, which was Below Average. School Survey participation rates have been above city averages for all constituencies for all years of the term.

Overall, the school is in a strong position to meet near-term financial obligations and is financially sustainable based on its current practices, however there were material weaknesses noted in the past three independent financial audits for FY2013, FY2012 and FY2011.

C. Compliance with Charter, Applicable Law and Regulations

Over the course of the charter term, the school has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations but not with others. The school has approximately seven more uncertified teachers than the limit allowed by the NY State Charter Schools Act; however four of these are pending reciprocity from outside of New York State. Additionally the school submitted the independent financial audits for its 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years after the November 1 deadline established in state charter law. However, this was largely due to financial staffing changes and the school's 2012-2013 financial audit was submitted by deadline.

D. Plans for Next Charter Term

In its next term, HCZ Promise I will serve the complete span of grades as a full K-12 school beginning in 2015-2016—though it will not serve any grades it hasn't already served during its current charter term. Because the charter school is an integral part of Harlem's Children Zone's overall community development plan, the organization will continue to provide financial and in-kind support to Promise Academy I in its next term.

Geoffrey Canada's retirement as CEO of Harlem's Children Zone is set to take place in the summer of 2014. Mr. Canada will retain his title of President and will continue to serve both on HCZ's and HCZ Promise I's Board of Trustees. Anne Williams-Isom, who has been the Chief

Operating Officer (COO) of HCZ, will assume responsibilities as CEO. The Board and CEO will also be hiring a Superintendent for HCZ Promise I who will be overall school leader of the four “schools within a school” of HCZ Promise I.

For the aforementioned reasons, the NYCDOE recommends a full-term renewal, expiring on June 30, 2019.

The NYC DOE will continue to monitor the school's academic intervention supports and strategies throughout the course of its next charter term.

Part 2: School Overview and History

Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy I Charter School (HCZ Promise I) an elementary, middle, and high school currently serving approximately 926 students⁴ in grades K-10 during the 2013-14 school year. It opened in 2004-2005, and is under the terms of its second charter. The school's projected full grade span is K-12, which it is expected to reach in 2015-2016 when it will once again have a graduating class.⁵ After being split-sited in both public and private space for all but the most recent year of its school operations, the school is now located in private⁶ facilities in Manhattan within CSD 5 at 245 West 129th Street, New York, New York 10027.⁷

The mission of the HCZ Promise Academy is to provide high quality, standards-based academic programs for students, grades K-12, from underserved communities and underperforming school districts, and to provide students with the skills they need to be accepted by and succeed in college. HCZ Promise I promotes high achievement in all subjects through a demanding curriculum, the use of data-driven teaching methods, and, uniquely, extensive support services through its institutional partner, the Harlem Children's Zone. HCZ Promise Academy I is committed to promoting academic accomplishment, positive character development, healthy lifestyles and leadership skills

The school is given financial, operational, and academic support from its institutional partner, community based organization (CBO) the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ). Support includes back office support, financial contributions, fundraising, facility use, food services, and other in-kind contributions. School leadership reported that in fiscal year 2013, HCZ Promise I received a total of 4.8 million dollars in financial and in-kind support from HCZ.

Among the HCZ programs that HCZ Promise I (and Promise II) families have access to are the HCZ early childhood program (Baby College, a nine-week parenting program, Three-Year Old Journey, a multi week, tri-lingual educational program, and HCZ's PreK program [GEMS]). There are also a healthy living program (Healthy Harlem), an obesity program, counselling, and after-school programming for remediation, enrichment, recreational, and athletic programs. In addition, HCZ offers the College Success Program, a post-secondary support program for students who have gone off to college. All of these programs are available to community members "zone-wide," and to HCZ Promise I and II family members.

Prior to its second charter term, the Board of HCZ Promise I requested changes to its charter, which were approved by the NYC DOE in 2007-2008, to have Kindergarten be its primary intake grade, after enrolling new students in grades K and 6 during most of its first charter term. As a result of the changes, HCZ Promise I had its first two graduating classes in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 but will not have its third graduating class until 2015-2016. While the school primarily enrolls new students in kindergarten but does backfill open seats from its waitlist. The school received 178 kindergarten applications in its August 2013 lottery.⁸

Over the charter term, the school has served the following percentages of special populations of students:⁹

⁴ ATS data from October 31, 2013.

⁵ NYC DOE internal data. Note: before the school changed its intake grades prior to its second charter term was approved, the school had two graduating cohorts of students in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 who began their enrollment in Promise I as middle school students. Current high school students began as elementary school students.

⁶ NYC DOE internal data.

⁷ NYC DOE Location Code Generating System database.

⁸ Self-reported by the school in April 2014. Applications are for the 2015-2016 school year.

⁹ Comparisons to both the CSD and City are made against students in Grades K-12. This is determined by the grades the school served in the 2012-2013 school year. Special population figures are as of October 31st for each given school year, with the exception of the 2012-2013 school year, which is as of October 26, 2012.

Special Populations

Year	Free Reduced Lunch				Students with Disabilities				English Language Learners			
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
School	87.8%	86.4%	86.0%	77.2%	11.6%	12.2%	12.7%	14.9%	2.2%	1.2%	1.5%	1.9%
CSD 5	73.7%	77.7%	80.4%	81.0%	15.4%	16.0%	16.3%	16.7%	9.7%	10.4%	10.0%	9.4%
NYC	61.7%	64.5%	67.3%	69.3%	14.9%	15.0%	15.1%	15.5%	14.8%	15.0%	14.6%	14.2%

The table above indicates that HCZ Promise I serves a comparable percentage of FRL students to its district of location, a slightly lower population—though increasing percentage—of Students with Disabilities, and a low percentage of English Language Learner students.

HCZ Promise I was renewed for a full five year term in the winter of 2009 with no conditions.

The HCZ Promise I Board of Trustees is led by Board Chair Kenneth Langone, a founding Board member. The school has four principals: Tonya White (K-2), Achil Petit (3-5), Shakira Petit (6-8) and Marquitta Speller (high school grades). Ms. White has been principal with HCZ Promise I since 2007, the other three school leaders have been in their current roles for the last 3 to 4 years each.

Part 3: Renewal Process Overview

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 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 law 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 Framework.¹⁰

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 law 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 staff representatives participated in the review of this school, including the visit to the school on March 12-13 and 26, 2013:

- Richard Larios, Senior Director, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Kamilah O'Brien, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Gabrielle Mosquera, Director of Oversight, NYC DOE Charter Schools Accountability and Support
- Adrien Siegfried, Associate Planner, NYC DOE Office of Portfolio Management
- Ashley Renick, Associate Director of Planning, Strategy and Policy, NYC DOE Office of Portfolio Management
- Pier Duncan, Director of Operations, NYC DOE Panel for Educational Policy

¹⁰ http://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 HCZ Promise I has demonstrated academic achievement and progress.

Academic Attainment and Improvement

During this charter term, the school has received two grade NYC DOE High School Progress Reports and four Elementary/Middle School Progress Reports. It has two graduating cohorts from its high school and four years of New York State (NYS) assessment data. (For detailed information on the grade-level data on NYS assessments, please see Appendix A.)

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report: High School

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade			A	A
Student Progress			A	A
Student Performance			A	A
School Environment			B	B
College and Career Readiness ¹¹			A	A
Closing the Achievement Gap Points			3.1	4.0

Performance on the NYC DOE Progress Report: Elementary / Middle School

Progress Report Grade	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Overall Grade	B	C	B	C
Student Progress	C	C	C	C
Student Performance	C	B	B	B
School Environment	A	A	B	C
Closing the Achievement Gap Points	2.0	3.5	1.7	2.0

HS Performance¹² Compared to Peer and NYC Averages¹³

4-year Graduation Rate				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School			98.4%	98.5%
NYC	65.1%	65.5%	64.7%	
Difference from NYC			33.7%	
6-year Graduation Rate ¹⁴				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School				
NYC	69.2%	70.9%	73.2%	

¹¹ The College and Career Readiness grade was not introduced until the 2011-2012 school year.

¹² HCZ Promise I CS originally accepted new students in kindergarten and middle school but revised its charter to have kindergarten to be their primary intake grade, discontinuing recruitment of new classes of the middle schoolers in 2009. The 2011-2012 and 2012-2013 graduating classes entered as middle schoolers. As a result there will be a two-year gap before the school's next graduating cohort in 2015-2016.

¹³ The graduation rates for NYC as of the 2012-2013 school year were not available during the report's publication.

¹⁴ The school will not have students eligible to contribute to a 6-year graduation rate until 2013-2014.

Difference from NYC	-	-	-	
---------------------	---	---	---	--

College Readiness Index - 4 years				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School			46.0%	60.0%
Peer Percent of Range ¹⁵			85.8%	100.0%
City Percent of Range			100.0%	100.0%

Credit Accumulation

% 1st-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	78.7%	-	-	87.7%
Peer Percent of Range	53.4%	-	-	61.0%
City Percent of Range	62.4%	-	-	72.8%
% 2nd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	89.6%	88.6%	-	-
Peer Percent of Range	78.4%	76.2%	-	-
City Percent of Range	82.5%	80.5%	-	-
% 3rd-Year Students Earning 10+ Credits				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	77.3%	97.0%	-
Peer Percent of Range	-	100.0%	93.8%	-
City Percent of Range	-	96.7%	95.7%	-

Students scoring at or above Level 3, compared to CSD, NYC¹⁶, and State averages

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	38.4%	39.8%	42.8%	21.7%
CSD 5	29.8%	29.6%	29.1%	13.4%
Difference from CSD 5	8.6	10.2	13.7	8.3
NYC	44.6%	45.7%	46.9%	26.4%
Difference from NYC	-6.2	-5.9	-4.1	-4.7
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-14.1	-15.0	-12.4	-9.5

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	60.2%	69.3%	67.6%	28.1%
CSD 5	38.5%	39.6%	39.0%	13.1%
Difference from CSD 5	21.8	29.7	28.6	15.0
NYC	56.3%	58.3%	60.0%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	3.9	11.0	7.6	-1.5
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-4.4	4.7	1.9	-0.8

¹⁵ 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 or city.

¹⁶ All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

Mission and Academic Goals

Over its second charter term, HCZ Promise I has achieved: 8 of 13 applicable charter goals in the first year of the charter term, 9 of 14 in the second year, 8 of 15 in the third year, 10 of 12 in the fourth year¹⁷.

Progress Toward Academic Charter Goals

	Met in 2009-2010?	Met in 2010-2011?	Met in 2011-2012?	Met in 2012-2013?
Each year, 75 percent of students in grades 3—8 who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS ELA exams.	No	No	No	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of students in grades 3—8 who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Math exams.	No	No	No	N/A
Each year, 75 percent of students in grades 4 and 8 who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Science exams.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Each year, 75 percent of students in grades 5 and 8 who have been enrolled at the school on BEDS day for at least two consecutive years will perform at or above Level 3 on the NYS Social Studies exams.	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A
For each year of the charter, grade-level cohorts of the same students (i.e. students who were continuously enrolled in the school at least two years on BEDS day) will reduce by one-half the difference between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State ELA exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State ELA exam. In the event that the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75 percent on the previous year's ELA exam, Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy will demonstrate growth (above 75 percent) in the current year.	No	No	No	N/A
For each year of the charter, grade-level cohorts of the same students (i.e. students who were continuously enrolled in the school at least two years on BEDS day) will reduce by one-half the difference between the percent at or above Level 3 on the previous year's State Math exam and 75 percent at or above Level 3 on the current year's State Math exam. In the event that the number of students scoring above proficiency in a grade level cohort exceeded 75 percent on the previous year's Math exam, Harlem Children's Zone Promise Academy will demonstrate growth (above 75 percent) in the current year.	No	No	No	N/A

¹⁷ 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.

Each year, the percent of students in grades 3—8 performing at or above Level 3 on the State ELA exam in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYCDOE.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year, the percent of students in grades 3—8 performing at or above Level 3 on the State Math exam in each tested grade will exceed the average performance of students tested in the same grades of the Community School District in which the school is located. This will be measured by an analysis of performance compared to CSDs conducted by NYCDOE.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year the school will receive a 'B' or higher on the Student Progress section of the NYCDOE Progress Report.	No	No	No	No
Each year, the school will be deemed "In Good Standing" on the NYS Report Card.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year, 75% of students enrolled in grades 9-12 will accumulate 10 or more credits towards graduation. The school will report this each September by submitting a report of student credit accumulation from the previous school year for purposes of the NYCDOE Progress Report.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year, beginning in 2010-2011, 75 percent of the cohort will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examinations in ELA.	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year, 75 percent of the first cohort will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examinations in Math.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year, 75 percent of the initial cohort will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examinations in Science (Living Environment, Chemistry, or other).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year, beginning in 2010-2011, 75 percent of the initial cohort will have scored at least 65 on the New York State Regents examinations in History (Global Studies or U.S. History).	N/A	Yes	Yes	Yes
Each year, the average performance of students in the 12th grade will exceed the state average on the SAT or ACT tests in reading and mathematics.	N/A	N/A	No	No
Each year, at least 75% of each student cohort (as defined by NYSED)[5] graduates within five years.	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes

Responsive Education Program

As part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE visited HCZ Promise I on March 12 and 13, 2014, with follow-up operational and school organizational visits on March 26 and April 3, 2014. Based on discussion, document review, and observation the following was noted:

- Alignment with Common Core
 - HCZ Promise I has made a variety of adjustments to align curriculum and instruction to the Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS), including:
 - Over the course the term, HCZ Promise I's instructional leadership worked with CCLS expert Patti Gill to develop an individualized approach to planning and teaching—in grades 3-8 all students who score at Level 1 or 2 on the NYS

- assessments have a Personalized Lesson Plan (PLP) that provides customized intervention support; in grades 9-10, all students have a PLP;
 - Increased writing time in primary grades and across the curriculum, and aligned grading to state-written response rubrics;
 - Increased time and structure for guided reading and added a daily independent reading period to the school's instructional schedule;
 - Added a vocabulary component to each guided reading lesson;
 - Added Engage NY resources to assist with mathematics instruction, as well as adding more reading and writing in short and extended response formats to math;
 - For the Upper Elementary and Middle schools, HCZ Promise I added NYS Expeditionary Learning to improve rigor, increase project based learning, and improve higher level thinking.
 - In 2012-2013, the school changed its interim assessment system from Acuity to iReady for all grades. This was done with the understanding of the leadership team that iReady provides a stronger CCLS alignment and because it provides in not only data reports but also individualized skill-based lessons based on assessment results.
- Instructional Model and Classroom Instruction
 - The instructional leadership team provides formal and informal professional development opportunities through the efforts of administrators and coaches. The Lower Elementary school leadership team includes a director of instruction and both math and literacy coaches, the Upper Elementary and Middle school includes assistant principals and coaches, as does the high school with department chairs also providing support. Informal observations are frequent and professional development is provided on weekly grade level or departmental meetings and the Data Days that follow iReady administration.
 - The school is phasing in use of the Classroom Assessment Scoring System (CLASS), a teacher observation tool that is supported by intense professional development that results in certification for those trained on the tool's use, a certification that is updated annually.
 - Formal evaluations are done by the principal and reviewed with HCZ's CEO and COO (though this will be done with the Superintendent in the next term).
 - Teachers also have opportunities to receive professional development from invited external experts, such as Patti Gill, or through partnerships, as with special education professional development through the Special Education Collaborative at the NYC Charter Center.
 - Over the two days of the school visit, NYC DOE representatives observed twenty-six classrooms, grades kindergarten through ten, with members of the school's instructional leadership team.
 - While class sizes ranged from twelve to twenty-four students per class, most classes in the elementary and middle school grades had between eighteen and twenty-four students. Class sizes were smaller in the high school grades, where some observed classes had between twelve and nineteen students, including the seminar class taught as part of the Bard pre-college program pilot. In all but six of the observed classes there were at least two adults in the room delivering or supporting instruction. In ELA and Math classes we observed additional teachers (special subjects teachers) assisting with instruction and monitoring learning. We also observed high school students assisting as tutors in some primary grade classrooms.
 - All observed classes were safe, orderly and conducive to learning. Students were consistently on-task and responsive to teacher directions and instruction.
 - Instructional delivery varied but included direct instruction, modeling, guided and independent practice, peer discussion, Socratic seminar, and station learning. 'Do Nows' and mini-lessons were common elements of observed lessons.
 - Multiple checks for understanding, formal and informal, were employed with varying degrees of effectiveness—questioning, polling, exit tickets, observation,

- activity and work sheets, homework, and some performance-based projects, generally writing but also presentation and musical performance as well.
- Questioning in most observed classrooms ranged from basic recall questions to higher level critical thinking questions; most common were basic recall and questions that required students to explain reasoning, but with some questions asking students to analyze, synthesize, and evaluate.
 - Almost all observed classes were efficient, with students consistently working at instructional tasks, independent reading, note-taking, read and response activities, science projects, document analysis, etc.
 - Classrooms were print- and resource-rich. Student work along with instructional and behavioral supports were displayed; curriculum materials and technology, particularly SMART board use as a lesson support, source of information and resource for teacher and student modeling and laptops used for iReady assessments and individualized skill practice, were also observed in use.
 - Feedback on student work, both oral and displayed written feedback, was usually positive and sometimes descriptive and connected to standards or lesson goals. In some observed classrooms, questioning strategies were used effectively to develop student thinking and in others opportunities to develop context, connect a student's response to previous or future learning, or to clarify or extend a response were missed.
 - Examples of differentiated instruction were observed, including reading level appropriate self-selected student reading during independent reading, individualized skill practice with iReady, additional assistance from multiple adults in classroom setting, and small group instruction in ELA and math.
- Based on debriefs with the school's instructional leaders after classroom visits, all classrooms were deemed to be aligned with the school's mission and instructional priorities, although execution in a small minority of classrooms was below expectations.
- Addressing the Needs of All Learners
 - HCZ Promise I has the support of the HCZ special education coordinator, who works with an identified site coordinator, one per each of the four "schools" within a school—the site based coordinator reports to the individual school principal.
 - Special education staffs at all four "schools" within a school are appropriately certified.
 - Special Education services are provided in a general education setting with related services that include push-in and pull-out support of the following areas: Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS), Counseling, Speech Therapy, Occupational Therapy, and Physical Therapy.
 - The school implements a Response to Intervention (RTI) program. The school uses learning specialists and Title I teacher to provide Tier II and III support.
 - HCZ Promise I offers a structured English language immersion program for ELL students that includes push-in and pullout support during the instructional day as well as in after school programming.
 - The school employs four site coordinators, one for each "school within the school." Each is either a certified special educator, social worker, or learning specialist, and though they report to their respective principals they receive support from HCZ's special education coordinator. The HCZ special education coordinator is the main contact with the local Committee for Special Education (CSE) but each of the four site coordinators is connected to the CSE and can and will follow up on communication with the CSE.
 - The school added an occupational therapist and a speech teacher in school year 2013-14 in order to provide related services on-site, decreasing breaks and delays in these services.
 - HCZ also offers additional instructional support (remediation and enrichment) through the network's after school program, its College Success Program, and various other initiatives, such as Healthy Harlem and counseling programs. The after school program also uses iReady so that individual skills based support in both the regular school day and after school programs is coordinated. The after school program also provides support for the regular school day by offering a homework help period.

- **Assessment System**
 - HCZ Promise I uses a variety of assessments to monitor progress, support instruction and accountability, including:
 - iReady is administered for ELA and math in all grades four times a year, three times prior to state assessments and one time after.
 - EngageNY assessments are used to assess progress in unit mastery.
 - Fountas and Pinnell is administered each marking period in grades kindergarten through three.
 - The school uses periodic writing on demand assessments, graded using the state writing rubric.
 - The High School also uses former Regents for students to practice and evaluate progress.
 - Teacher and department created unit assessments, as well as performance-based assessments are also used to monitor student mastery of lesson and unit instruction.

Learning Environment

- During the days of the visit, all observed transitions and student-teacher interactions were safe, orderly and respectful.
- CSAS representatives conducted one-on-one interviews with 15 HCZ Promise Academy I teachers.
 - Interviewed teachers spoke consistently about the types of assessments used at both the school and Academy levels, and could speak at length about the ways in which data was used to inform their instructional practice.
 - Interviewed teachers reported both meeting regularly with the school's Special Education coordinator and receiving professional development related to teaching students with disabilities.
 - All interviewed teachers were aware of who was responsible for their supervision and evaluation, how formal and information observations were conducted, and that CLASS was the basis of both their evaluation and their coaching support.
 - All interviewed teachers spoke positively of their informal observations and feedback they had received from their coaches.
- CSAS representatives conducted group interviews with 17 HCZ Promise Academy I students.
 - Interviewed students spoke about the school's challenging work and high academic expectations.
 - Students were able to name several ways in which they can seek academic and/or social help both inside and out of the classroom as well during afterschool and weekend programs.

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 developed its governance structure and organizational design.

On April 17, 2014, as part of the renewal review process, representatives of the NYC DOE conducted an interview with the school's Board of Trustees. Based on document review and observation, the following was noted:

- The Board currently has nine active members, which is more than the minimum number of seven members and fewer than the maximum number of seventeen members established by its bylaws. The current board has five members from the first year of its first term, one from the third year of its first term, one from the fourth year of its first term, one from the last year of its first term, and one from the last year of its current term.
- The Board has consistently achieved quorum, as recorded in meeting minutes.
- The individual Academy principals update the Board on academic progress and the CBO (Harlem Children's Zone) updates the Board on 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. This is also evidenced by the monthly updates to the Board, as recorded in the meeting minutes; academic performance updates are made by the school's leadership and financial and operational performance updates are made by the school's CBO, Harlem Children's Zone.
- Resources and formal structures for leadership and staff evaluation are in place.
- The Board has had active and functioning committees, as required by its bylaws, including a Supervision and Evaluation Subcommittee, a Student Achievement Subcommittee, an Executive Subcommittee and a Finance Subcommittee, as recorded in meeting minutes and confirmed during the Board interview.

School Climate & Community Engagement

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

- The school has experienced little leadership turnover during the course of its charter term. Its current Lower Elementary Academy principal, Tonya White, has been in the role throughout the term; its Upper Elementary Academy principal, Achil Petit, Middle School principal, Shakira Petit, and High School principal, Marquitta Speller, have all been in their current roles for at least three years each. Geoffrey Canada has been the President and CEO since the school's founding, as well as serving as School Superintendent.
- The school has experienced consistent instructional staff turnover throughout its charter term. Its instructional staff turnover rates over the course of its charter are as follows: 24% in 2009-2010; 28% in 2010-2011; 38% in 2011-2012; and 38% in 2012-2013.¹⁸
- The school's non-instructional staff turnover rates have ranged from 9% to 46% over the course of this charter term.¹⁹
- To date, according to the school's Annual Report the New York State Department of Education (NYSED) the school has met its charter goal of having an annual average student attendance rate of at least 95% twice and not met it twice during the current term.

Average Daily Attendance	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
	93%	95%	94%	95%

¹⁸ Self-reported from Data Collection Form submitted with Renewal Application in December 2013.

¹⁹ Self-reported from Data Collection Form submitted with Renewal Application in December 2013.

- Over the course of the charter term, the NYC School Survey results and response rates for HCZ Promise 1 were:

HCZ Promise I Charter School NYC School Survey Results

	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Academic Expectations	Well Above Average	Above Average	Average	Below Average
Communication	Well Above Average	Above Average	Above Average	Average
Engagement	Well Above Average	Above Average	Average	Average
Safety & Respect	Above Average	Above Average	Average	Average

HCZ Promise I Charter School Response Rates Compared to Citywide Average

	Parents	Citywide	Teachers	Citywide	Students	Citywide
2009-2010	72%	49%	100%	76%	93%	82%
2010-2011	81%	52%	100%	92%	82%	83%
2011-2012	69%	53%	86%	97%	90%	82%
2012-2013	67%	54%	100%	87%	90%	83%

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 review, and observation, the following was noted:

- According to its Annual Reports to NYSED, HCZ Promise I has consistently met its charter goals related to its enrollment targets, retention of students and parent satisfaction. The school has struggled to meet its goals related to staff and student satisfaction, doing so once in four years.
- The NYC DOE conducted a public renewal hearing for the school in an effort to elicit public comments on HCZ Promise I’s renewal. Approximately 34 community members attended the hearing with six offering public comment. All speakers spoke in favor of the school’s renewal; no speakers spoke against.
- The NYC DOE made randomized phone calls to parents from a roster provided by the school for students of all grades. Calls to parents/guardians were made until twenty phone calls were completed. Of these calls, 100% provided positive feedback regarding the school.

Financial Health

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

- Based on the Fiscal Year (FY) 13 financial audit, the school's current ratio indicated a strong ability to meet its current liabilities.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school had sufficient unrestricted cash to cover its operating expenses for more than two months without an infusion of cash.
- A comparison of the enrollment projections for the 2013-14 budget to the actual enrollment revealed that the school had met its enrollment target, supporting its projected revenue.
- As of the FY13 financial audit, the school had met its debt obligations.

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

- Based on the financial audits from FY11 to FY13, the school generated an aggregate surplus and in FY13 the school operated at a surplus.
- Based on the FY13 financial audit, the school's debt-to-asset ratio indicated that the school had more total assets than it had total liabilities.
- Based on the financial audits from FY11 through FY13 the school had overall positive cash flow, with increasing cash in each fiscal year.

There were material weaknesses and significant deficiencies noted in the past three independent financial audits for FY 2013, FY 2012 and FY 2011.

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

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

- HCZ handles the accounting function on behalf of Promise Academy I and II. The office has been reorganized to segregate duties by function (accounts payable, bank reconciliation, etc) as opposed to by organization. HCZ hired a controller and an Interim CFO during the second half of FY13. HCZ also hired an assistant Controller and is in the process of hiring a permanent CFO.
- The school agreed with the financial auditors that the ability to both prepare and post journals was not a proper segregation of duties but noted there were no improper journal entries as a result.
- Accounting for the 457(f) plan was transferred to the new Controller and effective FY14 they will ensure each payment to employees is properly authorized and documented.
- Effective FY14, HCZ implemented weekly staff meetings for the financial and business office personnel of HCZ and the school to better ensure proper coordination of accounting and payments between the two parties.
- It has implemented a new staffing plan to better define roles and add resources to improve the quality and timeliness of internal and external financial reporting.

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

Over the course of the charter term, the Board has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations with one exception.

The school has been compliant with some applicable laws and regulations and out of compliance with others.

The Board is in compliance with:

- Membership size. The board has consistently been within the range of seven to seventeen members outlined in the Board's bylaws.
- Availability of minutes and agendas. The Board has made all board minutes and agendas available to the public via the school's website.
- Timely submission of documents. Over the charter term, the Board has submitted all required documents in a timely fashion.

The Board has been out of compliance with:

- Required number of Board meetings. The Board has held the number of board meetings outlined in its charter and required by its bylaws during all years except 2012, when it held 1 annual meeting and five regular meetings instead of the required 9.

The school is in compliance with:

- Submission of all required documents. The school has submitted the required private facility safety plan. The school is in compliance with AED/CPR certification requirements.
- Insurance requirements. The school has all appropriate insurance documents.
- Fingerprint Clearance. Over the course of the charter term, while all staff have had the required fingerprint clearance, it has not always been conducted in a timely manner.

The school is out of compliance with:

- Certification of staff. The school is out of compliance with NY State Charter Schools Act which relates to teacher certification. A school can have no more than five teachers or 30% of the teaching staff uncertified, whichever number is lower. The school has nine uncertified core teachers, of which four are pending reciprocity from outside of New York State and one is missing the newly required DASA (Dignity for All Students Act) training. The school expects those five teachers to receive their certification shortly. The school is monitoring the progress of the four remaining teachers and expects them to receive certification by September 2014.
- Financial Audits. The school submitted the financial audits for its 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years after the November 1 deadline established in state charter law.

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 school intends to complete its expansion to a full scale K-12 school in the next charter term when with matriculation of its current 9th and 10th graders to 11th and 12th grade.
- With the retirement of Geoffrey Canada from the CEO role, Anne William-Isom, the current COO, will assume the role of CEO in the summer of 2014. Mr. Canada will continue as President and as a Board member for HCZ Promise I.
- The Board is also in the process of hiring a Superintendent to be overall school leader of the four-school HCZ Promise I Charter School. The school's principals will report to the Superintendent and the Superintendent will report to the CEO.
- The Board of Trustees will also be revising its by-laws for the upcoming term to adjust for 2010 charter law revisions requiring monthly meetings to ensure compliance with this requirement while maintaining current Board membership.
- The school will continue to refine its programs and services in the charter term to ensure that they are meeting to the needs of its students, including evaluating the Bard early college pilot program, continue its study in partnership with Mathematica of cohort progress not just in the school but with the full range of HCZ wraparound services.

As a reminder regarding accountability in the next charter term:

- 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.

In response to these amendments, the school notes the following:

- During the course of the expiring term the school's population of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch have been consistently comparable or higher than that of their district.
- Its population of Students with Disabilities has increased and is close to the district average in the most recent reported year.
- Its population of English Language Learner students has consistently been well below the district's average. HCZ Promise I holds its annual lottery for three-year olds and encourages lottery participants to attend HCZ or other community pre-schools. Many do attend HCZ's and the program provides instruction in three languages: English, Spanish and French. Many of the community's non-English speaking families are French-speaking African immigrants and the school believes its pre-school programs help its students do sufficiently well on the LAB-R assessment to not be designated English Language Learners.
- Nonetheless, the school is continuing and extending its efforts to attract and retain these students, including to:
 - target blocks within Harlem that have higher density immigrant families, using bi- and multi-lingual staff members to canvas homes and businesses to recruit more ELL applicants;
 - all staff members distribute tri-lingual brochures and flyers;
 - extend partnerships with other community organizations (like Harlem Hospital) to reach more family members.

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.²⁰

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.²¹

A school seeking renewal of its charter must submit a renewal application to the charter entity to which the original charter application was submitted.²² 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;
- 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.²³

²⁰ See § 2850 of the Charter Schools Act of 1998.

²¹ See §§ 2851(4) and 2852 of the Act.

²² See generally §§ 2851(3) and 2851(4).

²³ § 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 law 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
Schools that are academic successes have many of the characteristics below: <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
Evidence for success might include, but not be limited to, the following depending on school configurations: <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
Schools with successful missions and goals have many of the characteristics below: <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

<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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)
<p>Evidence for likely success in planning for school growth in a new charter term may include, but not be limited to, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

<p>Successful schools consistently perform despite change. While there is no single path for ensuring sustainability, successful schools often have the following features:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

% Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	38.4%	39.8%	42.8%	21.7%
CSD 5	29.8%	29.6%	29.1%	13.4%
Difference from CSD 5 ²⁴	8.6	10.2	13.7	8.3
NYC	44.6%	45.7%	46.9%	26.4%
Difference from NYC	-6.2	-5.9	-4.1	-4.7
New York State	52.5%	54.8%	55.2%	31.2%
Difference from New York State	-14.1	-15.0	-12.4	-9.5

% Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	60.2%	69.3%	67.6%	28.1%
CSD 5	38.5%	39.6%	39.0%	13.1%
Difference from CSD 5	21.8	29.7	28.6	15.0
NYC	56.3%	58.3%	60.0%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	3.9	11.0	7.6	-1.5
New York State	64.6%	64.6%	65.7%	28.9%
Difference from New York State	-4.4	4.7	1.9	-0.8

% of Third Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	52.7%	57.1%	41.3%	22.3%
CSD 5	32.9%	28.6%	30.3%	13.4%
Difference from CSD 5	19.8	28.5	11.0	8.9
NYC	46.5%	48.1%	49.0%	28.1%
Difference from NYC	6.2	9.0	-7.7	-5.8

% of Third Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	55.9%	70.2%	41.3%	23.4%
CSD 5	38.7%	34.9%	36.9%	16.1%
Difference from CSD 5	17.2	35.3	4.4	7.3
NYC	54.3%	54.8%	57.0%	33.1%
Difference from NYC	1.6	15.4	-15.7	-9.7

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	40.0%	36.5%	58.5%	26.1%
CSD 5	27.8%	33.2%	29.1%	11.7%
Difference from CSD 5	12.2	3.3	29.4	14.4
NYC	45.6%	51.0%	52.4%	27.2%
Difference from NYC	-5.6	-14.5	6.1	-1.1

²⁴ All comparisons to either the CSD or NYC take into account only grades the school itself serves.

% of Fourth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	64.2%	60.8%	74.4%	17.0%
CSD 5	38.1%	43.2%	39.6%	15.4%
Difference from CSD 5	26.1	17.6	34.8	1.6
NYC	58.4%	62.3%	65.7%	35.2%
Difference from NYC	5.8	-1.5	8.7	-18.2

% of Fifth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	44.4%	41.2%	46.6%	21.4%
CSD 5	27.2%	32.7%	30.9%	11.1%
Difference from CSD 5	17.2	8.5	15.7	10.3
NYC	46.2%	49.0%	52.2%	28.7%
Difference from NYC	-1.8	-7.8	-5.6	-7.3

% of Fifth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	63.0%	69.1%	76.1%	45.7%
CSD 5	38.5%	42.1%	41.3%	8.7%
Difference from CSD 5	24.5	27.0	34.8	37.0
NYC	59.7%	62.9%	65.2%	29.6%
Difference from NYC	3.3	6.2	10.9	16.1

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	15.3%	48.2%	42.7%	9.8%
CSD 5	31.2%	30.1%	31.6%	13.9%
Difference from CSD 5	-15.9	18.1	11.1	-4.2
NYC	40.1%	43.6%	45.3%	23.3%
Difference from NYC	-24.8	4.6	-2.6	-13.6

% of Sixth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	57.6%	79.5%	82.3%	39.0%
CSD 5	38.6%	39.7%	39.5%	16.4%
Difference from CSD 5	19.0	39.8	42.8	22.6
NYC	53.0%	56.0%	59.3%	28.8%
Difference from NYC	4.6	23.5	23.0	10.2

% of Seventh Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	15.9%	38.3%	23.7%
CSD 5	28.7%	24.0%	26.5%	15.0%
Difference from CSD 5	-	-8.1	11.8	8.7
NYC	38.2%	36.5%	43.3%	25.5%
Difference from NYC	-	-20.6	-5.0	-1.8

% of Seventh Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	68.3%	63.4%	18.5%
CSD 5	37.7%	38.3%	37.9%	10.8%
Difference from CSD 5	-	30.0	25.5	7.7
NYC	52.6%	55.5%	57.3%	25.0%
Difference from NYC	-	12.8	6.1	-6.5

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in English Language Arts				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	-	27.1%	26.9%
CSD 5	24.1%	27.3%	26.8%	14.7%
Difference from CSD 5	-	-	0.3	12.2
NYC	37.5%	35.0%	39.0%	25.4%
Difference from NYC	-	-	-11.9	1.5

% of Eighth Graders Proficient in Math				
	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
HCZ Promise Academy Charter School	-	-	68.6%	30.9%
CSD 5	35.7%	42.5%	39.1%	11.0%
Difference from CSD 5	-	-	29.5	19.9
NYC	46.3%	52.5%	55.2%	25.7%
Difference from NYC	-	-	13.4	5.2

Appendix B: Additional Accountability Data

NYC DOE Progress Reports

2012 – 2013 Academic Year: [Elementary/Middle School](#); [High School](#)

2011 – 2012 Academic Year: [Elementary/Middle School](#); [High School](#)

2010 – 2011 Academic Year: [Elementary/Middle School](#); [High School](#)

NYC DOE Accountability Reports

[Annual Comprehensive Review Report 2012 – 2013](#)

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

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