



New York State Education Department

2021-2022 Renewal Site Visit Report for BoR-Authorized Charter Schools under the 2015 Charter School Performance Framework

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

Renewal Site Visit Date: October 20, 2021

Date of Report: February 9, 2022

[Charter School Office](#)
89 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12234
charterschools@nysed.gov
518-474-1762

Table of Contents

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION	3
METHODOLOGY	7
BENCHMARK ANALYSIS	9
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	11
BENCHMARK 1: STUDENT PERFORMANCE	12
BENCHMARK 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING	13
BENCHMARK 3: CULTURE, CLIMATE, AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT.....	17
BENCHMARK 4: FINANCIAL CONDITION	20
BENCHMARK 5: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT	21
BENCHMARK 6: BOARD OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNANCE.....	22
BENCHMARK 7: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY	24
BENCHMARK 8: MISSION AND KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS	27
BENCHMARK 9: ENROLLMENT, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION.....	28
BENCHMARK 10: LEGAL COMPLIANCE	31

ATTACHMENT 1: 2021 NYSED CHARTER SCHOOL INFORMATION DASHBOARD

ATTACHMENT 2: CHARTER SCHOOL FISCAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUMMARY DASHBOARD

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Charter School Summary¹

Name of Charter School	WHIN Music Community Charter School
Board Chair	Gregory David
District of location	NYC CSD 6
Opening Date	Fall 2017
Charter Terms	Initial Term: September 1, 2017 – June 30, 2022
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K - Grade 5 / 324 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K - Grade 8 / 486 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	NA
Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grades 2-5: 401 West 164th St., New York, NY. 10032 - Public Space • K - Grade 1: 1086 St. Nicholas Ave., New York, NY 10032 -Private Space
Mission Statement	<i>The WHIN Music Community Charter School will provide our diverse student population with a rigorous academic instruction, intensive music education and a positive learning environment so that every student can thrive academically and personally.</i>
Key Design Elements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rigorous, inquiry-driven, project-based, academic curriculum aligned with the Common Core Learning Standards. WHIN teachers will use the inquiry and project based Expeditionary Learning (EL) framework for teaching and learning to challenge their students to be critical thinkers and take an active role in their classrooms and community. • Music-infused curriculum and El Sistema music education. Music will be integrated with core content areas using the Learning Through Music Five Processes Framework which include Questioning, Listening, Creating, Performing, and Reflecting. El Sistema is based on group

¹ The information in this section was provided by the NYS Education Department Charter School Office.

	<p>learning, peer teaching, and a commitment to keeping the joy and fun in learning music and music making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic use of time and scheduling. The school offers an extended school day four days per week providing students in early grades with more time for literacy and math instruction. • Looping. Students will loop with their classmates and teachers for two school years (K-1, 2-3, 4-5). • Co-teaching model. Classrooms will be staffed with two certified teachers, including at least one with special education and/or English as a Second Language credentials. • Inclusionary model of instruction. WHIN will employ the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model to support ELL students inside and outside of the classroom. Special education teachers will follow a multi-tiered Response to Intervention (RtI) model. • Responsive Classroom. Teachers will be trained to work with students and help them develop strategies for resolving conflicts.
<p>Requested Revisions (Revisions are not approved unless approved by the Board of Regents)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand the charter school’s current grade span from K-Grade 5 to K-Grade 8. • A commensurate increase in authorized enrollment from 324 students to 486 students. • Amend the school’s organizational chart to reflect a change in the reporting structure for the school leader. This revision is proposed to commence upon approval. • A non-material revision to the extended day schedule (a key design element) to allow the school flexibility to determine the length of the day each year. This revision is proposed to commence upon approval.

Noteworthy: WHIN Music Community Charter School (WHIN) was founded on the principles of El Sistema, including concepts of radical inclusion, high achievement, and constant growth both as individuals and as an organization, data driven instruction. WHIN offer students extended time in literacy and math, a dedicated Science class, targeted intervention and two periods daily of ensemble-based music instruction. Classroom and music teachers have opportunities to collaborate regularly which allows for consistency of school culture, integration of social studies content, and reinforcement of key literacy and math concepts in music. It also allows classroom teachers to leverage the students’ music knowledge in core content instruction. Complementing the academic rigor is the school’s commitment to building the socio-emotional health and character of its students through *the WHIN Ways of Being* so students can master the 21st Century Skills needed to positively impact their world as citizen artists.

Additionally, WHIN in partnership with The Juilliard School has established a mentoring program. NYC high school students of color who are interested in attending Juilliard participate in a rigorous training program in music, civics, and academics designed to help them prepare for entry to The Juilliard School upon graduation from high school. WHIN students shadow the pre-college students in music and civic classes and receive mentorship from the high school students. Students and families have raved about this program which is modified each year. Ideally, WHIN hopes this program will provide a pipeline for WHIN students to attend Juilliard. [This video, Village](#), represents the final performance of WHIN and Juilliard students. [This video is a short documentary](#) that features interviews with students and staff from WHIN and Juilliard.

COVID-19 PANDEMIC NOTE: As of the publication of this document, New York State continues to be in the midst of responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. NYSED understands that these are challenging times. The NYSED Charter School Performance Framework is a robust document that allows NYSED to continue to use it as an evaluative tool even during the current statewide crisis. With state assessments cancelled for the 2019-2020 school year and administered under the constraints of the COVID-19 pandemic for the 2020-2021 school year (see the applicable memos at [Laws, Regulations & Memos | New York State Education Department](#)). Benchmark 1 allows for the use of longitudinal data. The NYSED Charter School Performance Framework is a robust document that allows NYSED to continue to use it as an evaluative tool even during the current statewide crisis. NYSED has also implemented a local assessment plan that will supplement, not supplant, state assessment data as per the [memo](#) (See Monitoring Plan section).

Renewal Outcomes

Pursuant to the Board of Regents Renewal Policy, the following are possible renewal outcomes:

- **Full-Term Renewal:** A school’s charter may be renewed for the maximum term of five years. For a school to be eligible for a full-term renewal, during the current charter term the school must have compiled a strong and compelling record of meeting or exceeding Benchmark 1, and at the time of the renewal analysis, have met substantially all other performance benchmarks in the Framework.

- Short-Term Renewal:** A school’s charter may be renewed for a shorter term, typically of three years. As discussed above, the Regents will place an even greater emphasis on student performance for schools applying for their second or subsequent renewal, which is consistent with the greater time that a school has been in operation and the corresponding increase in the quantity and quality of student achievement data that the school has generated. In order for a school to be eligible for short-term renewal, a school must either:
 - (a) have compiled a mixed or limited record of meeting Benchmark 1, but at the time of the renewal analysis, have met substantially all of the other performance benchmarks in the Framework which will likely result in the school’s being able to meet Benchmark 1 with the additional time that short-term renewal permits, or
 - (b) have compiled an overall record of meeting Benchmark 1 but falls far below meeting one or more of the other performance benchmarks in the Framework.
- Non-Renewal:** A school’s charter will not be renewed if the school does not apply for renewal or the school fails to meet the criteria for either full-term or short-term renewal. In the case of non-renewal, a school’s charter will be terminated upon its expiration and the school will be required to comply with the Charter School Office’s Closing Procedures to ensure an orderly closure by the end of the school year.

Please Note: The Regents may include additional terms, conditions, and/or requirements in a school’s Full-Term or Short-Term Renewal charter to address specific situations or areas of concern. For example, a school may meet the standards for full-term renewal or short-term renewal with regard to its educational success but may be required to address organizational deficiencies that need to be corrected but do not prevent the Regents from making the required legal findings for renewal. A school may also meet the standards for full-term renewal or short-term renewal of only a portion of its educational program (e.g., for the elementary school program, but not the middle school program). Such additional terms and/or requirements may include, but are not limited to, restrictions on the number of students and grades to be served by the school, additional student performance metrics, heightened reporting requirements, or specific corrective action.

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS
Current Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2017 to 2018	Year 2 2018 to 2019	Year 3 2019 to 2020	Year 4 2020 to 2021	Year 5 2021 to 2022
Grade Configuration	K - Grade 1	K - Grade 2	K - Grade 3	K - Grade 4	K - Grade 5
Total Approved Enrollment	108	162	216	270	324

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Proposed Enrollment Requested by the School²

	Year 1 2022 to 2023	Year 2 2023 to 2024	Year 3 2024 to 2025	Year 4 2025 to 2026	Year 5 2026 to 2027
Grade Configuration	K - Grade 6	K - Grade 7	K - Grade 8	K - Grade 8	K- Grade 8
Total Proposed Enrollment	351	405	459	486	486

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Renewal Report

The primary purpose of the renewal site visit to Board of Regents-authorized charter schools is to supplement and validate the information collected over the charter term by the New York State Education Department (NYSED) Charter School Office (CSO). This information is used to inform the action taken by the Board of Regents to approve, modify, or disapprove the charter school’s request for renewal. In advance of action by the Board of Regents, the CSO prepares a renewal recommendation that is based on the school’s performance in three broad areas:

1. The school’s **academic success** and ability to operate in an educationally sound manner;
2. The school’s **organizational viability** and ability to operate in a fiscally sound manner; and
3. The school’s faithfulness to the terms of its charter and **adherence to applicable laws and regulations**.

In addition, NYSED, on behalf of the New York State Board of Regents, is a community-based authorizer committed to principles of equity and access for all students across New York State. Community-based authorizing is based on the principle that community stakeholder voice, and response to community need, is an integral component of charter school decision making at all levels. During the renewal visit, the CSO will look for evidence of community voice across the school from governance to the educational program, as well as a commitment to the principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion, in the school’s policies and practices.

A one-day remote renewal site visit was conducted at WHIN Music Community Charter School on October 20, 2021. The CSO team conducted interviews with the board of trustees, school

² This proposed chart was submitted by WHIN Music Community Charter School in its renewal application. It is subject to change pending the final renewal recommendation and approval by the Board of Regents.

leadership team, teachers, and student support team. In cooperation with school leadership, the CSO administered anonymous online surveys to teachers and parents.

The team conducted nine remote virtual classroom observations and eight recorded classes in K through Grade 5. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length and conducted jointly with the School Leader. NYSED utilizes the CSO's remote Classroom Observation Worksheet as a lens for remote classroom observations. It is shared with the school prior to the site visit and can be found in the [Renewal SV Protocol](#). The documents and data reviewed by the team before, during, and after the site visit included the following:

- **Current 2021-2022 organizational chart and a revision requesting a change to the current organizational chart;**
- **A 2021-2022 master school schedule;**
- **Board materials and a narrative describing the board's self-evaluation process;**
- **Narrative describing the process used to evaluate school leadership;**
- **Narrative describing the process school leadership uses to evaluate teachers;**
- **School administered teacher, parent/student survey results;**
- **NYCDOE School Quality Reports showing survey results;**
- **CSO 2021 Parent, Teacher, and Student Surveys' Results;**
- **Current school policies, including the discipline policy, complaint policy, enrollment and admissions policy, and by-laws;**
- **NYSED Attachment 1: 2021 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard;**
- **NYSED Attachment 2: Charter School Fiscal Accountability Summary Dashboard;**
- **Narrative describing the school's progress and efforts made toward reaching its enrollment and retention targets;**
- **2021-2022 Faculty/Staff Roster;**
- **School-submitted Annual Reports during current charter term;**
- **School's 2021 Self-Evaluation Tool;**
- **Prior CSO monitoring reports (check-in, mid-term, renewal); and**
- **School's 2021 renewal application.**

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

The 2015 Performance Framework, which is part of the oversight plan included in the Charter Agreement for each school, outlines 10 Performance Framework benchmarks in three key areas of charter school performance:

- Educational Success
- Organizational Soundness
- Faithfulness to Charter and Law

Observational findings from the review of the renewal application, supporting data, and the site visit will be presented in alignment with the 2015 Performance Framework benchmarks and Indicators according to the rating scale below. A brief summary of the school's strengths will precede the benchmark analysis. Each benchmark will be rated; and the report narrative will provide evidence-based information relative to each indicator.

Level	Description
Exceeds	The school meets the performance benchmark; potential exemplar in this area.
Meets	The school generally meets the performance benchmark; few concerns are noted.
Approaches	The school does not meet the performance benchmark; a number of concerns are noted.
Falls Far Below	The school falls far below the performance benchmark; significant concerns are noted.

For the site visit conducted on October 20, 2021 at WHIN Music Community Charter School, see the following Performance Framework benchmark ratings and narrative.

**New York State Education Department
2015 Charter School Performance Framework Rating³**

2015 Performance Benchmark		Level
Educational Success	<p>Benchmark 1: Student Performance: The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic trends toward proficiency, proficiency and high school graduation. At all grade levels and all assessments, scoring proficiently means achieving a performance level of 3 or higher (high school Regents and Common Core Regents exam score of 65 or higher).</p> <p>Note: Due to the ongoing impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the data used to formulate this rating has not been updated since the administration of the state 3-8 math and ELA Assessments in SY 2018-2019. Therefore, this rating does not reflect the efficacy of the school's academic program in SY 2019-2020 through the current academic year which is reflected in the Benchmark 2 and 3 ratings.</p>	Approaches
	<p>Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning: School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students' well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLS) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.</p>	Meets
	<p>Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Family Engagement: The school has systems in place to support students' social and emotional health and to provide for a safe and respectful learning environment. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school's academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.</p>	Meets
Organizational Soundness	<p>Benchmark 4: Financial Condition: The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.</p>	Meets
	<p>Benchmark 5: Financial Management: The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls and procedures, and in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.</p>	Meets
	<p>Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance: The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.</p>	Meets
	<p>Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity: The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure, clearly delineated roles for staff, management, and board members. The school has systems and protocols that allow for the successful implementation, evaluation, and improvement of its academic program and operations.</p>	Meets
Faithfulness to Charter & Law	<p>Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements: The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.</p>	Meets
	<p>Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention: The school is meeting or making annual progress toward meeting the enrollment plan outlined in its charter and its enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced priced lunch program; or has demonstrated that it has made extensive good faith efforts to attract, recruit, and retain such students.</p>	Approaches
	<p>Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance: The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.</p>	Meets

³ Charter schools authorized or renewed beginning in the 2019-2020 school year and thereafter use the [2019 Charter School Performance Framework](#), and all other charter schools use the [2015 Charter School Performance Framework](#) until renewal. Refer to the appropriate framework for the applicable benchmark standards.

Summary of Findings

- WHIN is in year 5 of operation and serves students in K- Grade 5. During its current charter term, the school is rated in the following manner: meeting eight benchmarks and approaching two benchmarks. A summary of those ratings are provided below.

- **Summary of Areas of Growth and Strengths:**
 - The school faithfully integrates its key design elements, most notably the focus on music instruction. School leadership and the board of trustees are committed to an academically rigorous and music intensive academic program that fosters student ownership, inquiry, and sense of community.
 - Leaders reported clear structure for curriculum development, lesson planning, and teacher coaching.
 - Teachers reported feeling supported and listened to at the school.
 - The school relied heavily on internal assessment platforms including the Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of Progress (STEP) assessment for ELA, Assuming Math Concepts (AMC) for math, iReady for both ELA and math, as well as internally designed formative, interim, benchmark and summative assessments for Music, ELA, Math, Science, and available state test results from the 2020-2021 school year. WHIN has had near 100 percent participation rates on all local assessment administered.
 - The school executes multiple systems to meet students' diverse needs, including two full-time teachers per classroom to support SWDs and ELLs, a robust Rtl program and child study teams to tailor and monitor academic and social-emotional supports, and the use of Responsive Classroom structures and Second Step.
 - The board of trustees has diverse expertise, operates a high-functioning committee structure, and demonstrates awareness of and actively participates in pursuing student achievement and the school's mission.

- **Summary of Areas in Need of Improvement:**
 - The school has not met its enrollment targets for students with SWDs, ELLs, and ED students during its initial charter despite robust recruitment and marketing plan.

Benchmark 1: Student Performance

The school has met or exceeded achievement indicators for academic trends toward proficiency, proficiency, and high school graduation. At all grade levels and all assessments, scoring proficiently means achieving a performance level of 3 or higher (high school Regents and Common Core Regents exam score of 65 or higher).

Finding: Approaches

Note: State assessments were not administered in the 2019-2020 school year and were administered under the COVID-19 pandemic constraints during the 2020-2021 school year. As such, NYSED is limited to what results it can include from those two years in the analysis of this benchmark. In the Spring of 2021 NYSED instituted a Local Assessment Plan designed to collect authorizer-approved local/interim assessment data from Board of Regents-authorized schools. More details regarding this initiative can be found in the [NYSED Local Assessment Plan memo](#). Local assessment data will be shared starting in the 2021-2022 school year.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 1:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has only been able to be assessed as student academic performance trending upward based on its school-administered local assessment data, as the charter school has no state-level testing data due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. It began to serve Grade 3 students in the 2019-2020 school year and Grade 4 students in 2020-2021. The school has administered its charter-approved local assessments in ELA, math and Music throughout the charter term, and uses the data to strengthen its intervention strategies.

At the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year, 92 percent of the students who took the STEP Assessment for literacy were assessed at level 1 or below standards. By the end of the year, 56 percent of these students made one or more year's growth which demonstrated that the interventions put into place were working to close the achievement gap. SWDs and ELLs demonstrated significant growth with regard to reading progress with 39 percent and 31 percent making one or more year's growth. In math, and based on the Assuming Math Concepts assessments, at the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year, 18 percent of all students were below standard or at level 1; 35 percent were approaching standard or at level 2 and 48 percent were at level 3 and 4. By the end of the 2017-2018 school year, 57 percent of all students, 60 percent of SWDs, 50 percent of ELLs made one or more years of growth in math. During 2018-2019 and 2019-2020, student growth and proficiency levels continued to trend upward even during 2020-2021. Despite significant growth, the majority of students who took local assessments in ELA and math perform below grade-level expectations.

NYSED designated WHIN as a school in **Good Standing** for the following academic years 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. All accountability subgroups made Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional academic information.

Benchmark 2: Teaching and Learning

School leaders have systems in place designed to cultivate shared accountability and high expectations and that lead to students’ well-being, improved academic outcomes, and educational success. The school has rigorous and coherent curriculum and assessments that are aligned to the New York State Learning Standards (NYSL) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.

Finding: Meets

<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
1. <i>Curriculum</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school has a documented curriculum that is aligned to the NYSL. b. Teachers use unit and lesson plans that introduce complex materials, stimulate higher order thinking, and build deep conceptual understanding and knowledge around specific content. c. The curriculum is aligned horizontally across classrooms at the same grade level and vertically between grades. d. The curriculum is differentiated to provide opportunities for all students to master grade-level skills and concepts. e. The curriculum is systematically reviewed and revised.
2. <i>Instruction</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school staff has a common understanding of high-quality instruction, and observed instructional practices align to this understanding. b. Instructional delivery fosters engagement with all students.
3. <i>Assessment and Program Evaluation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school uses a balanced system of formative, diagnostic and summative assessments. b. The school uses qualitative and quantitative data to inform instruction and improve student outcomes. c. The school uses qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of the academic program and modifies the program accordingly.
4. <i>Supports for Diverse Learners</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The school provides supports to meet the academic needs for all students, including but not limited to: students with disabilities, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students. b. The school has systems to monitor the progress of individual students and facilitate communication between interventionists and classroom teachers regarding the needs of individual students.

Academic Program for Elementary School:

- ES:
 - The school follows the Bridges math curriculum, grounded in hands on learning.
 - The school uses EL Education (formerly Expeditionary Learning) literacy curriculum which is module based and includes a range of integrated content.
 - The school uses Wilson Foundations, Hagerty and guided reading as supplements to the literacy curriculum.
 - The school uses Full Option Science System (FOSS) Next Generation science curriculum and school developed social studies units.
 - Music instruction is daily at the school and follows the EL Sistema method.

Academic Program for Students with Disabilities and English language learners (ELLs):

- SWDs:
 - The school offers both push-in and pull-out supports.
 - Each classroom has a special education certified teacher to support SWDs.
- ELLs:
 - Each grade has a certified ELL teacher in one of the classrooms to support students.
 - The school also has an ELL interventionist who provides push-in and pull-out support to ELL students as needed.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 2:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has been consistent in its Meet rating, and it is particularly strong in the areas of interventions and supports.

1. Element: ***Curriculum:***

- **Indicator a:** Leaders and teachers reported that the school uses Expeditionary Learning EL Education literacy, Bridges Mathematics, and FOSS as primary curriculums. They reported that these are aligned to state standards. These materials were observed and used during classroom observations. Fifty-five percent of teachers who responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school has a documented curriculum that is aligned to the New York State learning standards.
- **Indicator b:** Leaders reported, and submitted schedules confirmed, that teachers have a range of collaborative planning times weekly and monthly. This includes weekly time with co-teachers, weekly content meetings facilitated by either a leader or consultant, and monthly collaborative planning time across content areas. Lesson plans are submitted by grade-level teams weekly to leadership for review according to the leadership team. Twenty teachers responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher survey. Sixty percent of teachers who responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school's curriculum is aligned horizontally across same grade level classrooms.
- **Indicator c:** The commercial curriculum programs used have alignment built into them according to school leaders. There are also opportunities for vertical and horizontal planning built into the PD and collaboration schedules provided by the school and described by leadership.

- **Indicator d:** Leaders and the student support team reported that the co-teaching model allows for differentiation within classrooms, both through small groups and more individualized support. The supplemental literacy curriculums also are reported to support further differentiation. Seventy-eight parents who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that I am aware of the academic supports available to my child.
- **Indicator e:** The renewal application described, and leadership confirmed that they have established a curriculum review committee both to review current programming as well as plan for the middle school. Teachers also reported that one activity during summer PD was reviewing data and curriculum in order to identify priority standards for the year.

2. Element: ***Instruction:***

- **Indicator a:** Leadership were able to identify several practices that they believed were common across the school, including the use of lesson targets, and a focus on full participation. These strategies were present in many of the observed classroom, in alignment with leaders' assessment of their staff's current skill level in both the interview and self-reflection. Fifty percent of teachers who responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school staff has a shared understanding of high-quality instruction that supports all learners.
- **Indicator b:** Interviews discussed the use of a range of techniques for engagement of all students and these were generally present in observations, including choral responses, small group work, and cold-calling. Forty percent of teachers who responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher Survey strongly agreed with the statement that instructional delivery fosters engagement with all students.

3. Element: ***Assessment and Program Evaluation:***

- **Indicator a:** WHIN administered local assessments at the beginning of each year and immediately implemented several intervention strategies based on the data. The school repeated the administration of local assessments at the end of the year. The school strengthened those intervention strategies each subsequent year including moving the reading interventionist from part-time in year one to full-time for the next and remaining years.
- The school uses STEP as a reading assessment and AMC in math. They also use partner created interims in 3rd grade and iReady. The school plans to use MAP next year. Teachers also reported using a range of both curriculum based and teacher created assessments, as well as exit tickets and other more informal checks for understanding on a daily basis.
- **Indicator b:** Teachers reported using data to create reading and math groups, identify skills for re-teaching, and identify priority standards. During observed lessons, teachers pulled small groups to work on specific skills.
- **Indicator c:** Leaders were able to speak to several changes made based on data, including the introduction of supplemental literacy programs, increasing the number of interventionists on staff, and introducing a focus on close reading instruction in the upper grades.

4. Element: ***Supports for Diverse Learners:***

- **Indicator a:** As described in the student and family handbook to support the needs of SWDs in the least restrictive environment, WHIN offers:
 - Integrated Co-Teaching and Collaborative Team Teaching (ICT/CTT) classrooms with one special education teacher and one general education teacher or one ENL teacher and one general education teacher in the classroom to service all students; Stakeholders reported, and observations confirmed that the co-teaching model allows teachers to support SWDs, ELLs and academically struggling students.
 - Special Education Teacher Support Services (SETSS), which include service by a special education teacher within the general education setting or small group pull out; and
 - Related services such as speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, counseling, and other related services. The school has added interventionist support over time based on academic needs identified in the data. Sixty-five percent of teachers who responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher Survey strongly agreed with the statements that the school provides supports to meet the academic needs for SWDs and ELLs.
 - The NYCDOE indicated that the school seems to have built a good relationship with its families. However, the school's relationship with the CSE has had some challenges. The school has struggled to provide reports to the CSE in a timely manner, making it difficult to effectively facilitate IEP meetings. The CSE has concerns about the school's staffing, as it does not appear to have sufficient bilingual staff to meet the needs of all the families they serve. The school has improved in its work with SWDs, but the CSE continues to have concerns regarding the high number of requests from the school for paraprofessionals. The CSE questions whether the school uses paraprofessionals to address deficits in school staffing or in the instruction provided to SWDs.
- **Indicator b:** The student and family handbook outlines systems for RtI intervention and monitoring for students in need of academic and behavioral supports across three tiers of increasing support. Within the RtI program, a Child Study Team (CST), consisting of teachers, the principal, director of music, director of special programs, executive director, parent/guardians, the director of school culture, and/or other related service providers as needed reviews and analyzes data, defines strengths and areas of need for the student, plans for specific interventions, and monitors student progress. As confirmed in the school leadership focus group, data points monitored by the CST to assess students' needs include STEP and AMC results, classroom work, discipline and attendance records, and qualitative progress notes shared by team members.

Benchmark 3: Culture, Climate, and Family Engagement

The school has systems in place to support students’ social and emotional health and to provide for a safe and respectful learning environment. Families, community members and school staff work together to share in the responsibility for student academic progress and social-emotional growth and well-being. Families and students are satisfied with the school’s academics and the overall leadership and management of the school.

Finding: Meets

<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
<p>1. <i>Behavior Management and Safety</i></p>	<p>a. The school has a clear approach to behavioral management, including a written discipline policy. b. The school appears safe and all school constituents are able to articulate how the school community maintains a safe environment. c. The school has systems in place to ensure that the environment is free from harassment and discrimination. d. Classroom environments are conducive to learning and generally free from disruption.</p>
<p>2. <i>Family Engagement and Communication</i></p>	<p>a. The school communicates with and engages families with the school community. b. Teachers communicate with parents to discuss students’ strengths and needs. c. The school assesses family and student satisfaction using strategies such as surveys, feedback sessions, community forums, or participation logs, and considers results when making schoolwide decisions. d. The school has a systematic process for responding to family or community concerns. e. The school shares school-level academic data with the broader school community to promote transparency and accountability among parents, students and school constituents.</p>
<p>3. <i>Social-Emotional Supports</i></p>	<p>a. The school has systems or programs in place to support the social-emotional needs of students. b. School leaders collect and use data to track the socio-emotional needs of students. c. School leaders collect and use data regarding the impact of programs designed to support students’ social and emotional health.</p>

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 3:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has been consistent in its Meets rating and has put into place systems including professional development for teacher to

address disciplinary concerns and social and emotional supports to provide for a safe, calm, and respectful learning environment.

1. Element: ***Behavior Management and Safety:***

- **Indicator a:** As described in the student and family handbook, WHIN has established learning environment that promotes personal development, advances social inclusion, and develops community building for all students and families. The learning environment is founded upon three philosophies/practices: El Sistema, Restorative Justice, and Responsive Classroom to support positive, preventative discipline, a warm school culture, and student reflection on their choices to understand consequences and make amends when necessary. To this end, WHIN uses Responsive Classroom structures including morning meeting, interactive modeling, positive teacher language, guided discovery, academic choice, and working with families. When values are not upheld, the student and family handbook outlines three tiers of infractions and consequences that are utilized to handle specific situations.
 - The school has a clear discipline policy as part of renewal that articulates a clear ladder of consequences. Teachers and leaders reported that there are also consistent behavior management structures across classrooms, supported by the director of culture, grounded in PBIS. There are also core values and associated behaviors, *the WHIN Ways of Being*, that were consistently cited by stakeholders and observed being referenced in observations. All teachers also reported using responsive classroom, which was included on the PD calendar provided.
 - Of the expected 223 parent responses to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey, seventy-three parents responded. This represents 33% of the expected responses. Seventy-three percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school's discipline policy is fair to all students. Forty-five percent of teachers who responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher Survey strongly agreed with the same statement.
- **Indicator b:** Observed classrooms were safe and teachers and leaders spoke to the support available to maintain this environment. This includes adults monitoring transitions, the support of the director of culture, and weekly character education lessons using the Second Step program. Eighty-nine percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school provides a safe environment. Sixty percent of teachers who responded to the CSO 2021 Teacher Survey strongly agreed with the same statement.
- **Indicator c:** The director of culture reported monitoring school culture data to ensure that it is not disproportionately impacting individual student groups; this was also cited in the renewal application.
- **Indicator d:** Observed lessons did not show any significant behavior disruptions that detracted from learning; when there were behavior issues teachers were generally able to address quickly and in a non-disruptive manner. Eighty-four percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the classroom environments support learning and are generally free from disruption.

2. Element: ***Family Engagement and Communication:***

- **Indicator a:** School leaders reported conducting regular sessions to hear from families and provide them suggestions on how to work with their students. They also discussed the range of recitals and other events that bring families into the school during a non-COVID year. Eighty-eight percent of families who responded to the 2020-2021 CSO Parent strongly agreed with the statement that the school seeks feedback from parents through surveys, meetings, or some other way.
- **Indicator b:** Teachers reported that they communicate with parents at least weekly, both in writing as well as at pick-up and drop-off. They also noted that families can access student grades online on an ongoing basis. Eighty-two percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that I receive regular and timely information on my child's academic progress in my home language.
- **Indicator c:** In the focus group and evidenced in the CSO Parent Survey, an overwhelming majority of parents agree the school seeks their feedback and involvement in the decision-making process through surveys, meetings, or forums. Parent indicated that they were recently asked to provide feedback regarding the expansion to middle school. During the school leadership focus group, school leaders reported that communication with families is extremely high and, through multiple channels including surveys, phone calls, and texts, families regularly share feedback and their thoughts on the school.
- **Indicator d:** Fifty-nine percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school has a complaint policy that is easy to find. The CSO has received six complaints during the charter term, the majority of which were informal complaints from families which have been addressed and resolved in accordance with the school's complaint policy
- **Indicator e:** Fifty-one percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school informs parents about how it performs compared to other school in the district and New York State.

3. Element: ***Social-Emotional Supports:***

- **Indicator a:** School leaders and teachers reported, and it was confirmed in the schedule and renewal application that there is a daily morning meeting focused on building relationships and addressing social-emotional concerns. There is also a weekly block dedicated to character education. The Child Study Team meeting also looks at social-emotional needs of individual students. The school also reported an on-site health center focused on counseling supports. Eighty-eight percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey strongly agreed with the statement that the school has social, emotional, and mental health programs and supports for all students.
- **Indicator b:** School leaders reported that the child study team meetings look at behavioral data to assess needs for supports. The director of student culture reported using data to connect families with needed resources for additional supports.
- **Indicator c:** The director of student culture reported collecting schoolwide data and adjusting curriculum and other programming as needed. Teachers referenced him as a source of support, guidance, and feedback on their practices as well.

Benchmark 4: Financial Condition

The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.

Finding: Meets

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has been consistent in its Meets rating with its high financial composite score.

See the school’s fiscal dashboard attached to the end of this report (Charter School Fiscal Accountability Summary). The fiscal dashboard provides detailed information regarding the school’s compliance with Benchmark 4 of the Charter School Performance Framework. Unless otherwise indicated, financial data is derived from the school’s annual independently audited financial statements which can be found on the NYSED website at <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/psc/csdirectory/CSLaunchPage.html>.

- Financial Composite Score
- Working Capital
- Debt to Asset
- Cash Position
- Total Margin

Financial Condition

WHIN Music Community Charter School appears to be in good financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school’s independently audited financial statements.

Overall Financial Outlook

A financial composite score is an overall measure of financial health based on a weighting of primary reserves, equity, and net income. A charter school with a score between 1.5 and 3.0 is generally considered to be in good financial health. WHIN Music Community Charter School’s 2020-2021 composite score is 2.67.

**Composite Scores
2017-2018 to 2020-2021**

<i>Year</i>	<i>Composite Score</i>
2017-2018	2.33
2018-2019	2.37
2019-2020	2.00
2020-2021	2.67

Benchmark 5: Financial Management

The school operates in a fiscally sound manner with realistic budgets pursuant to a long-range financial plan, appropriate internal controls and procedures, and in accordance with state law and generally accepted accounting practices.

Finding: Meets

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has been consistent with a Meets rating.

Renewal is based on evidence that the following indicators are generally present:

1. The school has an accurate and functional accounting system that includes monthly budgets.
2. The school sets budget objectives and regularly analyzes its budget in relation to those objectives.
3. The school has allocated budget surpluses in a manner that is fiscally sound and directly attends to the social and academic needs of the students attending the school.
4. The school has and follows a written set of fiscal policies.
5. The school has complied with state and federal financial reporting requirements.
6. The school has and is maintaining appropriate internal controls and procedures.
7. The school follows generally accepted accounting principles as evidenced by independent financial audits with an unqualified audit opinion, a limited number of findings that are quickly corrected, and the absence of a going concern disclosure.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 5:

NYSED CSO reviewed WHIN Music Community Charter School's 2020-2021 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

Benchmark 6: Board Oversight and Governance

The board of trustees provides competent stewardship and oversight of the school while maintaining policies, establishing performance goals, and implementing systems to ensure academic success, organizational viability, board effectiveness and faithfulness to the terms of its charter.

Finding: Meets

<i>Element</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
1. <i>Board Oversight and Governance</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The board recruits and selects board members with skills and expertise that meet the needs of the school. b. The board engages in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting priorities and goals that are aligned with the school’s mission and educational philosophy. c. The board demonstrates active oversight of the charter school management, fiscal operations, and progress toward meeting academic and other school goals. d. The board regularly updates school policies. e. The board utilizes a performance-based evaluation process for evaluating school leadership, itself, and providers. f. The board demonstrates full awareness of its legal obligations to the school and stakeholders.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 6:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has been consistent with a Meets rating, as the board of trustees is consistently strong as evidenced by CSO liaison board meeting observations.

1. Element: **Board Oversight and Governance:**

- **Indicator a:** The board of trustees currently consists of seven individuals with diverse backgrounds in finance, education, including music education, law, fundraising, and leadership development. During the board of trustees focus group, board members noted hiring an outside consultant to assist with board recruitment as three members have transitioned off and new members subsequently recruited since the school’s founding. As part of the board’s own self-evaluation process, the board assesses its own composition needs and has identified a priority to increase the diversity of board members. The renewal application and a board member focus group described how these additions were intended to fill key gaps in the existing board composition.
- **Indicator b:** Board members and school leadership discussed the process by which the board receives data and engages in decision making, aligned with the school’s mission. Some key examples include the additional staffing provided for intervention based on academic data, the decision around proposed middle school expansion, and identification

of new facilities. The role of the board in these processes was confirmed by review of board minutes and the renewal self-reflection.

- **Indicator c:** The renewal application and board minutes demonstrate that the board, both as whole and through its committees, reviews financial, academic, and operational data on a monthly basis and uses it to monitor progress and hold school leadership accountable.
- **Indicator d:** The renewal application and board self-evaluation describe a clear policy for reviewing policies annually and updating as needed. The board of trustees confirmed during its focus group that there is a process for considering any policy revisions, beginning with discussion at the relevant board committee before review and approval by the full board. Examples provided included an annual routine review of financial policies and procedures and changing the math curriculum.
- **Indicator e:** During WHIN's founding year, an evaluation tool for the executive director was created, which includes quantitative evaluation of 41 competencies related to organizational development, leadership skills, educational program, family and community engagement, and staff and teacher engagement and qualitative open-ended questions related to strengths, areas for growth, challenges ahead, and upcoming goals. Each board member completes the evaluation with a combined document shared and discussed with the entire board and executive director. Additionally, the school submitted a description of the board's self-evaluation process, which includes individual completion of a self-reflection tool, review by the board chair, and follow-up conversations between the board chair and each board member. The board evaluation document also describes regular engagement in reflecting on all aspects of the organization, including the school's operations and the board's own strengths and areas of growth. The board worked with a consultant during the 2018-2019 school year to develop this self-evaluation tool as well as a board development report card, roles and responsibilities member agreements, and meeting and orientation protocols.
- **Indicator f:** During the board of trustees focus group, board members described how, through support from its external consultant, detailed materials related to board member roles and responsibilities and the onboarding process for new members have been drafted. Furthermore, the school has lawyers to advise on various specialty areas as needed such as facilities and special education.

Benchmark 7: Organizational Capacity

The school has established a well-functioning organizational structure, clearly delineated roles for staff, management, and board members. The school has systems and protocols that allow for the successful implementation, evaluation, and improvement of its academic program and operations.

Finding: Meets

<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
<p>1. <i>School Leadership</i></p>	<p>a. The school has an effective school leadership team that obtains staff commitment to a clearly defined mission and set of goals, allowing for continual improvement in student learning.</p> <p>b. Roles and responsibilities for leaders, staff, management, and board members are clearly defined. Members of the school community adhere to defined roles and responsibilities.</p> <p>c. The school has clear and well-established communication systems and decision-making processes in place which ensure effective communication across the school.</p> <p>d. The school successfully recruits, hires, and retains key personnel, and makes decisions – when warranted – to remove ineffective staff members.</p>
<p>2. <i>Professional Climate</i></p>	<p>a. The school is fully staffed with high quality personnel to meet all educational and operational needs, including finance, human resources, and communication.</p> <p>b. The school has established structures for frequent collaboration among teachers.</p> <p>c. The school ensures that staff has requisite skills, expertise, and professional development necessary to meet students’ needs.</p> <p>d. The school has systems to monitor and maintain organizational and instructional quality—which includes a formal process for teacher evaluation geared toward improving instructional practice.</p> <p>e. The school has mechanisms to solicit teacher feedback and gauge teacher satisfaction.</p>
<p>3. <i>Contractual Relationships</i> □N/A</p>	<p>a. The board of trustees and school leadership establish effective working relationships with the management company or comprehensive service provider.</p> <p>b. Changes in the school’s charter management or comprehensive service provider contract comply with required charter amendment procedures.</p> <p>c. The school monitors the efficacy of contracted service providers or partners.</p>

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 7:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has improved from an Approaches to a Meets rating as the charter school has maintained an effective and strong school leadership team that has put systems, protocols and supports into place to ensure a high-quality teaching and learning environment.

1. Element: ***School Leadership:***

- **Indicator a:** School leadership was able to describe their mission and instructional priorities for the year, as well as the data that was used to help identify those priorities. These priorities were also defined in the renewal application and confirmed by interviewed teachers.
- **Indicator b:** Each member of the school leadership team was able to clearly describe the delineation of their roles and teachers confirmed they knew who to go with what concerns. These roles and responsibilities were also confirmed by a review of the school submitted organizational chart.
- **Indicator c:** Teachers and leaders and the submitted self-evaluations and talked about a range of structures to solicit teacher input in decision-making, including surveys, focus groups, and a teacher leader committee.
- **Indicator d:** School leaders and the renewal application discussed several strategies used for teacher recruitment, including university partnerships and a new partnership with Teach for America. Teachers talked about strategies implemented at the school to support retention, including training, growth opportunities, and voice in decision making.

2. Element: ***Professional Climate:***

- **Indicator a:** The school has a range of skill sets on the leadership team. Over the course of the charter term, they have adjusted the leadership structure from a co-leader model to an executive director and school leader model and brought on outside finance support to best meet the needs of the school.
- **Indicator b:** Teachers and leaders reported, and schedules confirmed, that there is daily, weekly, and monthly collaboration structures for teachers in various configurations depending on the purpose of the collaboration.
- **Indicator c:** The school leaders and teachers reported both three weeks of summer PD as well as weekly PD offered at the school, facilitated by either leaders or consultants. This was confirmed by the submitted PD calendar. Additionally, teachers and leaders reported that teachers often have the opportunity to attend outside trainings. Teachers and leaders reported that PD topics are informed by the school's mission/vision, needs identified by data and observations, and teacher input as solicited by surveys.
- **Indicator d:** Teachers and leaders discussed a clear evaluation process, which includes a self-evaluation, goal setting and progress monitoring. The evaluation tool provided by the school demonstrates alignment to this process as well as criteria aligned to the school's mission and key design elements.
- **Indicator e:** Teachers, leaders and the submitted self-reflection talked about a range of structures to solicit teacher input, including surveys, focus groups, and a teacher leader committee. Teachers also reported that they complete surveys after PD and feel their feedback is taken into consideration for improvements to future PD sessions. All teachers interviewed reported an improvement in professional climate since the mid-year period, which leadership had identified as a focus area in their self-reflection.

3. Element: ***Contractual Relationships:***

- **Indicator a:** N/A
- **Indicator b:** N/A
- **Indicator c:** N/A

Benchmark 8: Mission and Key Design Elements

The school is faithful to its mission and has implemented the key design elements included in its charter.

Finding: Meets

<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
1. <i>Mission and Key Design Elements</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. School stakeholders share a common and consistent understanding of the school's mission and key design elements outlined in the charter.b. The school has fully implemented the key design elements in the approved charter and in any subsequently approved revisions.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 8:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has been consistent in its Meets rating and has increased the social-emotional aspect of its mission and key design elements.

1. Element: **Missions and Key Design Elements:**

- **Indicator a:** All interviewed stakeholders were able to speak to the school's mission and key design elements. The key design elements prioritized by interviewed stakeholders including the integration of music through the el Sistema method, co-teaching, the importance of project-based and rigorous academics, and use of responsive classroom. Ninety-seven percent of families who responded to the CSO 2021 Parent Survey agreed with the statement that they feel the school is fulfilling its mission.
- **Indicator b:**
 - Co-teaching was present in all observed lessons and all stakeholders talked about the importance of this to meet the needs of students as well as a range of co-teaching methods depending on the situation.
 - The school uses curriculum programs that are standards-aligned inquiry driven, and project-based. Teachers spoke to these aspects of the curriculum and they were seen being implemented with fidelity during observed lessons.
 - All students receive music instruction daily, as evidenced in school schedules and classroom observations. Teachers and leaders spoke to the methods followed in this instruction as well as how music is used to support other subjects and other subjects reinforce music instruction.
 - All teachers and the student support team spoke to the use of responsive classroom, including the daily morning meeting structure. The PD calendar showed substantial responsive classroom training, particularly during the summer institute mentioned by teachers.

Benchmark 9: Enrollment, Recruitment, and Retention

The school is meeting or making annual progress toward meeting the enrollment plan outlined in its charter and its enrollment and retention targets for students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible applicants for the free and reduced priced lunch program; or has demonstrated that it has made extensive good faith efforts to attract, recruit, and retain such students.

Finding: Approaches

<u>Element</u>	<u>Indicators</u>
1. <i>Targets are met</i>	a. The school maintains sufficient enrollment demand for the school to meet or come close to meeting the enrollment plan outlined in the charter.
2. <i>Targets are not met</i>	<p>a. The school is making regular and significant annual progress toward meeting the targets.</p> <p>b. The school has implemented extensive recruitment strategies and program services to attract and retain students with disabilities, English language learners, and students who are eligible for free and reduced priced lunch. Strategies include, but are not limited to: outreach to parents and families in the surrounding communities, widely publicizing the lottery for such school, efforts to academically support these students, and enrollment policy revisions, such as employing a weighted lottery or enrollment preference, to increase the proportion of enrolled students from the three priority populations.</p> <p>c. The school has implemented a systematic process for evaluating recruitment and outreach strategies and program services for each of the three categories of students, and makes strategic improvements as needed.</p>

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark the school has been consistent with its Approaches rating as it has shown some improvement but has not met its SWDs and ELLs enrollment targets despite its robust strategic efforts.

2. Element: **Target are not met:**

- **Indicator a:** The school is currently at 82.5 percent of its contracted enrollment which represents 223 students of its 270 maximum authorized enrollment. The school has had difficulty meeting its contracted enrollment each year of its charter term. In year 1, the school met 73 percent of its contracted enrollment but had shown slight improvement in year 2 and year 3 where the school had met 86 percent and 88 percent respectively for those years. The school has shown slight improvement of its enrollment and retention of SWDs.
 - WHIN has not met its ELL or ED enrollment targets over time, and has consistently been rated as falls far below in comparison to the ELL and ED enrollment in the district of location, NYC CSD 6.

- In year 1, WHIN enrolled an ELL population of 14% and the NYC CSD 6 enrolled an ELL population of 32 percent. WHIN has showed only a slight increase in ELL enrollment. WHIN's ELL student enrollment is currently at 15 percent and the district of location is at 31 percent currently (a -16 percent point differential).
- In year 1, WHIN's ED enrollment was 71 percent, and it has improved to 81 percent in year 4, as compared to NYC CSD 6 which has maintained an ED enrollment of 82 percent for the past 3 years.
- In year 1, WHIN's SWD enrollment exceeded that of the district of location's SWDs enrollment by +6 percentage points and declined in year 2 falling below the district of location by -1 percentage point. Beginning In year 3, WHIN has been consistent in having met or surpassed NYC CSD 6 SWD enrollment. The school's SWD enrollment is currently at 28 percent as compared to the district of location's SWD enrollment of 25 percent (a +3 percentage-point differential).
- WHIN has shown consistent and strong improvement in its retention of SWD, ELL and ED student subgroups. In 2018-2019, the school's SWD retention was at 57 percent in 2018-2019, and increased to 92 percent by 2020-2021, surpassing the district of location by +2 percentage points.
- The school's retention of ELL and ED student subgroups has improved over a three- year period beginning in 2018-2019 through 2020-2021, beginning with a retention of ELLs at 64 percent and ED students at 73 percent to an 83 percent and 85 percent respectively. Compared to the district of location, this improvement reflects a drop from a -19 percentage-point differential in 2018-2019 to a -6 percentage-point differential in 2020-2021 for the ELL student subgroup. Similarly, the school's improvement in retention of the ED student subgroup reflects a drop from -10 percentage point differential to a -5 percentage-point differential in comparison to the district of location.
- **Indicator b:** The renewal application describes, and the school leadership discussed during a focus group conversation a range of student recruitment activities aimed at recruiting a diverse student population, including school partnerships, parent ambassadors, and community events. The school submitted parent testimonials as evidence of the school's recruitment efforts. Here is a summary of specific recruitment strategies. WHIN implements multiple recruitment strategies to attract and retain SWDs, ELLs, and ED students in addition to conducting school tours and information sessions and promoting the school through social media.
 - For ED students, strategies include:
 - Use of a weighted lottery to give ED students preference;
 - Recruiting students from less affluent areas of Washington Heights and Inwood;
 - Conducting information sessions at daycares with a high population of ED families; and
 - Asking current families to share their experience with other families looking for an elementary school.
 - For ELLs, strategies include:
 - Presenting all digital and hard copy recruitment materials in multiple languages;
 - Conducting parent information sessions and school tours in multiple languages;

- Conducting parent information sessions at daycares which serve ELL populations;
- Asking current, and new enrolling, ELL families to tell their personal networks about the school; and
- Conducting all-staff canvassing of the area with promotional materials in multiple languages and a high number of Spanish speaking staff.
- Several community-based organizations serving ELL families and community support the school with its recruitment, marketing, and enrollment efforts include:
 - Mama Tingo Child Care & Learning Center
 - Community League of the Heights (CLOTH)
 - Neighborhood Trust Federal Credit Union (NTFCU)
 - Rena Day Care
 - Sugar Hill Museum
 - Birch Herbert Early Childcare Center
 - For SWDs, strategies include:
 - Articulating the special education program at parent information sessions at daycares, the school, and community events;
 - Spending extra time with parents who have applied and whose children have a disability to explain the RtI process, intervention strategies, and special education model;
 - Speaking with families about the special education program when canvassing the area;
 - Highlighting special education classes during school tours; and
 - Inviting current parents of SWDs to speak about the program during recruitment events.
- **Indicator c:** Based on their evaluation of recruitment strategies, the board reported that it had recently approved a contract with a marketing firm to support these efforts.

See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional information.

Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance

The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.

Finding: Meets

<i>Element</i>	<i>Indicators</i>
1. <i>Legal Compliance</i>	<p>a. The school has compiled a record of substantial compliance with applicable state and federal laws and the provisions of its charter including, but not limited to: those related to student admissions and enrollment; FOIL and Open Meetings Law; protecting the rights of students and employees; financial management and oversight; governance and reporting; and health and safety requirements.</p> <p>b. The school has undertaken appropriate corrective action when needed and has implemented necessary safeguards to maintain compliance with all legal requirements.</p> <p>c. The school has sought Board of Regents and/or Charter School Office approval for significant revisions.</p>

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 10:

Over this charter term, the trajectory with regard to this benchmark has been consistent with a Meets rating as the charter school has compiled a record of substantial compliance with all applicable state and federal laws and its charter. The school has also undertaken appropriate action on its own to maintain compliance.

1. Element: **Legal Compliance:**

- **Indicator a:** The school has a legal expert on the board (noted in the focus group interview) and legal counsel to ensure the school is in substantial compliance with all applicable state and federal laws and its charter.
- **Indicator b:** The CSO issued a Notice of Concern to the school for failure to enroll a comparable number of ELLs and ED students when compared to the district of location. The school reports annually its recruitment and enrollment efforts and regularly reviews those efforts with the board of trustees, the executive director, and the CSO liaison. Regarding complaints, the board received a formal staff complaint and hired an external firm to investigate. The firm found no wrongdoing.
- **Indicator c:** The school has generally sought Board of Regents and/or Charter School Office approval for significant revisions. The school did implement two change to its charter in error without authorizer approval. The school has since requested the required revision to reflect a change to the school schedule and a change in the reporting structure to commence in the 2022-2023 school year.

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Overview

Charter School Selection

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

BEDS Code

310600861111

2020-2021 Enrollment

223

ESEA Accountability Designation (2019-2020):

This school is designated as a school in **Good Standing** under current New York State criteria as defined by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Charter School Information

School District of Location:	NEW YORK CITY GEOGRAPHIC DISTRICT # 6
Total Public School Enrollment of Resident Students attending Charter Schools:	21%
Additional School District: (if applicable)*	N/A
Total Public School Enrollment of Resident Students attending Charter Schools:	-
Grades Served:	Elementary
Address:	401 W 164TH ST-4TH FL NEW YORK NY 10032
Website:	www.whinmusic.org
RIC:	NEW YORK CITY
Regents Region:	NEW YORK CITY REGION - MANHATTAN
Regent:	NAN EILEEN MEAD
Active Date:	7/1/2017
Authorizer:	NYS BOR
CEO:	CHARLES ORTIZ
CEO Phone:	(267) 879-2545
CEO Email:	charlie.ortiz@whinmusic.org
BOT President:	GREGORY DAVID
BOT President Phone:	(917) 656-2715
BOT President Email:	gregoryevandavid@gmail.com
Institution ID:	800000087936

BoR Charter School Office Information

Regional Liaison:	Vickie Smith
Performance Framework:	2015
Current Term:	9/1/17-6/30/22
2017-2018	Check-in
2018-2019	Check-in
2019-2020	Midterm
2020-2021	Check-in
2021-2022	Renewal

Benchmark Rating

Year of Rating

BM1	
BM2	
BM3	
BM4	
BM5	
BM6	
BM7	
BM8	
BM9	
BM10	

2021 Survey Results	Expected Responses	Total Responses	Response Rate
Parent Survey	223	73	33%
Student Survey (Grades 9-12)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Teacher Survey	-	20	-

*An additional district may be used for comparison if a school is chartered to serve a school district other than the one in which they are located or if 40% of their students are residents of a district other than the district in which they are located.

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 1: Similar Schools Comparison

Charter School

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

Not applicable to this charter school

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

Charter School

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

*2.a.i. and 2.a.ii. Trending Toward Proficiency – Aggregate and Subgroup Standards-Based Trend Toward Proficiency :
Not applicable to this charter school*

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

2.b.i. and 2.b.ii Proficiency - Aggregate and Subgroup School Level Proficiency:

Not applicable to this charter school

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

2.b.iii. Aggregate Grade-Level Proficiency:

Not applicable to this charter school

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Regents Outcomes

Charter School

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

Regents Testing Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Annual Regents Outcomes:

Not applicable to this charter school

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 3: High School Outcomes

Charter School

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

3.a.i. and 3.a.ii. High School Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Total Cohort Regents Testing Outcomes:

Not applicable to this charter school

3.a.iii. and 3.a.vi. High School Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup College and Career Readiness:

Not applicable to this charter school

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 1 - Indicator 3: High School Outcomes

3.b.i. and 3.b.ii. Graduation Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Cohort Graduation Rates:

Not applicable to this charter school

3.b.iii. and 3.b.iv. Graduation Outcomes – Aggregate and Subgroup Cohort On-Track to Graduate:

Not applicable to this charter school

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 9 - Indicator 1: Enrollment and Retention

Charter School

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

1.a.i. Aggregate Enrollment:

Aggregate Enrollment: Reported vs Contracted - Target = 100%

Whin Music Community CS	Contracted Enrollment	Reported Enrollment	Percent of Contracted Enrollment
2017-2018	108	79	73%
2018-2019	162	139	86%
2019-2020	216	191	88%
2020-2021	270	223	83%

1.a.ii. Subgroup Enrollment:

Subgroup Enrollment: Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and Economically Disadvantaged

	SWD			ELL			ED		
	WHIN Music Community CS	NYC CSD 6	Differential to District	WHIN Music Community CS	NYC CSD 6	Differential to District	WHIN Music Community CS	NYC CSD 6	Differential to District
2017-2018	27%	21%	+6	14%	32%	-18	71%	83%	-12
2018-2019	22%	23%	-1	17%	32%	-15	70%	82%	-12
2019-2020	25%	25%	0	13%	32%	-19	75%	82%	-7
2020-2021	28%	25%	+3	15%	31%	-16	81%	82%	-1

*See NOTES (2) and (6) below.

2022 NYSED Charter School Information Dashboard

Benchmark 9 - Indicator 1: Enrollment and Retention

1.b.i. and 1.b.ii. Retention:

Retention - Aggregate and Subgroups

	All Students			SWD			ELL			ED		
	Whin Music Community CS	NYC CSD 6	Differential to District	Whin Music Community CS	NYC CSD 6	Differential to District	Whin Music Community CS	NYC CSD 6	Differential to District	Whin Music Community CS	NYC CSD 6	Differential to District
2018-2019	72%	84%	-12	57%	83%	-26	64%	83%	-19	73%	83%	-10
2019-2020	84%	86%	-2	83%	89%	-6	96%	87%	+9	86%	86%	0
2020-2021	83%	89%	-6	92%	90%	+2	83%	89%	-6	85%	90%	-5

*See NOTES (2) and (6) below.

1.c.i. and 1.c.ii. High School Persistence:

Not applicable to this charter school

Notes

- (1) Data in the table above represents tested students who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on the NYS ELA and/or math assessment.*
- (2) For the students with disabilities and the English language learners subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.*
- (3) Pursuant to NYSED business rules, the data was suppressed for subgroups containing <5 students and the subgroup category may not be included for the metric.*
- (4) Data in the table above represents students who passed the Annual Regents or equivalents (score of 65 or better).*
- (5) The 4- and 5-year graduation rates reported are as of August. The 6-year graduation rates are as of June.*
- (6) Data in the table above represents a comparison between those grades served in the charter school to only those same grades in the district.*
- (7) A "." in any table indicates that the data was suppressed, no student sat for the exam, or the exam was not given.*
- (8) Data in the table above represents tested students who either maintained a proficient score from one year to the next or students whose proficiency level increased from one year to the next (a proficient score is level 3 or 4).*
- (9) Data in the table above represents students within their respective subgroups who have passed three out of the five Annual Regents and Regents Common Core Examinations (score of 65 or better) or equivalents.*
- (10) Data in the table above represents the percentage of students from the original 9th grade cohort who persisted within the same school to a 4-year graduation (includes August graduates).*



Charter School Fiscal Accountability Summary

WHIN MUSIC COMMUNITY CHARTER SCHOOL

Grades Served
Maximum Chartered Grades Served
Chartered Enrollment
Maximum Chartered Enrollment
Actual Enrollment

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	K-1	K-2	K-3	K-4
	-	K-5	K-5	K-5	K-5
	-	108	162	216	270
	-	324	324	324	324
	-	79	139	191	223

ASSETS

Current Assets

Cash and Cash Equivalents
Grants and Contracts Receivable
Prepaid Expenses
Other Current Assets

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	418,915	483,369	383,352	844,506
	-	67,060	157,807	290,876	200,226
	-	8,000	27,213	25,108	41,597
	-	101,265	25,000	-	120,000
Total Current Assets	-	595,240	693,389	699,336	1,206,329

Non-Current Assets

Property, Building and Equipment, net
Restricted Cash
Security Deposits
Other Non-Current Assets

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	197,084	244,178	506,341	548,925
	-	-	50,079	75,130	75,206
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	25,000	-	-	40,000
Total Non - Current Assets	-	222,084	294,257	581,471	664,131
Total Assets	-	817,324	987,646	1,280,807	1,870,460

LIABILITIES and NET ASSETS

Current Liabilities

Accounts Payable and Accrued Expenses
Accrued Payroll and Payroll Taxes
Due to Related Parties
Refundable Advances
Other Current Liabilities

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	178,391	106,647	205,628	135,118
	-	111,806	208,702	73,342	259,965
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	33,721	16,239	268,818	293,537
Total Current Liabilities	-	323,918	331,588	547,788	688,620

Long-Term Liabilities

Deferred Rent
Other Long-Term Liabilities

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	27,067	35,281	30,598
Total Long-Term Liabilities	-	-	27,067	35,281	30,598
Total Liabilities	-	323,918	358,655	583,069	719,218

NET ASSETS

Unrestricted
Restricted

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	171,806	603,991	697,738	991,242
	-	321,600	25,000	-	160,000
Total Net Assets	-	493,406	628,991	697,738	1,151,242
Total Liabilities and Net Assets	-	817,324	987,646	1,280,807	1,870,460

OPERATING REVENUE

State and Local Per Pupil Revenue - Reg. Ed
State and Local Per Pupil Revenue - SPED
State and Local Per Pupil Facilities Revenue
Federal Grants
State and City Grants
Other Operating Income

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	1,079,545	2,215,902	3,049,065	3,458,560
	-	220,807	300,150	571,469	774,190
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	565,120	410,522	121,221	219,268
	-	253,366	9,763	14,667	15,264
	-	-	-	5,584	-
Total Operating Revenue	-	2,118,838	2,936,337	3,762,006	4,467,282

EXPENSES

Program Services

Regular Education
Special Education
Other Expenses

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	1,380,283	1,494,716	1,860,426	1,876,644
	-	517,766	777,358	988,353	1,352,092
	-	-	-	-	-
Total Program Services	-	1,898,049	2,272,074	2,848,779	3,228,736

Supporting Services

Management and General
Fundraising

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	540,757	608,800	835,499	832,691
	-	12,247	15,029	86,600	69,869
Total Support Services	-	553,004	623,829	922,099	902,560
Total Expenses	-	2,451,053	2,895,903	3,770,878	4,131,296
Surplus/Deficit from Operations	-	(332,215)	40,434	(8,872)	335,986

SUPPORT AND OTHER REVENUE

Interest and Other Income
Contributions and Grants
Fundraising Support
Other Support and Revenue

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	334	3,696	76	472
	-	825,287	91,460	77,543	396,208
	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-
Total Support and Other Revenue	-	825,621	95,156	77,619	396,680

Change in Net Assets

Net Assets - Beginning of Year
Net Assets - End of Year

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	493,406	135,590	68,747	732,666
	-	-	493,406	628,991	697,738
	-	493,406	628,996	697,738	1,430,404

REVENUE & EXPENSE BREAKDOWN

Revenue - Per Pupil

Operating
Support and Other Revenue

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	26,821	21,125	19,696	20,033
	-	10,451	685	406	1,779
Total Revenue	-	37,272	21,809	20,103	21,811

Expenses - Per Pupil

Program Services
Management and General, Fundraising

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	24,026	16,346	14,915	14,479
	-	7,000	4,488	4,828	4,047
Total Expenses	-	31,026	20,834	19,743	18,526

% of Program Services
% of Management and Other
% of Revenue Exceeding Expenses

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	77.4%	78.5%	75.5%	78.2%
	-	22.6%	21.5%	24.5%	21.8%
	-	20.1%	4.7%	1.6%	17.7%

FINANCIAL COMPOSITE SCORE

Composite Score
BENCHMARK and FINDING:
Strong: 1.5 - 3.0 / Adequate: 1.0 - 1.4 /
Needs Monitoring: -1.0 - 0.9

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	2.33	2.37	2.00	2.67
	-	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong

WORKING CAPITAL

Net Working Capital
Working Capital (Current) Ratio
BENCHMARK and FINDING:
Ratio should be equal to or greater than 1.2

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	271,322	361,801	151,548	517,709
	-	1.8	2.1	1.3	1.8
	-	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard

DEBT TO ASSET

Debt to Asset Ratio
BENCHMARK and FINDING:
Ratio should be equal to or less than 1.0

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4
	-	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard

CASH POSITION

Days of Cash
BENCHMARK and FINDING:
Ratio should be equal to or greater than 60 days

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	62.4	60.9	37.1	74.6
	-	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Does Not Meet Standard	Meets Standard

TOTAL MARGIN

Total Margin Ratio
BENCHMARK and FINDING:
Ratio should be equal to or greater than 0.0

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21
	-	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.2
	-	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard	Meets Standard

