New York State Education Department

Renewal Site Visit Report
2018-2019

Discovery Charter School

Visit Date: October 2-3, 2018
Date of Report: July 3, 2019

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

CONTENTS

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION **2**

METHODOLOGY **4**

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS **6**

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 8
BENCHMARK 1: STUDENT PERFORMANCE 10
BENCHMARK 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING 11
BENCHMARK 3: CULTURE, CLIMATE AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT 14
BENCHMARK 4: FINANCIAL CONDITION 17
BENCHMARK 5: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT 19
BENCHMARK 6: BOARD OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNANCE 20
BENCHMARK 7: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY 22
BENCHMARK 8: MISSION AND KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS 25
BENCHMARK 9: ENROLLMENT, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION 26
BENCHMARK 10: LEGAL COMPLIANCE 27

ATTACHMENT 1 ..... **28**

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Charter School Summary[1]

Name of Charter School	Discovery Charter School
Board Chair	Sara Varhus
District of location	Greece Central School District (This school primarily serves students in the Rochester City School District.)
Opening Date	Fall 2011
Charter Terms	• Initial Charter Term: August 15, 2011 - June 30, 2016 • First Renewal Charter Term: July 1, 2016 - June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K-Grade 6 / 280 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K-Grade 6 / 280 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	None
Facilities	133 Hoover Drive, Rochester, New York 14615 (Private Space)
Mission Statement	*Discovery Charter School prepares students to meet the challenges of a rapidly changing world, providing children living in poverty "real skills for the real world." Within a learning environment featuring a rigorous and highly enriched curriculum, Expeditionary Learning assessment-guided instruction, a culture of inquiry and enthusiasm, and services designed to mitigate the major negative impacts of poverty, students achieve beyond their peers and become exceptionally well prepared to engage the world wherever their interests take them.*
Key Design Elements	• Poverty preference • Rigorous and highly enriched curriculum • Assessment-guided instruction • Culture of inquiry and enthusiasm • Services designed to mitigate the major negative impacts of poverty • Students achieve beyond their peers
Requested Revisions	None

Noteworthy: Serving students in poverty is of primary importance at Discovery Charter School (DCS) exemplified in its key design elements. These students need, to a greater extent than their more privileged peers, what Discovery stakeholders call "real world skills." DCS places a strong emphasis on the social-emotional development of the students it serves.

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

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 2016 to 2017	Year 2 2017 to 2018	Year 3 2018 to 2019
Grade Configuration	K - Grade 6	K - Grade 6	K - Grade 6
Total Approved Enrollment	280	280	280

Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021
Grade Configuration	K - Grade 6	K - Grade 6
Total Approved Enrollment	280	280

METHODOLOGY

A two-day renewal site visit was conducted at Discovery Charter School (DCS) on October 2-3, 2018. The New York State Education Department's Charter School Office (CSO) team conducted interviews with the board of trustees and school leadership team. In cooperation with school leadership, the CSO administered an anonymous online survey to teachers.

The team conducted twelve classroom observations in kindergarten through Grade 6. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length and conducted jointly with the school's assistant director and instructional coaches for math and English Language Arts (ELA).

The documents and data reviewed by the team before, during, and after the site visit included the following:

- **Renewal Application**
- **Academic data**
- **Renewal Site Visit Workbook**
- **Current organizational chart**
- **A master school schedule**
- **Map of school with room numbers and teacher names**
- **Board materials (roster, minutes, and strategic plan, if applicable)**
- **Board self-evaluation processes and documents**
- **Student/family handbook**
- **Staff handbook and personnel policies**
- **A list of major assessments**

- **Teacher and administrator evaluation processes**
- **Interventions offered at the school**
- **School-conducted surveys of teachers, parents, and/or students, and/or NYC DOE surveys**
- **Professional development plans and schedules**
- **Efforts towards achieving enrollment and retention targets**
- **School submitted Annual Reports**

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

The 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 Performance Framework benchmarks and Indicators according to the rating scale below, although not all indicators will necessarily be assessed on every site visit. A brief summary of the school's strengths will precede the benchmark analysis. Each benchmark will be rated; however, the report narrative will highlight those indicators not fully met by the school.

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 2-3, 2018 at DCS, see the following Performance Framework benchmark scores and discussion.

New York State Education Department
Charter School Performance Framework Rating

	Performance Benchmark	Level
Educational Success	**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).	Falls Far Below
	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.	Approaches
	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.	Meets
Organizational Soundness	**Benchmark 4: Financial Condition:** The school is in sound and stable financial condition as evidenced by performance on key financial indicators.	Meets
	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.	Meets
	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.	Approaches
	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.	Meets
Faithfulness to Charter & Law	**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.	Approaches
	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.	Approaches
	Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance: The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.	Meets

Summary of Findings

The Discovery Charter School (DCS) is in its eighth year of operation and serves students in kindergarten through Grade 6. During its current charter term, the school is rated in the following manner: exceeding no benchmarks, meeting five benchmarks, approaching four benchmarks, and falling far below one benchmark. Additional details regarding those ratings are provided below.

Areas of Strength:
Over the life of the charter, DCS leadership, staff, and board members have demonstrated a consistent and unified understanding and approach to the school's mission, which emphasizes serving students in poverty and the importance of building their "real-world skills." This includes a strong emphasis on social-emotional development. The school has invested substantial resources in expanding its programming and team in this area over the last several years and has noted a significant reduction in disciplinary incidences as a result.

Recognizing that 97% of DCS students are economically disadvantaged and many have experienced trauma and other ill effects of chronic poverty, the school also facilitates a variety of wraparound supports in collaboration with a number of organizational partners. For example, DCS serves as a pilot site for the Family Navigator program, sponsored by the Education Success Network, which connects eligible families with a "navigator" to gain access to additional support services in the community.

Areas in Need of Improvement:
Since the school first opened to serve students in 2011, DCS has not met all academic goals contained within the CSO's Performance Framework and its charter agreement. Student proficiency levels in both ELA and math have consistently ranked far below statewide averages. Although a comparison is also made to the Greece Central School District, as the school's district of location, most if not all students reside in the Rochester City School District. As such, performance data demonstrate a narrowed margin of variance to the Rochester City School District (RCSD)'s results over the last three years; particularly when looking at students classified as economically disadvantaged, who comprise the majority of DCS's enrollment. For example, in the 2015-2016 school year, DCS students outperformed the district on the state math assessment by a margin of +12%; in 2016-2017, DCS students outperformed the district on the state math assessment by +5%; and in the most recent year for which data is available, DCS students outperformed the RCSD in math by +4%. Similarly, since 2015-2016, the margin of variance between economically disadvantaged students achieving grade level proficiency in ELA relative to the RCSD decreased from +12% to +3% in 2017-2018.

Instructional leaders have implemented some curricular and pedagogical refinement efforts, such as articulating a set of "instructional consistencies" to enable students to reach grade level expectations; however, classroom instruction as observed during the renewal visit demonstrated uneven quality and limited adherence to those practices. For example, some teachers are unable to foster engagement with all students, resulting in students being off-task, not completing activities, and ultimately not meeting lesson objectives. In addition, overall slow pacing impedes instructional efficacy, particularly in upper grade classrooms.

DCS also continues to struggle with its recruitment and retention of special populations. While the school has maintained sufficient overall enrollment in each year of the charter term, and consistently enrolls a greater percentage of economically disadvantaged students than the RCSD, ongoing efforts to increase enrollment of other subgroups has resulted in minimal and/or inconsistent year over year improvements. The disparity is most marked between the district and DCS's percentage of ELL/MLL students (16% compared with 4% during the 2017-2018 school year). DCS has instituted a weighted lottery for ELL/MLL students.

Expectations for the Coming Charter Term:
Throughout the proposed charter term the NYSED CSO will work closely with DCS as they work to ensure that the academic outcomes of enrolled students will improve as compared to current academic outcomes. The school will be expected to make significant progress toward meeting or exceeding the state average on the 3-8 ELA and math state exams. In addition, and prior to the next charter renewal, the school is expected to:

- Evaluate its student recruitment strategies in order to ensure that it enrolls a comparable number of SWD, ELL/MLL, and ED students as compared to the RCSD;
- Show significant academic growth, reverse the narrowing margin of variance to the RCSD;
- Meet or exceed all target outcomes as outlined in the CS Performance Framework; and
- Meet or exceed Benchmark 9 standards, as well as compliance with other CS Performance Framework standards.

Failure to meet these standards, in addition to meeting other Charter School Performance Framework standards, may result in a future non-renewal recommendation.

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: Falls Far Below

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 1:

THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM FOR ELEMENTARY/MIDDLE SCHOOL:

- DCS currently serves students in kindergarten through Grade 6.
- Since its authorization in 2010, the school has implemented EL Education (formerly Expeditionary
- Learning) methodology and programming.
- The school reports a dual focus on strengthening students' academic as well as social-emotional skills to meet the needs of the "whole child."
- Most grade levels feature a dedicated interventionist and special education teacher, as well as a shared teacher assistant; subsequently, student to teacher ratios in classrooms are generally low.

THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLs)/MULTI-LINGUAL LEARNERS (MLLs):

- Kindergarten notwithstanding, DCS employs a dedicated special education teacher at each grade level to support students with disabilities enrolled at the school in integrated co-teaching classrooms. In addition, the school organizes counseling services as well as speech, occupational, and physical therapies through students' home districts.
- To support ELL/MLL students, DCS employs a full-time, certified English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) teacher, who provides language acquisition instruction by pushing into classrooms and pulling students out for small group work.
- In addition, DCS employs a fulltime social worker and a full-time speech and language pathologist.

See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional 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 (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.

Finding: Approaches

Element	*Indicators*
1. Curriculum	a. The school has a documented curriculum that is aligned to the NYSLS. 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.
2. Instruction	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. Assessment and Program Evaluation	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. Supports for Diverse Learners	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.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 2:

1. Element: ***Curriculum***:
   - **Indicator a:** DCS continues to utilize EL Education (EL, formerly known as Expeditionary Learning), as its overall framework for teaching and learning. In its renewal application, school leadership describes the school's efforts to drive "…ongoing innovation and improvement in all of its aspects: curriculum, support services, and organization." In response to trends in student performance, DCS underwent its first significant curricular overhaul during the 2017-2018 school year, adopting the EngageNY math modules and the EL ELA modules to ensure

better curricular alignment with the New York State Learning Standards (NYSLS) and drive higher levels of student performance.

- **Indicator b:** Although the school's renewal application and leadership describe common lesson planning components and schoolwide expectations, samples evaluated onsite demonstrated a wide variety of formats and inconsistent level of detail. Some teachers utilize published module lesson plans that introduce complex materials; these provide opportunities for higher order thinking; and build deep conceptual understanding. However, based on classroom observations conducted during the renewal site visit, these elements are not always present in lesson execution.
- **Indicator c:** Throughout the school's renewal application and during on-site focus group interviews, leaders and teachers articulate a key part of the rationale for implementing the EngageNY and EL modules was the need to increase horizontal and vertical curricular alignment across classrooms and between grades.
- **Indicator d:** DCS leadership and teachers report providing differentiated materials to allow opportunities for all students to demonstrate mastery of grade level concepts. For example, all students have to complete an end of unit performance task, but while working through the module, teachers offer students choices about how to meet learning targets. Teacher responses to a CSO-administered anonymous survey report that staff employ individualized student assessments to monitor progress and inform interventions.

2. Element: ***Instruction***:
   - **Indicator a:** In response to internal reflection as well as CSO prior findings that instruction lacked a consistent level of rigor across classrooms, school leaders report newly established "instructional consistencies" and school-wide classroom protocols are in place at the school. However, as described below, CSO staff observed limited evidence of these consistencies driving higher quality instructional practice, as the pedagogical foci emphasize teacher inputs rather than student outcomes.
   - **Indicator b:** In at least half of observed classrooms, instructional delivery failed to foster engagement with all students. During direct instruction and independent work time, CSO staff observed numerous students off-task and not participating in lesson activities, and few teachers attempted to redirect them. Slow pacing and lack of effective whole class checks for understanding in observed classrooms contributed to low levels of engagement. Overall, this trend was more noticeable in upper grade classrooms.

3. Element: ***Assessment and Program Evaluation***:
   - **Indicator a:** In the school's renewal application, leaders describe the array of formative, diagnostic and summative assessments administered at each grade level. Depending on grade level, the school utilizes diagnostic screenings, AIMSweb, Scholastic Reading Inventory (3rd-6th), NYSITELL, Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, EngageNY module pre-tests, and mid-module assessments. For students in grades three through six, these include internally developed benchmark exams primarily informed by EngageNY module questions and older NYS exam items. On site, school leaders attest to the assessments' predictive value via a very strong correlation with state test results.
   - **Indicator b:** DCS leadership collects and analyzes student performance data on the assessments listed above to inform classroom instruction and improve student outcomes. For example, during on-site focus groups, leaders described employing new instructional strategies to increase student engagement and deploying additional resources to fund

additional positions in areas of need based on concerning levels of students' content mastery. Additionally, ongoing progress monitoring systems determine which students receive additional academic supports inside and outside of the classroom through the school's Response to Intervention program.

- **Indicator c:** The school utilizes a combination of qualitative and quantitative data to evaluate its academic program; and modifies the program accordingly to improve quality and rigor. For example, during the 2017-2018 school year, DCS conducted a series of interviews with students and teachers and evaluated quarterly benchmark data to inform the decision for school-wide adoption of new curricular modules.

4. Element: ***Supports for Diverse Learners***:
    - **Indicator a:** The school addresses the academic needs of all students, including but not limited to students with disabilities, ELLs/MLLs, and economically disadvantaged students through a variety of programs. DCS maintains an integrated co-teaching classroom at each level from Grades 1-6. The school organizes counseling services as well as speech, occupational, and physical therapies through students' home districts to fulfill Individual Education Program (IEP) mandates. To support its ELL/MLL students, DCS employs a full-time, certified ESOL teacher, who provides language acquisition instruction by pushing into classrooms and pulling students out for small group work. To meet the needs of the school's large economically disadvantaged population, DCS provides robust libraries in each classroom and places special emphasis on building students' vocabularies through extended ELA blocks, based on the research around increased vocabulary contributing to achievement gap closure.
    - **Indicator b:** DCS has systems in place to monitor the academic progress of all students and facilitates regular and frequent communication between interventionists and classroom teachers to better meet the needs of individual students. The school utilizes AIMSweb to monitor students' skills at each grade level in ELA and math, with frequency determined by level of performance. AIMSweb data informs the school's tiered RtI offerings and is shared between grade level special education teachers, general education teachers, and outside service providers who work with individual students to evaluate the efficacy of supports and reset goals, as needed.

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

Element	*Indicators*
1. *Behavior Management and Safety*	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.
2. *Family Engagement and Communication*	a. Teachers communicate with parents to discuss students' strengths and needs. b. 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. c. The school has a systematic process for responding to parent or community concerns. d. The school shares school-level academic data with the broader school community to promote transparency and accountability among parents, students and school constituents.
3. *Social-Emotional Supports*	a. School leaders collect and use data to track the socio-emotional needs of students. b. School leaders collect and use data regarding the impact of programs designed to support students' social and emotional health.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 3:

1. Element: ***Behavior Management and Safety:***
    - **Indicator a:** In alignment with its overall mission to develop "effective learners and ethical people who contribute to a better world," DCS subscribes to the Responsive Classroom approach to behavioral management. In its renewal application, the school describes implementing an array of strategies to "foster safe and positive learning communities where students are connected, responsible and engaged in learning." These include a written student code of conduct and discipline policy that are communicated to all students and families via the school handbook.
    - **Indicator b:** DCS appears safe; during focus groups conducted on-site as part of the renewal visit, school leadership described several ways they have worked to ensure DCS students, families, and staff are secure on school grounds. Leaders emphasized emergency preparedness during August trainings and implement monthly drills.

Additionally, leaders worked with the school's landlord to update vulnerable classroom doors and to secure a grant for enclosing the lobby of the building.

- **Indicator c:** Leaders and approximately 78% of teacher responses to an anonymous online CSO survey characterize the school as "generally free of bullying, discrimination, and harassment for students." The school has appointed two coordinators to enforce its Dignity for all Students (DASA) policy to protect students from bullying. These coordinators provide professional development to staff and ensure an awareness of the policy for staff, students, and families.
- **Indicator d:** While some teachers failed to engage all students during lessons the CSO site visit team observed classroom environments as generally conducive to learning and free from serious behavioral disruptions.

2. Element: ***Family Engagement and Communication:***
    - **Indicator a:** DCS leaders and teachers report prioritizing ongoing communication and engagement with families to discuss students' strengths and needs. Teachers utilize communications folders and social media to keep families informed on a day to day basis. The school also distributes quarterly report cards, holds parent-teacher conferences with families at least twice a year, and provides translation assistance as needed. The school promotes family engagement through an array of workshop offerings for parents. These cover such topics as positive disciplinary strategies, immunization requirements, and household budgeting.
    - **Indicator b:** The school solicits feedback to assess stakeholder satisfaction through a biannual school-wide family survey. In the school's renewal application, leaders report that 95% of respondents indicated that they are happy overall with DCS on the most recently completed survey; representing an increase from 94% the year prior. The school considers survey results and other feedback when making programmatic decisions. For example, DCS lengthened its summer program in response to numerous family requests. DCS also conducts student surveys and periodic student focus groups; the latter spurred new student-led fundraiser ideas, such as Fancy Fridays, which allow students to opt for formal wear over uniforms on specific days.
    - **Indicator c:** In the event of parent or community concerns, DCS follows the process outlined in its Complaint/Grievance Policy. The policy included with the school's renewal application includes an appropriate and systemic chain of command response which allows complainants to seek remedy from the school director, then the school's board of trustees, and ultimately the Board of Regents if not satisfied.
    - **Indicator d:** DCS shares state assessment data in the aggregate with its broader school community to promote transparency and accountability among parents, students, and partner organizations, and hosts a community meeting to discuss results each fall.

3. Element: ***Social-Emotional Supports***:
    - **Indicator a:** DCS's EL approach embeds character growth in a wide array of academic activities. In addition, the school has created a social and emotional learning (SEL) team to collect and use data to track the needs of its students as well as implement several structured programs that promote positive and productive behavior. One hundred percent of teacher responses to an anonymous online CSO survey agreed that DCS "has systems in place to support students' social emotional needs."

- **Indicator b:** DCS utilizes the PATHS curriculum as the foundation for its SEL program. In kindergarten through Grade 3, students participate in an SEL special class once per week, while upper grade level teachers deliver two lessons each week. To measure the efficacy of this program, leaders collect and analyze attendance and referral data, as well as trends in the number of discipline calls from classroom teachers. The school employs two full-time social workers to support these programs and provide crisis counseling for students and families.

Benchmark 4: Financial Condition

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

Finding: Meets

Important Notes:

- The key financial indicators used to evaluate this benchmark will be presented within a separate fiscal dashboard instrument that will provide context for the school's performance on each of the metrics, outline the specific targets for each metric, and also provide additional subsidiary detail on each calculation.
- Unless otherwise indicated, financial data is derived from the school's annual independently audited financial statements.

1. Near-Term Indicators:	
1a.	Current Ratio
1b.	Unrestricted Days Cash
1c.	Enrollment Variance
1d.	Composite Score
2. Sustainability Indicators:	
2a.	Total Margin
2b.	Debt to Asset Ratio
2c.	Debt Service Coverage Ratio

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 4:

DCS's Composite Scores
2014-2015 to 2016-2017

Year	***Composite Score***
2014-2015	2.0
2015-2016	2.3
2016-2017	1.8

Source: NYSED Office of Audit Services

<u>Near-Term Indicators</u>

Near-term indicators of financial health are used to understand the current financial performance and viability of the school. The CSO uses three measures:

The *current ratio* is a financial ratio that measures whether or not a charter school has enough resources to pay its debts over the next 12 months. The ratio is mainly used to give an idea of the school's ability to pay back its short-term liabilities (debt and payables) with its short-term assets (cash, inventory, receivables). The higher the current ratio, the more capable the school is of paying its obligations, with a ratio under 1.0 indicating concern. For 2016-2017, DCS had a current ratio of 1.9.

Unrestricted cash measures, in days, whether the charter school can meet operating expenses without receiving new income. Charter schools typically strive to maintain at least 90 days of cash on hand. For fiscal year 2016-2017, DCS operated with 70 days of unrestricted cash.

Enrollment maximization measures whether or not a charter school is meeting its enrollment projections, thereby generating sufficient revenue to fund ongoing operations. Actual enrollment that is over 85% is considered reasonable. DCS's enrollment maximization for 2016-2017 was at 101%.

Long-Term Indicators

A charter school's *debt to asset ratio* measures the extent to which the school relies on borrowed funds to finance its operations. It is calculated as total liabilities divided by total assets. A ratio of 0.9 or less meets a standard of low risk. For 2016-2017, DCS's debt to asset ratio was 0.4.

Total margin measures the deficit or surplus a charter school yields out of its total revenues; in other words, whether or not the school is living within its available resources. Total margin is calculated as net income divided by total revenue. A total margin that is positive indicates low risk. For 2016-2017, DCS's total margin was -2%.

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

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:
The CSO reviewed DCS's 2016-2017 audited financial statements to determine whether the independent auditor observed sufficient internal controls over financial reporting. The auditor did not identify any deficiencies in internal controls that could be considered material weaknesses.

However, the auditor noted that 2016-2017 grant revenue was overstated, resulting in a significant audit adjustment. Since the grant-supported summer learning program was held subsequent to June 30 and, according to GAAP, grant revenue should be recorded as it is earned, the cash received should have been recorded as deferred revenue on the consolidated statement of financial position until the program took place. The auditor recommended the school review all grant documentation to ensure that revenue is recorded in the proper period, and management agreed to do so.

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: Approaches

Element	*Indicators*
1. Board Oversight and Governance	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:

Element: ***Board Oversight and Governance:***

- **Indicator a:** The board maintains an adequate membership per its by-laws and recruits and selects board members with skills and expertise that meet the needs of the school when vacancies arise, typically resulting from term expirations or relocations out of the area. Current board members possess expertise in educational administration, finance, accounting, law, executive management, human resources, and knowledge of the Rochester community; each of which is relevant to oversight of the school. The board is in the process of recruiting, interviewing, and submitting additional board members for CSO approval.
- **Indicator b:** In the school's renewal application, the board describes its process for establishing short-term and long-term goals for the school at its annual retreat. For example, a recent retreat addressed student performance on NYS ELA, math and science tests, and the board crafted a plan to improve academic achievement; however, these efforts fall short of comprehensive strategic planning and have not yet produced significant performance improvement on state assessments.
- **Indicator c:** The board demonstrates active oversight of the charter school through monthly meetings, ongoing review of financial and other budget-related items, and monitoring progress toward meeting performance goals. At each board meeting, the DCS school director provides a report on academic matters and school operations. At appropriate intervals over the course of each year, the board also reviews and approves the school's annual budget, tax filings, staff compensation adjustments, annual goals, the annual report to the CSO, and contracts with external vendors and partners, among other key tasks. Although the board engages in oversight activities, to date, it has failed to identify and correct the academic and demographic enrollment deficiencies identified elsewhere in this report. This is a material deficit in board oversight.

- **Indicator d:** The board reports contracting with an attorney who monitors and updates board practices and policies biannually, or as necessary. For example, the board updated its complaint policy to align with its board by-laws during this charter term.
- **Indicator e:** In the school's renewal application and during focus groups on-site, the board describes its evaluation process for the school director each year. While the board focuses primarily on the school's progress toward pre-set annual goals for academic, fiscal, and operational performance, it also considers levels of student and parent satisfaction with DCS programming by analyzing survey results. To evaluate themselves, trustees report completing a survey that informs retreat plans, but this does not happen every year. During the focus group conducted as part of the renewal site visit, the board shared its plans for utilizing 2018 survey results to identify topics for additional training later in the fall.
- **Indicator f:** As mentioned above, the DCS board demonstrates its awareness of its legal obligations to the school and stakeholders by retaining an experienced education attorney who attends all board meetings and keeps trustees and school leadership informed on legislative updates. Board meeting minutes confirm that board members recuse themselves from weighing in on decisions or votes if a potential conflict of interest exists.

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

Element	*Indicators*
1. School Leadership	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. 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. c. The school has clear and well-established communication systems and decision-making processes in place which ensure effective communication across the school. d. The school successfully recruits, hires, and retains key personnel, and makes decisions – when warranted – to remove ineffective staff members.
2. Professional Climate	a. The school is fully staffed with high quality personnel to meet all educational and operational needs, including finance, human resources, and communication. b. The school has established structures for frequent collaboration among teachers. c. The school ensures that staff has requisite skills, expertise, and professional development necessary to meet students' needs. 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. e. The school has mechanisms to solicit teacher feedback and gauge teacher satisfaction.
3. Contractual Relationships *✓N/A*	a. The board of trustees and school leadership establish effective working relationships with the management company or comprehensive service provider. b. Changes in the school's charter management or comprehensive service provider contract comply with required charter amendment procedures. c. The school monitors the efficacy of contracted service providers or partners.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 7:

1. Element: ***School Leadership:***
   - **Indicator a:** DCS employs a shared school leadership structure that generally nurtures staff members' commitment to the school's defined mission. Leaders set and monitor progress toward annual schoolwide goals; and have made programmatic adjustments in attempts to improve student learning and proficiency rates across the school.
   - **Indicator b:** DCS functions with two leadership teams, with only the school director serving on both simultaneously: its academic leadership team consists of an assistant school director, dean of students, coordinators, and coaches, and its operational leadership team consists of an

operations manager, assistant operations manager, and a financial management consultant. Based on documentation provided in preparation for the renewal site visit, the roles and responsibilities for each of these individuals are clearly defined and provide a relevant service to the school community.

- **Indicator c:** In its renewal application, the school describes ongoing communication with its constituents, including staff, students, families, and other members of the community via "well defined and predictable means" such as providing classroom observation feedback, quarterly data meetings, the school director's monthly report for the board, quarterly report cards, report card conferences, student-led conferences, monthly family events, weekly Community Circles, and regular ongoing communication such as phone calls, emails, text messages, telephone calls, and newsletters. DCS shares state assessment data in the aggregate with its broader school community to promote transparency and accountability among parents, students, and partner organizations, and hosts a community meeting to discuss results each fall.
- **Indicator d:** During focus group interviews conducted on site during the renewal visit, school leadership described the challenges in recruiting and retaining high quality staff due to competitive advantages offered by surrounding districts. To source candidates, DCS utilizes online platforms and local newspapers, maintains partnerships with several regional colleges by establishing a pathway for employing new graduates as teaching assistants and apprentice teachers, and participates in recruitment fairs. In its renewal application, DCS describes numerous incentives designed to retain the school's effective teachers, such as a 5% salary increase relative to local traditional public schools, improved benefits packages, creating additional opportunities for teachers to develop leadership experience, and adopting changes to the staff handbook and policies in response to teacher feedback on such topics as the professional dress code. In instances where teachers do not meet performance expectations, school leaders provide additional supports such as more frequent classroom observations and intensive coaching before the staff member is placed on a formal improvement plan. If adequate gains are not demonstrated, employment is terminated. The school's renewal application states approximately 1.5 teachers a year have been asked to leave DCS employment over the course of this charter term.

2. Element: ***Professional Climate:***
   - **Indicator a:** The school is generally staffed with appropriately credentialed and experienced personnel to meet its educational and operational needs. At the time of the renewal visit, there was at least one teacher vacancy; school leadership described being agile in reapportioning duties as necessary during such situations as well as parental leaves of absence for staff.
   - **Indicator b:** The school has established structures for frequent collaboration among teachers, including scheduled time for collaborative lesson planning on a daily basis with grade level colleagues, staff and department meetings, data analysis meetings, and monthly professional development workshops. Teacher responses to the CSO's anonymous online survey demonstrate unanimous agreement with the statement "faculty members frequently collaborate on matters of curriculum and instruction."
   - **Indicator c:** School leadership attempts to build staff members' skills, expertise, and professional development to enable them to meet students' academic and social-emotional needs. The primary mechanisms for these supports are schoolwide professional development activities and individualized instructional coaching for each teacher. In the school's renewal application, leaders describe significant investments of both time and financial resources to create long term professional learning plans that inform workshops and training topics during August pre-service and over the course of the school year. All DCS teachers participate in a number of coaching cycles, with the exact frequency depending on tenure and pedagogical strengths and/or areas of

weakness. Each coaching cycle is designed around "a jointly identified targeted goal for improving student achievement" and typically lasts between four to eight weeks.

- **Indicator d:** The school has systems to monitor organizational and instructional quality, such as a formal teacher evaluation process that includes multiple components to produce a "holistic" annual designation of performance quality. The school director and assistant director conduct pre-observation meetings, complete scheduled formal observations, provide feedback using the Danielson framework, and discuss overall findings and recommendations during post-observation meetings.
- **Indicator e:** DCS utilizes a variety of means to solicit teachers' feedback and gauge their satisfaction with school programming, their employment, and decision making. For example, the school administers an employee wellness survey every other year, exit surveys to departing staff members as well as staff "staying surveys" for those who remain to determine the efficacy of its retention strategies.

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: Approaches

Element	*Indicators*
1. *Mission and Key Design Elements*	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:

Element: ***Mission and Key Design Elements:***

- **Indicator a:** Over the life of the charter, DCS leadership, staff, and board members have demonstrated a unified understanding and approach to the school's mission, which emphasizes the aim to provide students from impoverished backgrounds with "real skills for the real world." The school's renewal application, teacher and parent survey results, and interviews with school leadership and board members each affirmed a shared commitment to providing wrap around supports to "mitigate the effects of poverty" on students' and their families' lives as much as possible.
- **Indicator b:** The school has implemented the majority of the key design elements memorialized in its charter, with the notable exception of a "rigorous and highly enriched curriculum." While the school continues to utilize the EL approach to teaching and learning and has made recent efforts to increase curricular alignment to state standards, DCS's record of academic underperformance refutes the promised level of rigor and recent updates have yet to prove effective.

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

Element	*Indicators*
1. Targets are met	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. Targets are not met	a. The school is making regular and significant annual progress toward meeting the targets. 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. 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.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

Element: ***Targets are not met:***

- **Indicator a**: DCS has maintained sufficient overall enrollment in each year of the charter term, and consistently enrolls a greater percentage of economically disadvantaged students than other public schools in its district of location; however, the school's efforts to increase its enrollment of other subgroups have resulted in minimal and/or inconsistent year over year improvements and have not achieved parity with the RCSD in any year of the charter term.
- **Indicator b:** To increase its enrollment and retention rates for students with disabilities and ELLs/MLLs, the school has implemented the following strategies: outreach to community-based organizations such as the Rochester Refugee Resettlement Center and local Head Start programs, strengthening academic supports for at-risk groups, outreach in both Spanish and Arabic languages, and a lottery preference for ELL/MLL students.
- **Indicator c:** School leadership and board members report regularly reviewing enrollment and retention data to monitor the effectiveness of the afore-mentioned strategies and plan for adjustments as necessary. For example, as the lottery preference has not produced a significant increase in the school's ELL/MLL population to date, the board is considering tripling its weight in the next school year to garner more robust enrollment results.

Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance

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

Finding: Meets

Element	*Indicators*
1. Legal Compliance	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. b. The school has undertaken appropriate corrective action when needed; and has implemented necessary safeguards to maintain compliance with all legal requirements. c. The school has sought Board of Regents and/or Charter School Office approval for significant revisions.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 10:

Element: ***Legal Compliance:***

- **Indicator a:** DCS has demonstrated substantial compliance with applicable laws over the course of its current charter term. To ensure this, the board contracts with an attorney who monitors board practices and policies and keeps trustees informed about relevant legal updates or developments.
- **Indicator b:** The school consistently meets its reporting requirements as determined by CSO monitoring visits and review of submitted documents. DCS has not been under corrective action at any point during this charter term.
- **Indicator c:** The school has appropriately sought CSO approval for several revisions to its charter, such as updates to align its complaint policy and board by-laws and amending its admissions policy to provide a weighted preference for ELL/MLL students and children of current staff members.

Attachment 1: 2018-2019 Renewal SV Report
Discovery Charter School

Benchmark 1:

Indicator 1: All Schools

1.a.i. Accountability - ESEA Accountability Designation:
DCS is designated as a school in Good Standing under current New York State criteria as defined by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is one metric of many included in the Charter School Performance Framework.

1.b.i. Similar Schools Comparison – Comparative Proficiency:
In ELA and math, Discovery Charter School students did not tend to outperform students in schools with similar grade spans and demographics.

Indicator 2: Elementary/Middle School Outcomes

:
2.a.i. Trending Toward Proficiency – Aggregate Standards-Based Trend Toward Proficiency
In 2015-2016, 28% of students attending Discovery Charter School were trending towards proficiency in ELA. In 2016-2017, the rate was 35%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 25%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

In 2015-2016, 32% of students attending Discovery Charter School were trending towards proficiency in math. In 2016-2017, the rate was 24%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 22%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

2.a.ii. Trending Toward Proficiency - Subgroup Standards-Based Trend Toward Proficiency:
In 2015-2016, 20% of students with disabilities attending Discovery Charter School were trending towards proficiency in ELA. In 2016-2017, the rate was 25%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 7%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework. In 2015-2016, 20% of students with disabilities attending Discovery Charter School were trending towards proficiency in math. In 2016-2017, the rate was 13%, and in 2017-2018, the rate was 6%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

In 2015-2016, 28% of economically disadvantaged students attending Discovery Charter School were trending towards proficiency in ELA. In 2016-2017, the rate was 36% and in 2017-2018, the rate was 25%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework. In 2015-2016, 32% of economically disadvantaged students attending Discovery Charter School were trending towards proficiency in math. In 2016-2017, the rate was 24%, and 22% in 2017-2018. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

Note: Data below represents the district in which DCS is chartered to serve students, the Rochester City School District, and the DCS' district of location which is the Greece Central School District.

2.b.i. Proficiency - Aggregate School Level Proficiency for All Students: See Tables 1a and 1b below.

Table 1a: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: Charter School, District, and NYS Level Aggregates
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Greece Central School District

	ELA					Math				
	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS
2014-2015	11%	34%	-23	31%	-20	8%	49%	-41	43%	-35
2015-2016	18%	38%	-20	38%	-20	21%	46%	-25	42%	-21
2016-2017	18%	35%	-17	38%	-20	13%	44%	-31	44%	-31
2017-2018	15%	39%	-24	46%	-31	16%	42%	-26	48%	-32

NOTE:

(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

Table 1b: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: Charter School, District, and NYS Level Aggregates
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Rochester City School District

	ELA					Math				
	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS
2014-2015	11%	5%	+6	31%	-21	8%	10%	-2	43%	-35
2015-2016	18%	7%	+11	38%	-20	21%	9%	+12	42%	-21
2016-2017	18%	8%	+10	38%	-20	13%	10%	+3	44%	-31
2017-2018	15%	12%	+3	46%	-31	16%	13%	+3	48%	-32

NOTE:

(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

2.b.ii. Proficiency – Subgroup School Level Proficiency: See Tables 2a and 2b below.

Table 2a: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup: Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Greece Central School District

Subject	School Year	*Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)*	*Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)*
ELA	2014-2015	25% (+20)	11% (-10)
	2015-2016	11% (+7)	18% (-7)
	2016-2017	7% (+4)	19% (-6)
	2017-2018	5% (-4)	14% (-15)
Mathematics	2014-2015	0% (-16)	8% (-29)
	2015-2016	11% (+3)	20% (-13)
	2016-2017	7% (-5)	13% (-18)
	2017-2018	5% (-5)	16% (-16)

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on such state assessment.

(2) For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

(3) In some cases, student subgroups still did not have enough tested students to form a representative sample (<5 students). For these subgroups testing data was withheld.

Table 2b: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup:
***Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Rochester City School District**

Subject	School Year	*Students with Disabilities (Variance to the district of location)*	*Economically Disadvantaged (Variance to the district of location)*
ELA	2014-2015	25% (+24)	11% (+6)
	2015-2016	11% (+10)	18% (+12)
	2016-2017	7% (+6)	19% (+12)
	2017-2018	5% (+2)	14% (+3)
Mathematics	2014-2015	0% (-4)	8% (-1)
	2015-2016	11% (+9)	20% (+12)
	2016-2017	7% (+5)	13% (+5)
	2017-2018	5% (+2)	16% (+4)

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on such state assessment.

(2) For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

(3) In some cases, student subgroups still did not have enough tested students to form a representative sample (<5 students). For these subgroups testing data was withheld.

2.b.iii. Proficiency – Grade Level Proficiency: See Tables 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b below.

Table 3a: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: ELA
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Greece Central School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS
Grade 3	25%	37% / 42%	-12 / -17	10%	44% / 43%	-34 / -33	16%	46% / 51%	-30 / -35
Grade 4	21%	40% / 41%	-19 / -20	15%	35% / 41%	-20 / -26	15%	44% / 47%	-28 / -32
Grade 5	11%	38% / 34%	-27 / -23	21%	30% / 35%	-9 / -15	6%	26% / 37%	-20 / -31
Grade 6	13%	35% / 34%	-22 / -21	30%	33% / 32%	-3 / -2	24%	40% / 49%	-16 / -25

NOTE:

(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

Table 3b: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: ELA
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Rochester City School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS
Grade 3	25%	8% / 42%	+17 / -17	10%	11% / 43%	-1 / -33	16%	17% / 51%	-1 / -35
Grade 4	21%	8% / 41%	+13 / -20	15%	8% / 41%	+7 / -26	15%	13% / 47%	+3 / -32
Grade 5	11%	5% / 34%	+6 / -23	21%	6% / 35%	+15 / -15	6%	7% / 37%	-1 / -31
Grade 6	13%	6% / 34%	+7 / -21	30%	5% / 32%	+25 / -2	24%	13% / 49%	+11 / -25

NOTE:

(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

Table 4a: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: Mathematics
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Greece Central School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS
Grade 3	26%	49% / 44%	-23 / -18	10%	53% / 48%	-43 / -38	24%	48% / 54%	-24 / -30
Grade 4	23%	49% / 45%	-26 / -22	13%	41% / 43%	-28 / -30	13%	43% / 48%	-30 / -35
Grade 5	5%	44% / 40%	-39 / -35	12%	45% / 43%	-33 / -31	6%	39% / 44%	-33 / -38
Grade 6	30%	39% / 40%	-9 / -10	18%	37% / 40%	-19 / -22	21%	36% / 44%	-15 / -23

NOTE:

(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

Table 4b: Grade Level Proficiency for All Students: Mathematics
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Rochester City School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Discovery CS	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS
Grade 3	26%	11% / 44%	+15 / -18	10%	14% / 48%	-4 / -38	24%	18% / 54%	+6 / -30
Grade 4	23%	11% / 45%	+12 / -22	13%	8% / 43%	+5 / -30	13%	13% / 48%	+1 / -35
Grade 5	5%	5% / 40%	0 / -35	12%	9% / 43%	+3 / -31	6%	11% / 44%	-5 / -38
Grade 6	30%	7% / 40%	+23 / -10	18%	6% / 40%	+12 / -22	21%	9% / 44%	+12 / -23

NOTE:

(1) Data in the table above represents all students tested who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.

Benchmark 9:

Table 5a: Student Demographics
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Greece Central School District

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Discovery Charter School	Greece CSD	Variance	Discovery Charter School	Greece CSD	Variance
Students with Disabilities	17%	14%	+3	16%	14%	+2
ELL/MLL	2%	5%	-3	4%	7%	-3
Economically Disadvantaged	97%	55%	+42	97%	61%	+36

NOTES:

(1) Data in the table above represents a comparison between those grades served in the charter school to only those same grades in the district.

(2) For the students with disabilities and the ELL/MLL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

Table 5b: Student Demographics
Comparison of Discovery Charter School and Rochester City School District

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Discovery Charter School	Rochester CSD	Variance	Discovery Charter School	Rochester CSD	Variance
Students with Disabilities	17%	22%	-5	16%	22%	-6
ELL/MLL	2%	15%	-13	4%	16%	-12
Economically Disadvantaged	97%	92%	+5	97%	92%	+5

NOTES:
(1) Data in the table above represents a comparison between those grades served in the charter school to only those same grades in the district.
(2) For the students with disabilities and the MLL/ELL subgroups, both current and former members of the subgroups have been combined.

According to NYSED data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 81% of students were retained in Discovery Charter School compared with 93% in the Greece Central School District.

According to NYSED data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 81% of students were retained in Discovery Charter School compared with 94% in the Rochester City School District