New York State Education Department

Renewal Site Visit Report
2018-2019

Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts

Visit Date: November 7-8, 2018
Date of Report: June 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 9
BENCHMARK 2: TEACHING AND LEARNING 10
BENCHMARK 3: CULTURE, CLIMATE AND FAMILY ENGAGEMENT 13
BENCHMARK 4: FINANCIAL CONDITION 15
BENCHMARK 5: FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT 17
BENCHMARK 6: BOARD OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNANCE 18
BENCHMARK 7: ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITY 20
BENCHMARK 8: MISSION AND KEY DESIGN ELEMENTS 23
BENCHMARK 9: ENROLLMENT, RECRUITMENT, AND RETENTION 24
BENCHMARK 10: LEGAL COMPLIANCE 26

ATTACHMENT 1: DATA **28**

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Charter School Summary[1]

Name of Charter School	Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts
Board Chair	Steve Gordon
District of location	• Greece Central School District (district of location) • Rochester City School District (district of residence)
Opening Date	Fall 2014
Charter Terms	Initial: August 24, 2014 – June 30, 2019
Current Term Authorized Grades/ Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 6/ 506 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/ Proposed Approved Enrollment	K – Grade 6/ 525 students
Comprehensive Management Service Provider	None
Facilities	299 Kirk Road, Rochester, NY 14612 – Private Space
Mission Statement	*Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts provides children an enriched and rigorous education through the humanities and arts integration leading to success in college, careers and life.*
Key Design Elements	• More time: Block scheduling, longer days, more days • A Disposition for Learning –Habits of Mind • A Focus on Language and Literacy: Speech and Language Support for All Learners • A Focus on Numeracy and Eight Mathematical Practices • Arts instruction and integration • Character Education • Child and Family Support
Requested Revisions	• To increase enrollment from 506 students to 525 students

Noteworthy: To effectively integrate the arts into the Renaissance Academy Charter School (RA) student experience, each grade level is assigned an arts integration specialist for each trimester across the school year.

Renewal Outcomes

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

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

- **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 2014 to 2015	Year 2 2015 to 2016	Year 3 2016 to 2017	Year 4 2017 to 2018	Year 5 2018 to 2019
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 2	K – Grade 3	K – Grade 4	K – Grade 5	K – Grade 6
Total Approved Enrollment	176	250	300	400	506

***Proposed Renewal Term Grade Levels and Approved Enrollment**

	Year 1 2019 to 2020	Year 2 2020 to 2021	Year 3 2021 to 2022	Year 4 2022 to 2023	Year 5 2023 to 2024
Grade Configuration	K – Grade 6	K – Grade 6	K – Grade 6	K – Grade 6	K – Grade 6
Total Approved Enrollment	500	525	517	525	525

*This proposed chart was submitted by the Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts with its renewal application. It is subject to change pending final review and approval by the Board of Regents.

METHODOLOGY

A two-day renewal site visit was conducted at RA on November 7-8, 2018. The New York State Education Department's Charter School Office (CSO) team conducted interviews with the board of trustees, school leadership team, and special populations teachers. In cooperation with school leadership, the CSO also administered an anonymous online survey to the school's entire teaching staff.

The team conducted fourteen classroom observations in K- Grade-6. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length and conducted jointly with RA's Chief Educational Officer, Director of Elementary Education, and Director of Intermediate Education.

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**
- **NYSED conducted surveys of teaching staff and parents**
- **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 from November 7-8, 2018 at RA, 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).	Approaches
	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.	Approaches
	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.	Falls Far Below
	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.	Meets
	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.	Falls Far Below
	Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance: The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.	Approaches

Summary of Findings

RA is a public charter school in its fifth year of operation and serves students in kindergarten through Grade 6. Nearing the conclusion of its initial charter term, the school is rated in the following manner: exceeding zero benchmarks, meeting four benchmarks, approaching four benchmarks, and falling far below two benchmarks. Additional details regarding those ratings are provided below.

Areas of Strength:
Since authorization, RA's leadership, staff, and board members have generally demonstrated a unified understanding and commitment to the school's mission, which emphasizes an arts-integrated educational experience for all students. As a result, students receive daily instruction in the visual arts, dance, music, and/or drama; units often culminate in art shows or performances that highlight students' achievements and also function as a way to keep families engaged with the school.

Further, each of RA's key design elements is generally evident throughout the school in both instructional and operational areas. Recognizing that a large number of its students come from underprivileged backgrounds and require substantial support both inside and outside of school, RA invests significant resources to provide adequate staff to meet their needs. These include a full-time school psychologist, social worker, dean of students, director of safety and wellness, school nurse, coordinator of special services, and a family services coordinator- each of whom can connect students and families with necessary community resources.

Areas in Need of Improvement:

Since opening in 2014, RA has not met the majority of its academic goals as stated in the CSO's Performance Framework. While students' performance in both ELA and math falls far below state proficiency averages at 24% and 14% respectively the school's math performance is of particular concern. Over the last three years RA's margin of variance over the Rochester City School District (RCSD) has narrowed to +12 percentage points for ELA and 0 percentage points for math. In particular, economically disadvantaged students now perform below the district's level of proficiency in math one of the lowest in the state. While leadership has implemented curricular adjustments and secured funding through local philanthropists to build out a "Math Fellows" program to refine the skill sets of RA instructional staff, these efforts have not yet produced quantitative outcomes to demonstrate their efficacy in helping students reach Performance Framework expectations.

RA has not met all its enrollment targets in any year of this charter term, experiencing particular difficulty recruiting and retaining special populations. While the school has maintained a total enrollment in each year of the charter term sufficient to remain in compliance with the terms of its charter, and consistently enrolls a slightly higher percentage of economically disadvantaged students than the RCSD (94% to 92% during the 2017-2018 school year), its efforts to increase its enrollment of students with disabilities and ELLs/MLLs have evidenced minimal impact. The disparity is most marked between the district and RA's percentage of English language learners (ELLs)/multi-lingual learners (MLLs); the school reported not enrolling any ELLs/ MLLs until this year.

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

- RA currently serves 506 students in kindergarten through Grade 6; this is the school's first year at full scale.
- RA provides an arts-infused educational program, with a strong focus on integrating a variety of artistic mediums (music, dance, drama, and the visual arts) into its core curriculum and daily instruction.
- The school staffs each classroom with two teachers; the composition of these teaching teams varies from lead and assistant, general education and special education, and/or general education and art teacher based on content area and demonstrated student need.
- To serve its students with disabilities, RA provides Direct and Indirect Consultant Teacher Services, an Integrated Co-Teaching (ICOT) classroom at each grade level staffed with one general and one special education teacher, and a 15:1:1 class multi-age classroom for students with more significant needs in Grades 3-5. In addition, the school employs its own full-time speech therapist and organizes counseling services, occupational, and physical therapies through students' home districts in accordance with IEP mandates.
- To support ELL/MLL students, an experienced English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) teacher pushes into classrooms and pulls students out to provide small group instruction for the mandated number of minutes. During an onsite interview, the ESOL teacher described establishing individualized language acquisition goals for each of the school's six ELL/MLL students and monitoring their progress every two weeks in collaboration with classroom teachers.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 1:

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: In the school's application for renewal and during on-site interviews during the visit, RA leadership and teachers attested to the school's curricular alignment to New York State Learning Standards and the Common Core State Standards in ELA and math. Teachers internally develop the school's curriculum for all content areas through a backwards-mapping approach from those standards, based on the Understanding by

Design methodology. A recent intensified focus on math curriculum and instruction included training by a St. John Fisher College consultant, the addition of a math specialist, and more instructional time for math.

- Indicator b: RA teachers utilize school-wide templates for thematic unit and lesson plans that introduce complex materials and, as scripted, provide opportunities for students to develop higher order thinking skills and content-specific understanding. Via the CSO's anonymous online survey, teachers reported uploading all lesson planning documents into Atlas Rubicon, a curriculum mapping software, to maintain a database of instructional materials for ongoing adaptation to meet specific students' needs.
- Indicator c: Teacher responses to the CSO's anonymous online survey described frequent opportunities for teachers to collaboratively plan and create curricular materials. During weekly grade level meetings, teachers monitor the curriculum to ensure horizontal alignment across classrooms at the same grade level. RA's practice of having its teachers "loop" with students in Grades 1-2 and 3-4 before departmentalizing in Grades 5-6 improves the vertical alignment of curriculum, as teachers are regularly immersed in two grade levels of content standards. Additionally, instructional coaches and teachers meet at least bi-annually to ensure the vertical alignment of skills in both ELA and math throughout the curriculum review and refinement process.
- Indicator d: During on-site focus group interviews, RA leadership and teachers cited a variety of methods used to differentiate curriculum and instruction so that all students have sufficient opportunities to master grade-level skills and concepts. For example, teachers regularly utilize the results of formative and diagnostic assessments to determine flexible student groupings in classrooms to allow for targeted, leveled instruction. During the renewal visit, CSO staff observed limited evidence of differentiation beyond small group work in most classrooms.

2. Element: ***Instruction***:
   - Indicator a: Leadership interviews, teacher survey responses, and classroom observations conducted by the CSO site visit team confirmed a common understanding of high-quality instruction. RA's instructional leadership team also utilizes a rigor checklist based upon the work of the Institute for Learning to monitor a consistent level of challenge across classrooms and grade levels at the school. Observed instructional practices generally align to this understanding; although to a variable degree among classrooms.
   - Indicator b: RA leadership considers the school's thematic units to be a key component of establishing and maintaining deep student engagement in learning. As described in the school's application for renewal, these thematic units may contain choice-based projects, collaborative learning, and opportunities for students to exercise a variety of learning modalities; each unit culminates in a performance task that pulls all of the instructional goals together. Additionally, RA cites its Whole Brain Teaching (WBT) approach, as well as the use of the Daily Five, i-Ready online modules, and Writing Workshop as drivers of consistently high levels of student engagement.
3. Element: ***Assessment and Program Evaluation***:
   - Indicator a: Over the course of the charter term, RA has implemented a balance of formative, diagnostic, and summative assessments. These include nationally-normed, standardized i-Ready assessments in ELA and math and internally developed benchmark exams administered three times each year, in addition to weekly and daily lesson-specific assessments such as exit tickets and performance tasks.

- Indicator b: In the school's renewal application, RA leaders described the systematic use of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments to inform instructional decision making with the goal of improving performance outcomes. Qualitatively, school leadership reports teachers utilize checklists during lesson execution to measure student mastery, and grade level teams analyze student work products to identify areas for re-teaching as well as opportunities for increasing rigor. Quantitatively, leaders and teachers refer to more formalized assessment data to inform instructional planning during "Data Dive" sessions led by the school's math and literacy specialists every three-six weeks.
- Indicator c: RA's board and school leadership uses an assortment of student data to evaluate the quality and effectiveness of academic offerings. For example, the school analyzes student performance at the programmatic level to identify if there are trends or weaknesses to redress. During onsite interviews, school leaders provided examples of responding to disappointing results by revisiting curricular materials and securing external funding for a math fellows program to improve outcomes in that content area.

4. Element: ***Supports for Diverse Learners***:
   - Indicator a: RA provides supports to address its students' academic needs, including but not limited to students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students. The school's renewal application documented its multiple settings for students with disabilities and learning exceptionalities, including direct and indirect consultant teacher services, integrated co-taught classrooms, and a 15:1:1 classroom for students with intensive academic needs. For the first time, in 2018-2019 the school employs an ESOL teacher to provide instruction for its six ELL students through a combination of push-in and pull-out language acquisition support. RA's daily school schedule includes a period of "academic collaboration and enrichment" time. During this 30-minute segment, all students receive targeted instruction to address their particular needs. To keep student to teacher ratios low and increase opportunities for individualization, every classroom is assigned a third adult to support students during this time. In addition, RA serves its high number of Title 1 students through a tiered Response to Intervention (RtI) system. Supports through this tiered system accelerate from general classroom strategies such as flexible groupings to pull-out support and progress monitoring up to five days per week, depending on the severity of a student's academic deficiencies. Thirty-five percent of teachers responding to the NYSED anonymous on-line survey indicated that RA does not have a strong and effective program for ELLs/MLLs, as opposed to 30% who felt they did.
   - Indicator b: Through the CSO's teacher survey, interventionists and classroom teachers reported communicating informally through email or impromptu meetings to stay abreast of students' progress and needs, as well as formally through scheduled meetings at least every six weeks.

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: RA has a clear approach to behavioral management, predicated heavily upon WBT and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). In its renewal application, leadership described this approach as a "prevention-oriented way for school personnel to organize evidence-based practices, improve their implementation of those practices, and maximize academic and social behavior outcomes for students." The school also maintains a written, CSO-approved discipline policy. The results of the school-administered student survey shows that only half of the students responding agreed that students are not picked on, called names or teased at the school. Regarding bullying, 36% of students indicated it was not an issue, while 37% thought it was. Certain teachers, on the NYSED anonymous on-line survey, said that they had never had DASA training (33%), and did not have a copy of the DASA policy (33%). There is a new DASA coordinator this year and several strategies have

been instituted to address bullying at the school, including implementation of a zero-tolerance policy, the Positivity Project as a means of prevention, and workshops provided by the Center for Youth. The DASA coordinator also serves as the dean of students.

- Indicator b: The school appears safe and constituents are able to articulate how the school community maintains a generally safe environment and facility. RA's full-time director of safety and wellness assumes primary responsibility for this, in collaboration with the school's senior leadership and community partners such as local police departments who have provided suggestions on maintaining a highly secure campus.
- Indicator c: Approximately 33% of teacher survey respondents disagreed that RA provides an environment "generally free of bullying, discrimination, and harassment for students." Further, teacher responses indicated not all staff received timely DASA training, nor could all staff accurately identify the school's DASA coordinator.
- Indicator d: On-site, the CSO visit team observed that classroom environments are generally conducive to learning and free from disruption. In instances where students were off task, teachers often attempted to redirect students using WBT techniques.

2. Element: ***Family Engagement and Communication:***
   - Indicator a. In their responses to the CSO's online survey, RA teachers reported they frequently communicate with parents to discuss students' strengths and needs. They accomplish this through both informal and formal means, such as phone calls, emails, text messages, and reminders via virtual applications, in addition to three formal report cards per year, and bi-annual report card conferences.
   - Indicator b. In RA's renewal application, the school described its method for assessing family and student satisfaction via annual surveys, and how it uses results to inform school-wide action plans.
   - Indicator c. RA implements a systematic process for responding to parent and/or community concerns. During onsite interviews, leaders described their open-door policy that enables most families to feel comfortable raising questions and issues informally for resolution. In more serious instances, school leaders direct families to follow the school's formal complaint policy.
   - Indicator d. The school shares school-level academic data with the broader school community through reports and documentation shared at public board meetings. These include data analysis and annual reports, which are also posted on the RA website. School leaders indicated that they are also available in hard copy in the main office.

3. Element: ***Social-Emotional Supports:***
   - Indicator a. School leaders collect and use data to track the socio-emotional needs of students. The school's renewal application detailed a process through which a support team comprised of RA's psychologist, social worker, dean of students, and other service providers convene weekly to review the progress and needs of all students receiving tiered social-emotional supports. For students with significant or ongoing behavioral needs, the support team creates individualized RtI behavior plans and assesses the efficacy of those interventions on a four-to six-week cycle.
   - Indicator b. School leaders collect and use data to evaluate the impact of RA's programs designed to support students' social and emotional health. Aggregate data reflecting trends in behavioral incidences, referrals, etc. is shared with the Center for Youth, which provides crisis interventionists to work with RA staff and students, to inform and strengthen their services. RA's renewal application also described using data to identify the need for additional counseling services and inform classroom social skills lessons.

Benchmark 4: Financial Condition

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

Finding: Approaches

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:

Financial Condition

RA appears to be in adequate financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements.

The CSO reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. Near-term indicators, such as the current ratio and unrestricted days cash, are measures of liquidity and of the charter school's capacity to maintain operations. Long-term indicators, such as total margin and debt-to asset ratio, are measures of the charter school's capacity to remain viable and to meet financial obligations.

Overall Financial Outlook

A *composite score* is an overall measure of financial health calculated by the Department's Office of Audit Services. This score is based on a weighting of primary reserves, equity, and net income. A charter school with a score between 1.5 and 3.0 is considered to be in strong financial health. RA's 2016-2017 composite score is 1.4.

Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts' Composite Scores
2014-2015 to 2016-2017

Year	*Composite Score*
2014-2015	1.1
2015-2016	2.1
2016-2017	1.4

Source: NYSED Office of Audit Services

Near-Term Indicators

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, RA had a current ratio of 2.0.

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, RA operated with 17 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. RA's enrollment maximization for 2016-2017 was at 109%.

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, RA's debt to asset ratio was 0.4. During the charter term NYSED had concerns about two loans that the school obtained. As the school's representative reported, the CEO's mother (independent contractor for the school serving in a consultant capacity as the Budget Director) is the obligee of the Cozine loan of $350,000, with a balance of $288,119, and an interest rate is 6%. A separate loan, known as the Gordon (board trustee and current chair) loan for $50,000 has been paid. A payoff letter is dated September 12, 2016. In accordance with the recommendation of the NYS Comptroller's Report, the school promptly addressed all of the Comptroller's recommendations, including modifying its Conflict of Interest and Transactions Policy.

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, RA's total margin was 24 percent.

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 Charter School Office reviewed Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts' 2015-2016 and 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.

The Office of the State Comptroller issued an audit report in August of 2016, covering the financial operations during the period from July 1, 2014 to March 17, 2016. There were three findings, related to ensuring policies and procedures for disbursements are properly supported, consultation with legal counsel to address inconsistencies between the school's charter, the by-laws, and the code of ethics, as related to the GML Sections 800-806, and ensuring board policy related to the signing of checks over $10,000 is followed. The school responded to correct policies to address specific procedures, rewrite the bylaws and code of ethics, and to create a new check signing policy.

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: Falls Far Below

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:

- Indicator a: The RA board of trustees maintains an adequate membership according to its by-laws and recruits and selects board members with skills and expertise that meet the needs of the school. During the onsite board interview, trustees articulated a desire to add more ethnic diversity to the group in order to better reflect student demographics.
- Indicator b: In the school's renewal application, the board described its approach to continuous improvement planning. However, during the on-site board interview, trustees were unable to articulate specific or concrete evidence of this approach in practice, nor has significant performance improvement on state assessments been realized.
- Indicator c: The board oversees the charter school through regular review of financial and other budget-related items, and monitoring student performance data at its monthly meetings. When asked what oversight the board provides to fiscal operations, the board members replied that the finance committee meets just prior to the board meeting. At each board meeting, RA's CEO and Chief Operating Officer (COO) report on academic matters and relevant school operations developments. However, during the onsite board interview, trustees were only able to speak in generalities in response to the majority of the CSO's questions. When asked how the board holds the school's CEO accountable for annual goals, and consequences if they are not met, the response reaffirmed a commitment to increasing math proficiency rates. The board indicated it wishes to be more involved with the school academically; its example is that it will visit classrooms, implying that the board's increased involvement will result in higher proficiency scores.
- Indicator d: The board reports contracting with an attorney who monitors and updates board practices and policies biannually, or more frequently if necessary. This arrangement notwithstanding, during the board interview, trustees lacked awareness of the status of the latest

approved version of its by-laws and had not ensured the Office of the State Comptroller (OSC) requested changes from the 2016 audit were incorporated into the school's code of ethics.

- Indicator e: The school's renewal application described an evaluation process for the school director that included establishing and monitoring progress towards outcomes-based goals. To evaluate themselves, trustees reported utilizing a self-evaluation tool. It is unclear how, or if, the board evaluates external partners such as the Center for Youth.
- Indicator f: As mentioned above, the RA board reported in the focus group that it demonstrates its awareness of its legal obligations to the school and stakeholders by retaining the services of an experienced education attorney; but does not closely monitor such issues at the school level. For example, none of the trustees present during the interview could speak to the specific employment relationship with a relative of a school leader to ensure appropriate conflict of interest considerations were upheld. Earlier in the charter term, issues related to a conflict of interest arose from the OSC audit in 2016. The issue was not remediated immediately with a revised code of ethics. However, by October 2018, these issues had been addressed. A potential conflict of interest has arisen with the employment of a family member of the administration. The board indicated it was unaware of this in the board focus group, which is indicative of a continued lack of awareness of the school's legal obligations and oversight.

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: RA employs an appropriately bifurcated school leadership structure that enables staff members to focus their time and energies on academics or operations to further the school's mission and goals. Leadership has established annual schoolwide goals and has made programmatic adjustments in attempts to improve student learning and proficiency rates across the school.

- Indicator b: Based on documentation provided in preparation for the renewal site visit, RA staff members' roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, with some degree of intentional overlap, and provide a relevant service to the school community. For example, RA employs two directors who each oversee a distinct grade span, but who work closely together to ensure continuity of programming across the school.
- Indicator c: In its renewal application, leadership describes ongoing communication with staff, students, families, and other members of the community, particularly to solicit feedback on the school's programming via survey. On the teacher survey, staff reported frequent communication with instructional leaders during weekly grade team meetings, classroom walkthroughs and observations, weekly newsletters, and an anonymous suggestion box. RA communicates with students' families in both informal and formal ways; the former including school-hosted family events, phone calls, emails, and text messages. The latter include three formal report cards per year and biannual report card conferences. The school leverages social media to keep external stakeholders informed about its programs and initiatives, and invites members of the community to attend performances such as the art show to learn more about RA.
- Indicator d: To hire qualified staff, RA primarily utilizes popular employment websites and also posts openings internally. The school's renewal application reports the board has implemented numerous incentives to retain effective teachers, such as competitive pay relative to local districts, annual compensation increases, improved health and dental benefits, 401k matching, and employer contributions to staff health savings accounts. In instances where staff members do not meet the school's performance expectations, leaders describe a series of individualized professional learning opportunities, mentor supports, and documented improvement plans before making decisions to terminate or not renew contracts.

2. Element: ***Professional Climate:***
   - Indicator a: The school is generally staffed with appropriately credentialed and experienced personnel to meet its educational and operational needs. During on-site interviews with school leaders, they described how roles were added and responsibilities expanded and redistributed as the school grew in size over the course of the charter term. Now that RA is at scale, leaders anticipate more stability.
   - Indicator b: RA dedicates time for regular collaboration among teachers on at least a weekly basis. Ninety-four percent of teacher responses to the CSO's anonymous online survey demonstrated agreement with the statement "faculty members frequently collaborate on matters of curriculum and instruction." This includes common planning times with classroom co-teachers, grade level teams, and departments, as well as regular opportunities to participate in professional learning communities with instructional leadership.
   - Indicator c: School leaders are intentional in their efforts to strengthen staff members' pedagogical skills and abilities to meet students' academic needs and improve performance outcomes. The school's renewal application describes a "hybrid model" of professional development, comprised of an annual learning plan mapped out for the whole school year for all staff, and job-embedded coaching cycles tailored to each individual staff member. During onsite interviews, staff described a system of surveys, classroom observations, and implementation meetings designed to measure the effectiveness of these supports and identify necessary adjustments over the course of the year.

- Indicator d: As detailed in its renewal application, RA regularly monitors its organizational and instructional quality by analyzing quantitative and qualitative data, surveying stakeholders, completing staff evaluations, and, when necessary, securing the services of an objective third party to provide feedback and recommendations on areas in need of improvement. The school's instructional leaders and teachers affirmed the school's formal evaluation process during onsite focus groups, including pre-observation meetings, lesson observations, and feedback conferences that measure instructional quality and inform subsequent teacher supports.
- Indicator e: RA leadership solicits teachers' feedback to gauge their satisfaction with their employment and school programs in two ways. The school's renewal application described an anonymous suggestion box, through which staff are encouraged to raise any and all concerns or issues for leaders' attention at weekly meetings, and an annual staff survey.

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

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:

- Indicator a: In the school leadership focus group, participants demonstrated their understanding of the school's mission and key design elements. This understanding was also conveyed by approximately 97% of teachers based on their responses to the CSO's anonymous online teacher survey.
- Indicator b: The school has fully implemented the key design elements identified in the charter. At the renewal visit, the following design elements were most evident in the daily schedule, classroom observations, signage and student work around the school: "More Time on Task;" "A Disposition for Learning – Habits of Mind;" and "Arts Instruction and Integration."

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: Falls Far Below

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.

See Attachment 1 for data tables and additional information.

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

- Indicator a: While RA has maintained sufficient enrollment in each year of the current term to be in compliance with its charter agreement, it has experienced a gradual decline in the number of students and families choosing to remain at the school. From 2016-2017 to 2018-2019, the school's population decreased in every grade except second, where enrollment grew by two students. The overall loss was 35 students. Board members cited families' concerns about educational opportunities after sixth grade. Certain ELL/MLL groups were "not interested" in this school, and the district has a targeted program for immigrant children that competes with charter efforts. RA has also demonstrated inconsistent annual progress toward meeting its targets for attracting and retaining students with disabilities. Similar efforts for the recruitment of ELLs/MLLs produced no enrollees until the current school year.
- Indicator b: The school enrolls a proportion of ED students on par with the RCSD, the majority of its students' district of residence and the community prioritized in its charter. However, the percentage of SWDs at RA has decreased slightly, from 16% to 14% over the course of the school's last two years of operation; and is currently five percentage points less than the RCSD. The workbook submitted by RA provides self-reported numbers that also show a further decrease.

Though the school employs a weighted lottery preference for students who qualify for admission as ELLs/MLLs, RA still falls far below its target for these students- the school did not enroll any ELL/MLL students until the final year of its initial charter term. In its renewal application, the school reported its family services coordinator, in place for two years, has led the following efforts: increased outreach and canvassing of Rochester neighborhoods and community centers to distribute informational brochures and flyers about the school's programs and services. They include The New Corner Settlement Organization, Catholic Charities, Rochester City Corner Adult Education Center, Head Start Programs, Library Story Hours, and the Rochester City Recruitment Fair. To specifically recruit ELL/MLL students, RA continues to develop relationships with Refugee and Immigration Centers, religious outreach centers, local centers that have been established for individuals from other countries such as the Ibero-American Action League, and Arabic and Latino/Hispanic cultural organizations. The family services coordinator is focused on developing relationships with ELL/MLL families.

- Indicator c: The extent to which the RA board of trustees and leadership have held themselves accountable for effective recruitment and outreach strategies, and a sense of urgency to make strategic improvements, remains unclear.

Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance

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

Finding: Approaches

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:

1. Element: ***Legal Compliance:***

- Indicator a: CSO records indicate that over the course of its first charter term, the RA board and school leaders have compiled an inconsistent record of compliance. The school has occasionally struggled to meet state requirements, provide accurate and timely reports, and implement some provisions of the charter agreement with fidelity. In the school's application for renewal, the board reported it has contracted with a law firm, an accounting firm, and an insurance carrier that have charter-specific expertise in order to supplement its capacity to comply with all legal requirements and best practices.
- Indicator b: In some instances, the school has undertaken appropriate corrective action when needed. For example, the school's renewal application describes a situation when RA was audited by the Office of the State Comptroller (OSC); and the official report questioned a loan from a board member to cover a gap in facilities costs. While the board had solicited and relied on legal guidance that the transaction was lawfully permissible, the school immediately paid off the private loan to resolve any question of impropriety. Subsequently, the board also wrote and approved a new Conflict of Interest policy based on the OSC's audit findings. The board indicated that it has become more sensitive to the concerns surrounding potential conflicts of interest. However, the board is still paying back another loan to a staff member's relative, who is also employed as a consultant at the school.
- Indicator c: The RA board has appropriately sought Board of Regents and/or Charter School Office approval for a number of significant revisions, including a change of district from Rochester to Greece due to the lack of suitable school facilities, shortening the school year, changing grade configurations, updating the board's by-laws to remove ex-officio members and require a minimum of 12 meetings per year, and implementing lottery preferences for employees' children and ELL/MLL students. However, the school failed to obtain CSO approval prior to implementing a new organizational structure.

Attachment 1: 2018-2019 Renewal SV Report
Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts

Benchmark 1:

Indicator 1: All Schools

1.a.i. Accountability - ESEA Accountability Designation:

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

1.b.i. Similar Schools Comparison – Comparative Proficiency:

In ELA and math RA 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 2016-2017, 29% of students attending Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts were trending toward proficiency in ELA. In 2017-2018, the rate was 33%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

In 2016-2017, 18% of students attending Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts were trending toward proficiency in math. 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 2017-2018, 0% of students with disabilities attending Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts were trending toward proficiency in ELA. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework. In 2017-2018, 0% of students with disabilities attending Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts were trending toward proficiency in math. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework.

In 2016-2017, 29% of economically disadvantaged students attending Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts were trending toward proficiency in ELA. In 2017-2018, the rate was 32%. This falls below the minimum expectation of 75% as set forth in the Charter School Performance Framework. In 2016-2017, 18% of economically disadvantaged students attending Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts were trending towards proficiency in math. 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.b.i. Proficiency - Aggregate School Level Proficiency for All Students: See Table 1a and 1b below.

Table 1a: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students: Charter School, District, and NYS: Comparison of Renaissance Academy Charter School of The Arts and Rochester City School District

	ELA					Math				
	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	25%	8%	+17	42%	-17	15%	11%	+4	44%	-29
2016-2017	31%	9%	+22	42%	-11	12%	11%	+1	46%	-34
2017-2018	24%	12%	+12	45%	-21	14%	14%	0	49%	-35

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: Comparison of Renaissance Academy Charter School of The Arts and Greece Central School District

	ELA					Math				
	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD	Variance to District	NYS	Variance to NYS
2015-2016	25%	37%	-12	42%	-17	15%	49%	-34	44%	-29
2016-2017	31%	39%	-8	42%	-11	12%	47%	-35	46%	-34
2017-2018	24%	39%	-15	45%	-21	14%	43%	-29	49%	-35

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 Table 2a and 2b below.

Note: A "." in any table indicates that the data is suppressed, no student sat for the exam, or the exam was not given.

Table 2a: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup: Comparison of Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts 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	2015-2016	0% (-1)	26% (+19)
	2016-2017	14% (+12)	28% (+20)
	2017-2018	13% (+10)	23% (+12)
Mathematics	2015-2016	. .	15% (+5)
	2016-2017	13% (+10)	12% (+2)
	2017-2018	8% (+5)	12% (-1)

NOTES:
(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.
(2) For the students with disabilities subgroup, both current and former members of the subgroup 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 Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts 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	2015-2016	0% (-7)	26% (+1)
	2016-2017	14% (+6)	28% (0)
	2017-2018	13% (+3)	23% (-6)
Mathematics	2015-2016	. .	15% (-23)
	2016-2017	13% (-5)	12% (-24)
	2017-2018	8% (-3)	12% (-22)

NOTES:
(1) Data in the table above represents tested students in respective subgroups who scored proficiently (level 3 or above) on each state assessment.
(2) For the students with disabilities subgroup, both current and former members of the subgroup 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 Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts and Rochester City School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS
Grade 3	25%	8% / 42%	+17 / -17	40%	11% / 43%	+29 / -3	24%	17% / 51%	+7 / -27
Grade 4	.	. / .	. / .	22%	8% / 41%	+14 / -19	37%	13% / 47%	+24 / -10
Grade 5	.	. / .	. / .	.	. / .	. / .	11%	7% / 37%	+4 / -26

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 Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts and Greece Central School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS
Grade 3	25%	37% / 42%	-12 / -17	40%	44% / 43%	-4 / -3	24%	46% / 51%	-22 / -27
Grade 4	.	. / .	. / .	22%	35% / 41%	-13 / -19	37%	44% / 47%	-7 / -10
Grade 5	.	. / .	. / .	.	. / .	. / .	11%	26% / 37%	-15 / -26

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: Math
Comparison of Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts and Rochester City School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Rochester City SD / NYS	Variance to Rochester City SD / NYS
Grade 3	15%	11% / 44%	+4 / -29	13%	14% / 48%	-1 / -35	16%	18% / 54%	-2 / -38
Grade 4	.	. / .	. / .	11%	8% / 43%	+3 / -32	15%	13% / 48%	+2 / -33
Grade 5	.	. / .	. / .	.	. / .	. / .	8%	11% / 44%	-3 / -36

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: Math
Comparison of Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts and Greece Central School District

	2015-2016			2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS	Renaissance Academy CS of The Arts	Greece Central SD / NYS	Variance to Greece Central SD / NYS
Grade 3	15%	49% / 44%	-34 / -29	13%	53% / 48%	-40 / -35	16%	48% / 54%	-32 / -38
Grade 4	.	. / .	. / .	11%	41% / 43%	-30 / -32	15%	43% / 48%	-28 / -33
Grade 5	.	. / .	. / .	.	. / .	. / .	8%	39% / 44%	-31 / -36

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

Indicator 3: High School Outcomes

(Not applicable to this charter school.)

Benchmark 9:

Table 5a: Student Demographics: Comparison of Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts and Rochester City School District

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Renaissance Academy CS of the Arts	Rochester CSD	Variance	Renaissance Academy CS of the Arts	Rochester CSD	Variance
SWD	16%	21%	**-5**	14%	22%	**-8**
ELL/MLL	0%	14%	**-14**	0%	16%	**-16**
ED	91%	92%	**-1**	94%	92%	**+2**

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. the subgroups have been combined.

According to NYSED data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 83% of students were retained in Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts compared with 94% in Rochester City School District.

Table 5b: Student Demographics: Comparison of Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts and Greece Central School District

	2016-2017			2017-2018		
	Renaissance Academy CS of the Arts	Greece CSD	Variance	Renaissance Academy CS of the Arts	Greece CSD	Variance
SWD	16%	14%	**+2**	14%	13%	**+1**
ELL/MLL	0%	6%	**-6**	0%	7%	**-7**
ED	91%	54%	**+37**	94%	60%	**+34**

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. the subgroups have been combined.

According to NYSED data, in the 2017-2018 school year, 83% of students were retained in Renaissance Academy Charter School of the Arts compared with 93% in Greece Central School District.