New York State Education Department

Renewal Site Visit Report
2016-2017

Syracuse Academy of Science Charter School

Visit Date: 11/2-3/2016
Date of Report: 4/5/2017

CONTENTS

SCHOOL DESCRIPTION

Charter School Summary[1]

Name of Charter School	Syracuse Academy Charter School
Board Chair	Fehmi Damkaci
School Leader	Tolga Hayali
District of location	Syracuse City School District
Opening Date	September 1, 2003
Charter Terms	Initial charter term: 1/15/2003 - 1/14/2008 First Renewal Term: 1/15/2008 - 6/30/2012 Second Renewal Term: 7/1/2012 - 6/30/2017
Current Term Authorized Grades/Maximum Authorized Enrollment	Grades K-12 / 933 students
Proposed Renewal Term Authorized Grades/Maximum Authorized Enrollment	Grades K-12 / 975 students
Facilities	K-4: 4837 South Salina Street, Syracuse, NY 13205 5-7: 200 West High Terrace, Syracuse, NY 13219 8-12: 1001 Park Avenue, Syracuse, NY 13219
Mission Statement	*Syracuse Academy of Science Charter School (SASCS) will provide support, challenges and opportunities for its students, and it will instill the necessary skills and knowledge in math, science3, and technology to empower students, through high intellectual standards, preparing them for college, career, and citizenship. The school seeks to graduate students who can think critically and creatively, who are committed to a lifetime of learning and civic involvement, and who are conscious of local, global, and environmental issues.*
Key Design Elements	• Curricula • Attitudes • Individual attention • College preparation • Participation • Reform and accountability
Requested Revisions	Non-material revision requested to rephrase the titles (but not detailed descriptions) of the key design elements: • College Preparation • Focused on STEM and Environment • Glocal Education

---

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

	• Student Centered School Structure
	• Parental Involvement and home visits
	• Performance based accountability

School Characteristics

Enrollment

School Year	Grades Served	Maximum Enrollment	Actual Enrollment
2016-2017	K-12	933	914
2015-2016	K-12	891	874
2014-2015	K-12	849	851
Maximum enrollment: 933			

METHODOLOGY

A two day renewal site visit was conducted at Syracuse Academy of Science Charter School (SASCS) on November 2-3, 2016. The CSO team conducted interviews with the board of trustees, school leadership team, and student support staff. In cooperation with school leadership, the team also may have administered anonymous online surveys to teachers, parents, and/or students.

The team conducted 13 classroom observations across the school's elementary, middle and high school sites. The observations were approximately 20 minutes in length and conducted jointly with the school director and school site deans.

The documents and data reviewed by the team before, during, and after the site visit included the following:
- **Teacher roster**
- **Current organization chart**
- **A master school schedule**
- **Board materials**
- **Board self-evaluation documents**
- **Blank teacher and administrator evaluation forms**
- **Student/family handbook**
- **Staff handbook and personnel policies**
- **A list of curricular documents**
- **A list of major assessments**
- **Enrollment data including subgroups**
- **Professional development plans and schedules**
- **Academic data**
- **NYSED-administered teacher survey**

BENCHMARK ANALYSIS

The Performance Framework, which is part of the oversight plan included in the Charter Agreement for each school that was chartered or renewed in 2012 or beyond, outlines 10 Performance Benchmarks in three key areas of charter school performance:

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

Observational findings from 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 November 2-3, 2016 at Syracuse Academy of Science Charter School, see the following Performance Benchmark Scores and discussion.

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).	Meets
	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 Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) 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.	Meets
	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.	Meets
	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.	Approaches
	Benchmark 10: Legal Compliance: The school complies with applicable laws, regulations, and the provisions of its charter.	Meets

SASCS has demonstrated strong academic performance over the charter term, outscoring the Syracuse City School District by wide margins and in some grades and subjects outscoring the NYS average. The school is located at three sites, and maintains a cohesive academic program with a superintendent holding overall responsibility, and a director who oversees the three site-based deans. The school has a comprehensive college preparatory curriculum in place and an assessment system that provides useful data to teachers and school leaders alike. The school is also continuing to enhance and focus its intervention programming. SASCS has implemented a school culture that is conducive to learning and uses a system of merits/demerits and recognition activities to encourage positive behaviors.

The SASCS Board of Trustees possesses a range of skills and backgrounds and reviews regular reports and data from the school. The board is familiar with overall school performance and has set goals for exceeding state performance in each grade. However, in focus group meetings during the renewal site visit, it did not demonstrate a sense of urgency around subgroup performance, such as special education. The school's organizational structure and staffing plan provide clear lines of accountability and ample support for teachers and staff. The school has strong enrollment and backfills from a waitlist. The proportion of students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs) is lower than the district. Board members noted a focus last year on increasing special education numbers and a shift this year to enhancing the enrollment and retention of ELLs.

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: Meets

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 1: See Appendix A for further information.

The school has demonstrated relatively strong performance compared to both the district and the state. School leaders indicated that all elementary and middle grades exceeded the district by between five and 31 percentage points and some grade levels exceeded state performance. They also reported that most grade levels improved from 2015, though school leaders indicated that the numbers of opt outs in some grades make it difficult to gauge. Students with disabilities (25% proficient in ELA, 26% proficient in math) performed significantly lower than the overall school performance, but outperformed the local district by 24 points on each assessment. This subgroup also demonstrated strong, double-digit growth over the last three years. On the other hand, the school's ELLs performed at very low levels (0% proficient in ELA, 8% proficient in math), which represents a decline in performance over the last three years, about 11 points in ELA and 9 points in math.

At the high school level, the 2012 Cohort Regents pass rate was between 93%and 98% across the five Regents-tested subjects, and the high school had a graduation rate of 93%. School leaders reported that 97% of students were accepted to college, though average SAT performance declined this year from that of 2015.

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 Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) for all students. Teachers engage in strategic practices and decision-making in order to address the gap between what students know and need to learn so that all students experience consistent high levels of engagement, thinking and achievement.

Finding: Meets

Element	*Indicators*
1. *Curriculum*	a. The school has a documented curriculum that is aligned to the CCLS. 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:

According to school leaders, the school has a comprehensive and NYSLS-aligned curriculum in place. The curriculum is built around the EngageNY modules for English language arts and mathematics with resources from a variety of commercial and teacher developed sources, including Journeys, Go Math, and Fusion for science. At the high school level the school offers a range of course options for students, including 16 math classes, 10 Advanced Placement (AP) classes, and 10 college credit bearing classes,

such as business math and renewable energy. The high school also offers review courses for students who have failed Regents exams and need additional review and practice. The school is exploring a partnership with Onondaga Community College that would allow qualified students to graduate high school with an associate's degree.

Teachers reported that curriculum resources are archived and refined in the online Atlas Curriculum Mapping system with pacing guides built around modules that include standards and essential questions. These resources inform lesson planning that includes five required elements, accommodations and interventions. Grade level teams at the elementary site develop lesson plans collaboratively and all lesson plans are uploaded to the online Planbook for review and feedback. School leaders report that lesson plans are submitted two weeks in advance of instruction, providing ample time for special education and ENL teachers to coordinate their instruction with general education teachers for accommodations and interventions.

Observed classes demonstrated generally rigorous but inconsistently engaging instruction. Teachers were observed to foster an environment that is conducive to learning with clear routines and procedures evident in observed classes. At the high school students worked effectively in small groups, independently and in whole class discussions. At the elementary site students used hand signals and transitions were efficient. Rigor was seen in questioning that challenged students to explain answers, cite evidence from text, and use subject specific vocabulary. A 9th grade ELA class introduced students to literary theory, with a rigorous reading on formalist, feminist and psychoanalytic lenses. Lessons were purposeful and organized, though not always driven by a focus on essential questions or clear learning objectives. Finally, while students were generally compliant with behavioral expectations, they were not always on task or cognitively engaged in learning activities. For example, in some high school classes, students had their heads down on desks without consequence for long periods of instruction. In some classes the learning burden was not placed on students; teachers lectured or asked basic recall questions while students did not take notes or engage with text.

The school reports using a range of assessments for a variety of purposes. In addition to assessments associated with EngageNY modules and curriculum programs, the elementary school uses Fountas and Pinnell to assess reading levels, quarterly benchmark assessments have been developed by teacher teams for ELA and math in grades 3-11, and Star assessments are administered monthly in ELA and math to grades 3-8 as well. Practice tests are also used prior to state tests. Assessment data are analyzed regularly and used by administrators for program and teacher oversight and evaluation as well as by teachers to inform instructional planning and interventions. For example, one school leader had detailed assessment results posted on her office wall and looks at the performance of individual students, classes and grades. However, the school makes limited use of disaggregated results for at-risk student populations.

The school has staff and systems in place for teacher supervision and support. A dean at each building provides instructional leadership and facilitates observations and evaluations utilizing the Danielson framework. Lesson plans are submitted through an online system and teachers receive feedback. In addition, the school uses consultants as instructional coaches, including support for special education.

The school also has systems and resources devoted to meeting the needs of at-risk students. An RTI process is in place to identify struggling students and provide targeted interventions, which include direct small group instruction, e.g., LLI program implemented by a reading specialist, and self-paced

computer-based instruction, e.g., Star Learning, Accelerated Math and Reader. The school piloted a schoolwide intervention block for math and is adding a supplemental reading block this year as well.

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:

During the two day evaluation visit the school was orderly and students well-behaved; there was no evidence of seriously disruptive behavior and school leaders reported infrequent use of out of school suspensions. Interviewed parents described the school as safe with no tolerance for bullying. The vast majority of parents surveyed by the school found the school safe and expressed satisfaction with the discipline process. A dean of students manages school culture and discipline in each building. The school recently revised its code of conduct to clarify consequences and refine its merit/demerit system. The elementary site is using Class Dojo to track positive and negative behaviors. The school adheres to the

positive behavioral intervention and support (PBIS) approach, as exemplified by award ceremonies, teacher excellence awards, and the League of Extraordinary Citizens based on Dojo points. The school also uses the Olweus anti-bullying program and promotes student engagement through enrichment, e.g., robotics, 4H, coding clubs.

The school has a range of tools in place to foster communication with parents, including an online student information system, progress reports and report cards, and the Class Dojo system. Elementary school parents pick up their students directly from the classroom, providing daily opportunities to check-in with their teachers. Interviewed parents described the school as accessible and helpful; said one parent, "They are willing to explain so you can help your child at home." While school leaders reported that the PTA had declined and parent engagement was stronger in the lower schools than the high school, they are in the process of creating home school organizations (HSOs) at each building.

Finally, the school is leveraging some community resources, such as a partnership with Onondaga Community College, to expand opportunities for students and staff.

Benchmark 4: Financial Condition

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

Finding: Meets

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 4:

Financial Condition
SASCS appears to be in sound financial condition as evidenced by performance on key indicators derived from the school's independently audited financial statements.

NYSED reviews the financial performance and management of charter schools using quantitative and qualitative methods. The data presents several near-term and long-term financial performance indicators. 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 NYSED 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 in strong financial health. SASCS's composite score for 2015-2016 is 3.00. The table below shows the school's composite scores from 2012-2013 through 2015-2016.

Syracuse Academy of Science Charter School's Composite Scores
2012-2013 to 2014-2015

Year	Composite Score
2015-2016	3.00
2014-2015	2.90
2013-2014	2.90
2012-2013	2.70

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. NYSED uses three measures:

The *current ratio* is a financial ratio that measures whether or not a school has enough resources to pay its debts over the next 12 months. The ratio is mainly used to give an idea of the education corporation'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 education corporation is of paying its obligations, with a ratio under 1.0 indicating concern. For 2014-2015, SASCS had a current ratio of 3.70x.

Unrestricted cash measures, in days, whether the corporation can meet operating expenses without receiving new income. Schools typically strive to maintain at least 90 days of cash on hand. For fiscal year 2014-2015, SASCS operated with 112 days of unrestricted cash.

Enrollment stability measures whether or not a school is meeting its enrollment projections, thereby generating sufficient revenue to fund ongoing operations. Schools typically strive to have low variability in enrollment over time. Actual enrollment that is over 85 percent is considered reasonable. SASCS's enrollment stability for 2014-2015 was at 100.2 percent.

Long Term Indicators

A 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 2014-2015, SASCS' debt to asset ratio was 0.20.

Total margin measures the deficit or surplus a 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 2014-2015 SASCS' total margin was 9.0 percent.

Finding: Meets

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 5:

NYSED reviewed SASCS' 2015-2016 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.

Finding: Meets

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:

The board possesses a range of skills and backgrounds relevant to charter school governance, including education (particularly higher education) and a parent perspective. The school is organized such that the board oversees a single leader who is responsible for management of each site through deans. The board receives regular reports from school leadership, including enrollment and academic performance data, such as monthly Star results. Interviewed board members were familiar with overall school performance and have set goals for exceeding state performance in each grade. However, they did not demonstrate a sense of urgency around subgroup performance, such as special education. The board is monitoring enrollment of subgroup populations relative to the Syracuse City School District, and is identifying recruitment strategies to ensure equal access to the school.

The board has undertaken strategic planning informed by its experience with growing and opening new school sites and has a process for self-evaluation. It has been responsive to leadership concerns; for instance, the school day for teachers was reduced with additional pay added for afterschool tutoring. The board has also increased salaries in hard-to-fill subjects and did not increase health insurance co-pays this year.

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:

The school has an effective leadership structure in place that includes a superintendent, a school director with overall responsibility for the three sites, each of which has a dean who manages day-to-day affairs and serves as instructional leader. Their relative roles and responsibilities were clear to staff.

The school provides robust teacher supervision and support, including review of and feedback on lesson plans as well as frequent classroom walk-throughs and a formal teacher evaluation system with an online system for documenting evidence and feedback. Interviews with staff suggested a strong professional culture. The school provides targeted coaching by instructional leaders as well as consultant coaches and uses improvement plans for teachers where there is concern; one school leader issues certificates of improvement for faculty members demonstrating growth. Each site has student support staff. The school is almost fully staffed; however, school leaders note the challenge of finding quality faculty members for certain key positions.

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:

Interviews with stakeholders, classroom observations and document review demonstrate a strong focus on academic achievement in a college preparatory environment. The school is driven by goals tied to academic performance and uses reflective practices to refine its program. The school's key design elements are in place, according to school leaders, including a rigorous core curriculum, a focus on productive attitudes, individual attention, college preparation, and educational reform and accountability. Service learning, however, although listed as a key design element, was not mentioned as a major priority.

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.

Table 3: Student Demographics – SASCS Charter School Compared to Syracuse City School District

	2014-15			2015-16			2016-17
	Percent of Enrollment			Percent of Enrollment			Percent of Enrollment
	School	SCSD	Variance[2]	School	SCSD	Variance	School[3]
Enrollment of Special Populations							
Economically Disadvantaged	69%	77%	-8	72%	79%	-7	78%
English Language Learners	6%	15%	-9%	5%	16%	-11	6%
Students with Disabilities	8%	20%	-12%	7%	20%	-13	9%

Summative Evidence for Benchmark 9:

The school has strong enrollment and backfills all grades from its waitlist. School leaders reported that many new students enter in the 9th grade seeking a high quality high school option. The proportion of

---

[2] Variance is defined as the percent of subgroup enrollment between the charter school and the district of location.
[3] Reported by the school; 2016-2017 enrollment data has not been publicly released as of the date of this report.

students with disabilities (9%) and English language learners (6%) is smaller than the district. Board members noted a focus last year on increasing special education numbers and a shift this year to enhancing ELL enrollment. The school collaborates with Christian Charities, an organization that works with refugee populations, and hired staff to work with refugee families and help with the transition to school. As a result, school leaders reported that the number of ELL students has increased this year.

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:

SASCS has substantially complied with legal obligations, applicable state and federal laws, and the terms of its charter.

Table 1: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes for All Students:
School, District& NYS Level Aggregates

All Students	ELA					Math				
	School	District		NYS		School	District		NYS	
		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)
2013-14	30%	9%	+21	31%	-1	37%	8%	+29	36%	+1
2014-15	24%	8%	+16	31%	-8	32%	9%	+23	38%	-6
2015-16	31%	11%	+20	38%	-7	34%	10%	+24	39%	-5

Table 2: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup –
Economically Disadvantaged Students: *School, District& NYS Level Aggregates*

Economically Disadvantaged	ELA					Math				
	School	District		NYS		School	District		NYS	
		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)
2013-14	25%	5%	+19	20%	+5	29%	6%	+23	26%	+3
2014-15	17%	5%	+12	21%	-4	28%	7%	+21	27%	+1
2015-16	28%	8%	+20	27%	+1	32%	8%	+24	28%	+4

Table 3: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup –
Students with Disabilities: *School, District& NYS Level Aggregates*

Students with Disabilities	ELA					Math				
	School	District		NYS		School	District		NYS	
		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)
2013-14	8%	1%	+7	5%	+3	13%	2%	+11	10%	+3
2014-15	4%	1%	+3	6%	-2	10%	2%	+8	11%	-1
2015-16	25%	1%	+23	8%	+17	26%	2%	+24	11%	+15

Table 4: Elementary/Middle School Assessment Proficiency Outcomes by Subgroup –
English Language Learners: *School, District & NYS Level Aggregates*

English Language Learners	ELA					Math				
	School	District		NYS		School	District		NYS	
		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)		District	Delta = (Sch–Dct)	NYS	Delta = (Sch–NYS)
2013-14	11%	1%	+10	3%	+8	17%	2%	+15	12%	+5
2014-15	17%	1%	+17	4%	+13	13%	2%	+11	13%	0
2015-16	0%	1%	-1	4%	-4	8%	3%	+6	12%	-4

Table 5: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes for All Students:
School, District & NYS Level Aggregates

4-Yr Cohort: **All Students**	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
ELA	87%	82%	+5	94%	84%	+10	93%	84%	+9
Math	89%	84%	+5	98%	86%	+12	98%	86%	+12
Global History	87%	78%	+9	94%	79%	+15	93%	78%	+15
US History	75%	79%	-4	94%	81%	+13	98%	81%	+17
Science	87%	83%	+4	96%	84%	+12	95%	84%	+11
Target Graduation Rate	84%	80%	+4	92%	80%	+12	93%	80%	+13

Table 6: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes by Subgroup – Economically Disadvantaged Students:
School, District & NYS Level Aggregates

4-Yr Cohort: **Economically Disadvantaged**	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
ELA	82%	75%	+7	88%	78%	+10	93%	79%	+14
Math	89%	79%	+10	96%	81%	+15	96%	81%	+15
Global History	87%	70%	+17	92%	71%	+21	93%	70%	+23
US History	74%	72%	+2	88%	74%	+14	96%	74%	+22
Science	84%	76%	+8	92%	78%	+14	96%	78%	+18
Graduation Rate	82%	67%	+15	88%	70%	+18	89%	73%	+16

Table 7: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes by Subgroup – Students with Disabilities: *School, District & NYS Level Aggregates*

4-Yr Cohort: **Students with Disabilities**	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
ELA	100%	43%	+57	-	49%	-	-[4]	51%	-
Math	80%	46%	+34	-	50%	-	-	51%	-
Global History	100%	39%	+61	-	40%	-	-	40%	-
US History	20%	42%	-22	-	46%	-	-	47%	-
Science	80%	48%	+32	-	49%	-	-	50%	-
Graduation Rate	100%	50%	+50		50%	-	-	50%	-

Table 8: High School Total 4-Year Regents Outcomes by Subgroup – English Language Learners: *School, District & NYS Level Aggregates*

4-Yr Cohort: **English Language Learners**	2010 Cohort			2011 Cohort			2012 Cohort		
Subject	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance	School	State	Variance
ELA	40%	39%	+1	-	44%	-	-	30%	-
Math	100%	58%	+42	-	56%	-	-	48%	-
Global History	100%	39%	+61	-	35%	-	-	24%	-
US History	60%	42%	+22	-	41%	-	-	30%	-
Science	80%	45%	+35	-	43%	-	-	32%	-
Graduation Rate	60%	31%	+29	-	31%	-	-	34%	-

---

[4] No available data